

two or three years? Who could be behind these democratic papers which began to sneeze as soon as Wall street took snuff? Belmont. He did this. Judge a man by his environments. Judging by those to whom he owes his election; judging by those who run his campaign; judging by those who help get up his campaign fund, because those men are making pledges all along to get this campaign fund. Who are they? There is Richard Olney of Massachusetts. Who is Olney? He is the man who has been revising the letter of acceptance which is to be issued soon by Mr. Parker. Who is Olney? He is a railroad lawyer, who was in Cleveland's administration as attorney general for the United States, and who, according to all the published prints, continued to draw his pay from the corporations at the same time he drew his pay from the people. And while he drew \$8,000 per year from the people, the report was that he drew \$25,000 every year from the corporations. The good book tells us we can not serve two masters at the same time. And the time came when he had to choose at the great riot in Chicago.

The Pullman Palace Car company, one of the most powerful, one of the most rapacious corporations on the face of the earth had cut down the scale of wages of their workmen, which the workmen resisted. There was a strike and resulted in the usual disorders which come from a strike. The street cars had been stopped. The capitalists of Chicago, the kings of the Pullman Palace Car company appealed to Cleveland to send the United States army there to put down the workmen, and make them accept the reduced scale of wages. John P. Altgeld, governor of Illinois (applause), in my judgment, one of the purest, the truest and the ablest democrats that has ever occupied the executive chair of any state since the civil war (applause) he said to Cleveland, don't violate the principle of home rule, the principle of state rights. I am here on the ground. I understand the merits of this dispute. I know the parties to the dispute. The state authorities and municipal authorities are competent to deal with this situation. We can uphold the law and maintain order. Don't send the federal troops in here and trample the state government under foot. Richard Olney, being the adviser of Cleveland, advised him that he had the right to send the federal troops into the sovereign state of Illinois over the protest of her democratic governor, and with shallow pretense of putting mail sacks on the car, they rushed it through the strikers, and thus used the power of the United States to break down their resistance and what was an infringement of their rights. Mr. Cooley, the great constitutional lawyer, wrote to Cleveland congratulating him that he had established a new principle in constitutional law. It was a new principle.

When Pennsylvania arose in revolt against the whiskey law, the troops of the state were called out and put under the control of the governor. Even Hamilton did not pretend that Washington had the right to call in the United States troops until the state authorities had used the state troops. President Jackson believed he would have to use force to collect the customs. It was Daniel Webster who advised him that he had no right, as a constitutional principle, to send the federal troops into South Carolina until all the forces of the state had been exhausted. Therefore, when I see Olney, Judge Parker and others of their like, I begin to suspect that the old Cleveland crowd of the second administration are coming to the front again. But there is another, John G. Carlisle has come out for Judge Parker. Who is Carlisle? He represented the whiskey trust in congress. In one night he turned from free silver to mono-metalism to become secretary of the treasury under Cleveland, and after the election of Cleveland the second time, and the Wilson and Gorman bill was on its passage, the schedules which had been made while it was in the house was not satisfactory to the sugar trust, and they rushed to Washington city. Havemeyer was put in touch with Carlisle, Cleveland's secretary of the treasury. And what happened then? Mr. Havemeyer who, by the way had been introduced to Carlisle by Stephen Elkins—did you ever hear of Steve (laughter) of West Virginia? He is the son-in-law of the vice-presidential nominee on the democratic

BETTER THAN SPANKING.

Spanking does not cure children of urine diff. erent. If it did there would be few children that would do it. There is a constitutional cause for this. Mrs. M. Summers, Box 109, Notre Dame Ind., will send her home treatment to any mother. She asks no money. Write her today if your children trouble you in this way. Don't blame the child. The chances are it can't help it

THOUSANDS OF FAIR WOMEN HERALD PRAISES FOR PE-RU-NA.

(Catarrhal Dyspepsia and Nervous Prostration Makes Invalids of More Women Than all Other Diseases Combined.)



Mrs. Leone Dolehan.

Miss Anna Prescott, in a letter from 216 South Seventh street, Minneapolis, Minn., writes:

"I was completely used up last fall, my appetite had failed and I felt weak and tired all the time. I took Peruna for five weeks, and am glad to say that I am completely restored to health."—Anna Prescott.

Mrs. Leone Dolehan, in a letter from the Commercial Hotel, Minneapolis, Minn., writes:

"For two months my physician experimented with me trying to cure a hard cold which settled in my stomach, caus-

ing inflammation and catarrh. I have now been well for six months, and I give all the credit to Peruna."—Mrs. Leone Dolehan.

Peruna will be found to effect an immediate and lasting cure in all cases of systemic catarrh. It acts quickly and beneficially on the diseased mucous membranes, and with healthy mucous membranes the catarrh can no longer exist.

Miss Louise Matt, 1259 Van Buren St., Chicago, Ill., writes:

"Peruna is a most wonderful medicine for catarrhal and stomach troubles."

"I suffered so long with indigestion and dyspepsia, and tried many things to cure me, without relief. I finally bought a bottle of Peruna and in just six weeks I was entirely rid of my stomach trouble."—Louise Matt.

Miss Louise Matt.

A Letter From Mrs. Senator Warren.

The following letter is from the wife of late Governor and now U. S. Senator, F. E. Warren of Wyoming:

"I am constantly troubled with colds, cough, etc., but thanks to your good medicine, Peruna, I always find a prompt cure."—Mrs. F. E. Warren.

If you do not derive prompt and satisfactory results from the use of Peruna, write at once to Dr. Hartman, giving a full statement of your case and he will be pleased to give you his valuable advice gratis.

Address Dr. Hartman, President of The Hartman Sanitarium, Columbus, Ohio.

ticket—introduced to Carlisle. Carlisle found out what he wanted, and he took his pen. Carlisle did, and he wrote down himself exactly the schedule which the sugar trust wanted, and thereby put millions into the pockets of the sugar trust, and millions of tax on the American people, and why? Because the sugar trust had contributed \$250,000 to the democratic state campaign fund in the state of New York. But I am proud to say that the people's party had in the senate of the United States a man who was not ashamed of his party or principles, and he brought that sugar trust before an investigating committee, which turned its books to the open gaze of the people, and brought down all the odium of exposure upon that deal. I allude to your brave, able, true-hearted senator from Nebraska, the Hon. William V. Allen. (Applause which was long continued.) If you want any more sugar schedules written as Havemeyer wants them, look to Olney and the democratic party.

Here comes Gorman of the state of Maryland. Have you ever heard of Gorman? He is a cousin of Davis. Stephen Elkins is the go-between that introduced him to Havemeyer. On the democratic side Arthur P. Gorman stands for the trusts, just as Aldrich stands on the republican side, and I appeal to Senator Allen if that is not right. On the democratic side Gorman speaks, acts and works and fights for the trusts, just as Aldrich does on the republican side.

Then comes Belmont. Who is Bel-

mont? The American agent of the Rothschilds. Now, you begin to see don't you? You remember that Cleveland bond issue—the midnight deal? Morgan, Belmont, Rothschild, Cleveland, a night time deal in which the bonds of the United States, one of the richest countries on earth, were turned over to this syndicate at a private deal, at a smaller price than many a railroad bond sells for; and thus this bond syndicate, represented by Belmont and Morgan, got from the American people \$262,000,000 in bonds, and we have not got a thing to show for it; we haven't got another acre of land, or another gun to show for it, or lighthouse to show for it. What have we got to show for it? The single gold standard. (Applause.) You remember how coin was construed to mean gold, and thus by the use of paper dollars, gold was raked out of the treasury in order to compel the issue of bonds to bond the people until Wall street for a time had enough.

I beg to call your attention to the fact that that situation remains exactly where Cleveland left it, exactly. The same endless chain can be worked again; the same exchange of paper and treasury notes in exchange for gold can be made again. The same appeal for bonds upon the American people can be made again. The only thing that relieved the situation was the discovery of gold in Rondike and the discovery of the process of working low grade ores that can be worked at a profit now. And if those resources should fail us tomorrow, we would be

in the same condition now as then. Then the people can look for another Cleveland administration, which was the rottenest administration we have ever had, in my opinion.

Some man tells me in an eloquent voice, look to the democratic party for relief. Nobody expects to look to the republican party, nobody. The wildest man knows that would not do. We are going to regenerate the party. Pledge it to what? Can you pledge it more solemnly than it was pledged in 1892? Can you pledge it more solemnly than it was pledged in 1896? Here is the handbook of 1892, that tells what it was pledged to. It was pledged to the removal of the tariff which was denounced then as it is now in St. Louis in 1904. The very same thing meant as much then as it does now—and it meant nothing then, and it means nothing now. (Applause.) In 1896 they went further and they pledged themselves to the abolition of national banks. They didn't do that this time. You put them into power in 1892. They had the house; they had the senate; they had the cabinet; the president. They had it all and every pledge they broke, and did exactly what they told you they would not do. Isn't that true? The charters of the banks expired in 1893, and they were rechartered for twenty more years, and the democratic party did not make a kick. They tell me they have got a new tariff plank. I look in the campaign book of 1892, at page 5, it is the same as now. It means nothing there, and it means nothing now. It is all done to