



Let this Machine do your Washing Free.

There are Motor Springs beneath the tub.

These springs do nearly all the hard work when once you start them going. And this washing machine works as easy as a bicycle wheel does.

There are slats on the inside bottom of the tub.

These slats act as paddles, to swing the water in the same direction you revolve the tub.

You throw the soiled clothes into the tub first. Then you throw enough water over the clothes to float them.

Next you put the heavy wooden cover on top of the clothes to anchor them, and to press them down.

This cover has slats on its lower side to grip the clothes and hold them from turning around when the tub turns.

Now we are ready for quick and easy washing.

You grasp the upright handle on the side of the tub and, with it, you revolve the tub one-third way round, till it strikes a motor spring.

This motor spring throws the tub back till it strikes the other motor spring, which in turn throws it back on the first motor spring.

The machine must have a little help from you, at every swing, but the motor springs, and the ball-bearings, do practically all the hard work.

You can sit in a rocking chair and do all that the washer requires of you. A child can run it easily full of clothes.

When you revolve the tub the clothes don't move. But the water moves like a mill race through the clothes.

The paddles on the tub bottom drive the soapy water THROUGH and through the clothes at every swing of the tub. Back and forth, in and out of every fold, and through every mesh in the cloth, the hot soapy water runs like a torrent. This is how it carries away all the dirt from the clothes, in from six to ten minutes by the clock.

It drives the dirt out through the meshes of the fabrics WITHOUT ANY RUBBING,—without any WEAR and TEAR from the washboard.

It will wash the finest lace fabric without breaking a thread, or a button, and it will wash a heavy, dirty carpet with equal ease and rapidity. Fifteen to twenty garments, or five large bed-sheets, can be washed at one time with this "1900" Washer.

A child can do this in six to twelve minutes better than any able washer-woman could do the same clothes IN TWICE the time, with three times the wear and tear from the washboard.

This is what we SAY, now how do we PROVE it?

We send you our "1900" Washer free of charge, on a full month's trial, and we even pay the freight out of our own pockets.

No cash deposit is asked, no notes, no contract, no security.

You may use the washer four weeks at our expense. If you find it won't wash as many clothes in FOUR hours as you can wash by hand in EIGHT hours you send it back to the railway station,—that's all.

But, if, from a month's actual use, you are convinced it saves HALF the time in washing, does the work better, and does it twice as easily as it could be done by hand, you keep the machine.

Then you mail us 50 cents a week till it is paid for.

Remember that 50 cents is part of what the machine saves you every week on your own, or on a washer-woman's labor. We intend that the "1900" Washer shall pay for itself and thus cost you nothing.

You don't risk a cent from first to last, and you don't buy it until you have had a full month's trial.

Could we afford to pay freight on thousands of these machines every month, if we did not positively KNOW they would do all we claim for them? Can you afford to be without a machine that will do your washing in HALF THE TIME, with half the wear and tear of the washboard, when you can have that machine for a month's free trial and let it PAY FOR ITSELF? This offer may be withdrawn at any time it overcrows our factory.

Write us TODAY, while the offer is still open, and while you think of it. The postage stamp is all you risk. Write me personally on this offer, viz: R. F. Bleber, General Manager of "1900" Washer Company, 269 Henry St., Longhampton, New York.

Mr. Watson's Letter

(Continued from page 13.)

inevitable consequences. But even he could not have foreseen the extravagant usurpations which have become the every day occurrence with us, the drag-net injunction, the imprisonment without trial by jury, the practical abrogation of habeas corpus. A cor-

poration which does not own a federal judge or two, is as much behind the times as it would be if it did not own lawyers, lobbyists, newspapers, politicians and professional witnesses.

When our party was first founded it declared that "the necessities of life which the poor must have to live, should not be subjected to tariff tax; and that no man's industry should be built up at the expense of another." These principles are surely sound and democratic. They are expressed in almost the exact words of Mr. Jefferson, whose ideal was a system of national taxation upon luxuries in which the poor man need not pay any tax at all.

Learned Democracy of Alexander Stephens.

I learned what I know of the principles of democracy at the feet of Alexander H. Stephens. My home was in his district, and I was one of the thousands of young men who gathered around him in his later years and fought his battles against the democratic bosses who sought to oust the old sage from office. Time and again he defied the democratic machine in Georgia; time and again they saved the machine by throwing to him an official nomination which he had not sought. He spent his fortune and made the last speeches of his glorious life in the vain effort to inject some Jeffersonian doctrine into the post-bellum democratic party.

Having learned what true democracy was from Stephens and from the writings of Jefferson, I am not willing to change the creed at the dictation of Belmont, Pat McCarren and Arthur Gorman.

Measured by the old standards of Jefferson, Jackson, Benton and Stephens, the party which calls itself democratic has no right to do so. It contains no democratic principles. It does not seek to accomplish any democratic purpose. It has no harmony of creed, no unity of action, no common legislative object. One and all, they would like to capture the offices; beyond that, they do not agree upon any earthly subject.

In effect, the democratic party of today has no mission except to keep the people divided, in order that the corporations may have no substantial opposition. The republican party is one good horse; the democratic party is another; sometimes the corporations ride the one, sometimes the other. In either event, they keep in the saddle.

Senator John T. Morgan of Alabama is the nestor of the south in the United States senate; and if anybody is competent to tell what modern republicans and democrats are, it is this veteran who has served his state so long in the upper house of congress. In December last, Senator Morgan declared publicly, through the newspapers, that there was no practical difference between the two old parties; that each of them railed against the trusts during a campaign, and each became servants of the trusts after the election. He called one the pot and the other the kettle, for blackness.

Yet Senator Morgan has to submit to the humiliation of being carried along—obedient, helpless, filled with impotent rage—by a lot of corporation agents who have captured the democratic party and have prostituted it to the service of the trusts.

Predicament of Gen. Wheeler

Consider the case of General Joseph B. Wheeler, also. This grizzled soldier was a member of congress when the infamous Gorman tariff act came back to the house to be voted on. Its sell-out to the trusts was so palpable, its slavish submission to corporation greed was so brazenly apparent, that General Wheeler made an elaborate speech against the bill. He showed how the entire south had been discriminated against by an increase of taxes upon those articles which she

bought, while at the same time those products which she sold were put upon the free list where they had to meet the competition of the world. He also showed how the very tools with which the laboring man had to toil for his daily bread were subjected to a higher tax than had been put upon them by the McKinley bill. He also showed how the trusts had been favored, how money would be taken from one class to swell the fortunes of a more favored class. He showed how the farmer would have to pay more under the democratic tariff than had been expected under the republican tariff on various articles, which may be reasonably called necessities.

General Wheeler's speech was a terrible arraignment of Gorman's bill. But as he was about to take his seat this question was asked by Mr. Hopkins: "I take it from the gentleman's remarks that he will vote against the bill." The reply of General Wheeler was prompt: "No, sir, I will vote for it," and the grizzled warrior sat down amid laughter.

Brave enough and intelligent enough to understand and denounce the odious law, he was not brave enough to defy his party and do what his heart and his conscience told him was right.

To this pass has party tyranny brought statesmen who groan under the yoke, yet dare not refuse their necks.

No Question that Wealth is Concentrated

Nobody will question the statement that by far the greater part of the wealth of this country is now owned and controlled by corporations. Nor will anyone doubt that they intend to maintain the present legislation which is so favorable to them.

Grant these premises and then go a step further; nothing will better serve to keep them in power and to maintain their wealth and advantage than the control of both "the great political parties." As long as the corporations own but one of these great parties their system is in danger, for the reason that elections are uncertain, at least the returns are. Even the astutest experts in finance may be lacking in the "instinct for popular movements." One who is always closeted in luxurious quarters, to which only the elect are admitted, may come to take his political knowledge from the newspapers, solely and may thus find himself dealing with an imaginary situation before he knows it.

Brazenly Plutocratic

To rely upon one of "the two great political parties" means possible defeat and disaster. By obtaining control of both, the element of risk is eliminated. This is so obviously true that I only state it as a basis for further comment. In controlling only one of "the two great political parties," the corporations might be willing to let the fact be more or less known. Mark Hanna, for instance, did not seem to care; nor did Quay. Both of these republican managers took a business-like view of the question and compelled the beneficiaries of class-legislation to put up the campaign fund necessary to perpetuate the system. They knew what they wanted, were willing to pay for it, did pay for it, and got it. Really no secret was made of the way in which it was done. The corporations were plainly, bluntly told that if they wanted to keep things just as they were they must pay the price, and they paid it.

Secrecy Necessary Now

But when it becomes the better policy to secure control of both "the two great political parties" so that the corporations will not be hurt in any event, secrecy is necessary. There must always be an ostensible party for the people, a party pretending to be democratic in principle. If the corporations were seen to be in open, undisputed control of both "the two great political parties," there would be

Sharples Tubular SEPARATORS

THE ONLY CONVENIENT KIND



No other occupies so little space, sits so firmly, has waist low can, enclosed self-oiling gears, light bowl without inside parts. Tubulars hold present world's record for clean skimming and perfect cream. Write for Catalog M-238.

The Sharples Co.
Chicago, Ill.

P. M. Sharples
West Chester, Pa.

an immediate revolt of the democratic masses. An open control of both the two old parties would defeat its own purpose. To make the scheme a success, secrecy and denial are absolutely necessary. Positive, direct evidence, therefore, could hardly ever be had. But if such a deal has been made, and both the old parties are in control of the corporations there ought to be circumstantial evidence which would carry conviction to any sensible mind.

Suppose that the corporations had determined to control both the old parties, and were in fact controlling them, what would be the evidence of it?

(1) That some of the corporations and trusts joined the republicans and others the democrats.

(2) That both parties drew their campaign funds from the trusts and the corporations.

(3) That the platforms of the two parties were made as much alike as possible—so much so that one of the candidates on the national ticket admitted they were "almost identical."

(4) That the environment of the candidates of the two parties was exactly the same.

(5) The political record which proved that both the old parties had united to defeat any measure of reform.

(6) The fact that the record showed that both the old parties had united in establishing, step by step, the system as we now have it.

These proofs are all at hand. Any well-informed citizen can see the facts if he will.

Accepts Nomination—Endorses Platform

I accept the nomination tendered me, and endorse the platform upon which it has been made. In this campaign when plutocracy has captured both the old parties it seemed an absolute necessity that some one should erect the standard of Jeffersonian democracy. Had no one made the effort to infuse the spirit of resistance into the people, four more years of apathy and discontent might have rendered the cause hopeless. The leaders in 1908 who would seek to rekindle the hopes of the masses might have been met with the cry "Too Late!"

To the courage and the intelligence of the voter, I appeal. If you think