

# Sharples Tubular SEPARATORS

## WHICH?

Tubular	or	Bucket Bowl?
Simple Bowl	or	Complicated?
Izzers	or	Hasbeens?
Right Now	or	Were Once?
Waist Low Can	or	Head High Can?
Self Oiling	or	Oil Yourself?
Wash 3 Minutes	or	Wash Thirty?
All the Cream	or	Most All?
Best Butter	or	Medium Butter?
Tubular Bowl	or	Bucket Bowl?

## WHICH DO YOU WANT?

Tubulars are different, very different. Just one Tubular—the Sharples. All the others make bucket bowls—can't make Tubulars because they are patented. Ask for catalog B-228.



The Sharples Co.,  
Chicago, Ill.

P. M. Sharples  
West Chester, Pa.

### A Shock to Senator Hoar.

There was one hearty outburst of laughter in the Smoot trial. President Smith had said that ex-Apostle Moses Thatcher differed from the other leaders of the Mormon church and wanted to go into politics against their judgment and advice.

"Why was this?" asked Mr. Taylor. "Did Mr. Thatcher desire any office?"

"Yes, he wanted some office, I believe," replied President Smith.

"Can you remember what office he wanted?"

"I do not just recollect."

"Wasn't it that of senator? Didn't Mr. Thatcher want to be United States senator?"

"Oh, yes," said Smith; "I think it was that. It was senator—or something like that."

The look that came over Senator Hoar's face as he heard the words that meant that any living being thought there was an office on earth like that of United States senator was something awful to witness. In a moment it had passed and the whole committee burst into laughter, in which Mr. Hoar joined feebly.—New York Times.

### BOOKS RECEIVED.

Mrs. Maud Ballington Booth has recently issued, through Fleming H. Revel Co., New York and Chicago, a very interesting work entitled, "After Prison, What?" Mrs. Booth's prominent connection with prison reform and the Volunteer Prison league enables her to speak from an extended observation, and she makes an eloquent plea for those who, having served a term in prison, go out to meet the cold and oftentimes uncharitable world.

"The Shame of the Cities," by Lincoln Steffens, is a new book issued by McClure, Phillips & Co., of New York. The book deals in a comprehensive and incisive way with municipal corruption as it has been brought out at recent investigations. St. Louis, Minneapolis, Pittsburg, Philadelphia, Chicago and New York are the principal cities discussed.

# The Lesson of 1894.

When the New York Times tells its readers that the democratic party "was sick unto death" for "four years, from 1896 to 1900," implying that it fell sick under the leadership of Bryan, having theretofore and under Cleveland's leadership been of sound and disposing mind and memory, the Times displays the same symptoms of malignant groverclevelanditis with which the Brooklyn Eagle suffers. If the editor of the Times were to examine his political almanacs he would find that the democratic party fell deathly sick under the leadership of Cleveland. We have advised our readers of the affliction in this respect under which the Eagle suffers (vol. vi., p. 785); but the Eagle's symptoms were more localized than are those of the Times. The Eagle pointed only to Illinois, where it found democracy in fine feather in 1892, but observed that it began to droop in 1896 and has continued to droop ever since. The Times, however, implies that Bryan demoralized the democracy of the whole country in the years running from 1896 to 1900. Yet the fact is, and all political almanacs prove it, that the democracy was demoralized in 1894 not only in Illinois, but all over the country; not in 1896 under Bryan, mind you, but in 1894 under Cleveland.

After our disclosure of this fact with reference to Illinois and in answer to the Brooklyn Eagle, the daily Banner, of Nashville, Tenn., came to the Eagle's support. In its issue of April 2 it pointed out the unwisdom of relying upon political almanacs, and went behind the statistical returns to show that really it was not Cleveland's fault that the democratic party became so sick in 1894. We are very much at one with the Banner regarding statistics in general, although for election returns we have never been able to find a satisfactory substitute. But when the Banner undertakes to explain why its party collapsed in 1894, it begs the question; or, as it would doubtless prefer to express it (in keeping with its "suppressio veri" and "expressio falsi") it is guilty of a "petitio principii." The point the Eagle made, the point the New York Times makes, the point Mr. Cleveland himself made in a public speech about a year ago, was this: that the democratic party was in healthy condition until Mr. Bryan took it in hand in 1896, and that from that time on it has been sick. Our answer is that the democratic party was sicker in 1894, under Cleveland, than in 1896 under Bryan. It is a transparent evasion to meet that answer, as the Banner assumes to do, with any explanation whatever, either good or bad, of why the fact was so. The issue is the fact itself, not the reason for it.

But the Banner's reasons are exceedingly poor. It explains the 1834 reverse in Illinois on the ground that under Altgeld the people of this state had become strongly antagonistic to Cleveland. But that couldn't have been so, let us remind the Banner, if Cleveland had commanded their confidence. Moreover, the collapse of 1894 was not confined to Illinois. It was general. Even New York and New Jersey voiced their condemnation of Cleveland in that fateful year. The Banner may amuse itself at explaining this; but the more it explains the plainer it makes it that it was Cleveland who demoralized the democratic party.

Thus far the Nashville Banner shows no symptoms of groverclevelanditis. It honestly admits that the collapse did occur in 1894. But now some symptoms of the malady that has attacked the Eagle and the Times begin to appear in the Banner. Possibly this may be attributed to its

method of ignoring election statistics and roaming around its editor's brains for facts. That is convenient, no doubt; but with reference to reputation for veracity it is somewhat risky. Of 1896 the Banner says: "But as bad as the reverse of 1894 may have been, it was nothing compared with the crushing defeat of 1896, when Bryan had obtained full control of the democratic party." The fact, however, is quite otherwise. We are obliged to go to election statistics to prove it, and therefore cannot hope to convince the Banner; yet the election statistics do testify most impressively that at the elections of 1896 the democratic party regained to a considerable extent its congressional losses of 1894. In the congress elected in 1894, under Cleveland's leadership, the democrats had only 93 representatives; in the congress elected in 1896, under Bryan's leadership, the democrats had 130 representatives. In the former, the republican majority was 74; in the latter it was only 24. And in the congress elected in 1900, also under Bryan, the democratic representation had risen to 153 and the republican majority had fallen to 20. We fear that the Nashville Banner, like the Brooklyn Eagle and the New York Times, may indeed be suffering with an attack, temporary we trust, of groverclevelanditis.—Chicago Public.

### Public Men and Friends' Wills.

The comments made here, there and everywhere upon the Bennett will case trial in New Haven last week illustrate the perils to a public man of being made a beneficiary under a friend's will. Very few of the remarks made about Mr. Bryan's connection with the case have been deliberately misleading, probably, for there has been more ignorance than malice abroad; but the ease with which distorted impressions travel in such an affair is wonderful to behold.

"The experience of history," wrote the late Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone, "teaches that the uncounted majority of those who get in the pages are bad. Most assuredly, now as heretofore, the men of the time are in most cases unprincipled and act from motives of interest, of passion, of prejudice, cherished and unchecked, of selfish hope or unworthy fear." Possibly that is true, terribly pessimistic though it be, of public men in their political capacity; but one may well hesitate to believe it of the public men in general, of our time, in their private characters. Now and then one is proved to be a scoundrel or a thief who has held high public station and has gained the confidence of a large number of citizens. But certainly, the Republican has not been willing to think that Mr. Bryan had been guilty of a reprehensible act in connection with this will, or had committed anything worse than possibly a mistake of judgment in allowing his friend to bequeath him money, without a serious protest.

Our interest in public men, consequently, led us to make as careful an examination as was possible into this celebrated will case—celebrated only because of Mr. Bryan's prominence in it. And the conclusion reached was that there was no moral taint whatever upon Mr. Bryan's character. This was confirmed by the decision of the judge of probate, which still stands, that the late Mr. Bennett was the victim of no "undue influence" when he made his will. It seems that Mr. Bryan is entitled to have this said in his behalf; and it should also be said in behalf of the general reputation of public men in America, which would surely suffer if a man of Mr. Bryan's prominence and presidential candidacies should be fairly chargeable with sordidly seeking to deprive

a widow of a fortune that was rightly hers.

The chief question involved was, perhaps, raised by the attorney for the contestants—and Mr. Bryan is not a contestant, he simply defends the will as its maker left it, not alone because he is himself a beneficiary, but because he is an executor of the will. This able attorney, Judge Stoddard, has been reported in the newspapers as saying that "Mr. Bryan could not afford" to accept the \$50,000, which Mr. Bennett directed his widow, in the sealed letter, to give to him. The ethics of wills and of the inheritance of money opens up an interesting range in discussion. Granted that the late Mr. Bennett was of sound mind and that he was under no "undue influence" when he made his will, it may be asked, who can afford to accept that \$50,000? It is well known by those who have examined the case with any care that Mr. Bennett left an estate that has been appraised at nearly \$300,000, and that to his wife, who is childless, he bequeathed property yielding an abundant income. It cannot be charged that, by accepting this legacy of \$50,000, Mr. Bryan would be reducing the widow to want, or anything resembling it. Who, then, can afford to accept the \$50,000 with a clearer conscience than the one person for whom the \$50,000 was intended by the man who had earned it?

This is a question of universal application, and it would be of interest were the man named Brown, instead of Bryan, whom the testator had designated as the beneficiary. If the bequest finally is diverted to some one else, that person will get property which the man who earned it did not desire should ever receive it. Could that person afford to take the money? Legally, yes; but morally—what? The testator's desire would have been frustrated by technical points of law. These technicalities, doubtless, are necessary, but when a testator's wish is so obviously defeated by technicalities, when it is clear to all the world that his purpose is being defeated by points of law, the moral question, who can afford to receive the legacy, assumes a peculiar status, which any of us is as competent to discuss as the learned members of the bar.

It is a conservative judgment that, inasmuch as Mr. Bennett, being in sound mind, plainly desired that Mr. Bryan should receive the \$50,000, no other living person could accept it with a clearer conscience than the man for whom it was intended. Still, the case illustrates the dangers a public man must face in allowing himself to become entangled in such a snarl. He exposes his acts and motives to misconstruction and renders life the less worth living. The moral is that no public man should suffer himself to be provided for in a friend's will—if he can help himself. The man who, after all his striving to prevent such a benefaction, should then find himself thus hoisted upon public attention in the inevitable will contest, would surely be worthy of sympathy. But Mr. Bryan must take the punishment of his indiscretion, as he deserves.—Springfield Republican.

Chicago has a novel organization in the way of an association created to supervise the celebration of Independence Day with fireworks. The association is planning to furnish free fireworks to every child in Chicago, but these fireworks must be set off in the parks and public playgrounds under the supervision of a fireman, a physician and a member of the association.

### A Bottle Free.

Drake's Palmetto Wine will restore the appetite, assist digestion, stimulate the liver and kidneys and cure sick headache, cramps, nausea, dyspepsia, indigestion, biliousness and constipated bowels. Any reader of this paper who is a sufferer can secure a trial bottle free. It will give you quick relief and a permanent cure, and cost you nothing. Write for it today to the Drake Formula Co., Drake Building, Chicago.