

tion, and the people would use these certificates for the payment of all dues to the government, including fares and freight charges. It would be but a short time when all these certificates would be returned to the government. The government would then be the possessor of the roads free of debt and without bonds bearing interest.

Suppose, out of consideration to those who believe that government should not issue certificates, but bonds, for the purchase of the roads, that such bonds, bearing interest, were issued. Would the payment of the interest on such bonds involve any further taxation of the people? Not at all. For the reason that such interest would be paid out of the earnings of the roads themselves, just as the people are now paying interest on the bonds of the roads now operated. In addition the people would save the dividends now paid to private parties as stockholders, and also the enormous attorney fees to railroad attorneys, the cost of maintaining lobbies throughout the country from municipal councils to the national senate, as well as saving the enormous salaries now paid to high railway officials.

After all, is it at all necessary that the government should purchase the rolling stock, the shops, round houses, stations and other fixtures of railroads? Could not the real object of government ownership, that is, protection of the people from extortion, be accomplished without this outlay? If the public owned the highways, as it should, could there be any such thing as railway monopoly? A railway is a public highway, and it is the private ownership of this highway that causes all the oppression of the people. The mere private ownership of cars, stations and the like, injures no one. Free competition could be allowed in these things, if the government retained possession of the highway. The real danger of the private ownership of the highway, is in the fact that for government to grant to a private party a franchise for the use of the highway, is to grant to that private party the right of eminent domain, which is really a prerogative of government alone. Therefore if government grants to a private company the right of eminent domain, it is equivalent to, and in fact is, a surrender to a private company of a portion of that government's own sovereignty, for the right of eminent domain is a sovereign right. Now, instead of the government granting to a private company such a prerogative, the government should retain that right in itself. It should own the highway alone. It could then appoint government officials to control all traffic, govern the running of trains and such regulations, leaving to private companies the privilege of running trains. By such means there would result a free competition among the several railway companies. The people would thereby secure the best service at competitive prices.

It is always the burned book that illumines the world. It is the expunged sentence that burns most deeply into the minds of men. An instance in point is the paragraph from Lawson's "Frenzied Finance," which appeared to the publishers of Everybody's Magazine, courageous as they may be, too "tropical" to appear in the article. The publishers thought its tone was likely to be considered as incendiary. Mr. Lawson finally reluctantly consented to strike the offending paragraph from his article. Then straightway the publishers reproduce the same offending paragraph editorially, making due explanation for its being stricken from the article. Here it is: "I am conscious of a haunting fear that these men and women may not always be patient, may not always be put off with skilled evasion or slippery subterfuge, and for one brief moment I see visions of a marching people, bearing aloft grisly heads on gory poles, and hear above the low, bestial murmur of the mob the cry for bread and for revenge. And then I remember that this is America, not France; that our laws are strong—if but the people are aroused to see them obeyed; that our prisons are ample, even though they be for the present filled with petty rascals who can do but little harm

A NOTRE DAME LADY.

I will send free, with full instructions, some of this simple preparation for the cure of Leucorrhoea, Ulceration, Displacements, Falling of the Womb, Scanty or Painful Periods, Tumors or Growths, Hot Flashes, Desire to Cry, Creeping feeling up the spine, Pain in the Back, and all Female Troubles, to all sending address. To mothers of suffering daughters I will explain a successful Home Treatment. If you decide to continue it will only cost about 12 cents a week to guarantee a cure. Tell either sufferers of it, that is all I ask. If you are interested write now and tell your suffering friends of it. Address Mrs. M. Summers, Box 169 Notre Dame, Ind.

though turned loose to make room for the real scoundrels who are undermining the foundations of our republic." And so especial attention is called to the "incendiary" paragraph, and by its suppression it becomes the most conspicuous and luminous of all. So runs the world away.

Frederick O. Olcott of New York, president and director of many banking institutions, who claims to have been an independent voter, is out for Parker. He says he voted twice for Cleveland, once for Harrison and twice for McKinley. It is safe to assert that he voted for Cleveland the first time, when his election seemed preferable to plutocracy than the election of Blaine. Then he voted for Harrison in 1888, because Cleveland in his first term had shown some signs of "independence," but in 1892, after Harrison had proved to some extent that plutocracy did not own him, then friend Olcott voted for the "stuffed prophet," because in 1892 he was the Wall street candidate. This makes the two times for Cleveland and one for Harrison. Then, of course, it was to be supposed that he would vote for McKinley, because there again the issue was plain as to the preference of Wall street. And now, still pursuing his thoroughly consistent course, he is ready to vote for Parker, the Wall street candidate. "Independent," indeed. His votes have been thoroughly consistent all along. Plutocrats have no parties. They vote for their tools. Someday, perhaps, the people will awaken to the wisdom of doing the same thing—that is vote for their own interests, instead of those of plutocracy. When that time comes we may hope for a revival of Americanism.

"SAFE AND SANE."

Both the republicans and Parker democrats are trying to patent and claim for their own of the phrase: "Safe and Sane." Neither of them can rightfully lay claim to being either safe or sane. They start out with platitudes, the main contention of which is both an absurdity and a blasphemy. They speak of the gold standard as being firmly established which is as rank an absurdity as could be uttered. A gold standard means that nothing but gold can be a legal tender. In the United States we have nearly a thousand millions of dollars besides gold which is more or less a legal tender. Greenbacks are a legal tender for everything except duties on imports and interest on the public debt. Silver dollars are a legal tender except where otherwise provided in the contract. National bank notes are a partial legal tender. With all this money afloat, the two old parties start out with the assertion that the gold standard is established. Then they follow that with the assertion that it is "irrevocably established." That is to say the emanations of Wall street issued through either of the old parties is greater than God himself. Parker says that it is "irrevocable." If God wants to change it he can't because Parker won't let him. Parker has spoken and that ends it. Absurdity and blasphemy! That's what they call "safe and sane!"

Something over 10,000 papers published this item concerning the Cooper Union meetings: "Jay W. Forrest, of Albany, told Tibbles of his nomination for vice president. Tibbles was greeted with cheers. 'It is an honor,' he said, 'to be tendered with a nomination by a party which feels that you will come forward and accept it, prompted only by honest methods of principles.' After the meeting a reception was held." Any man who has ever read any of Mr. Tibbles' writings or ever heard him speak in public will instantly assert that he could not be the author of a sentence constructed like that. What Mr. Tibbles did say was this: "It is an honor to be tendered a nomination by a party that feels assured that you will accept, although there may be no hope of office, and that you will defend its principles by all honest methods."

The Ohio populists are waking up. There are thousands of Bryan democrats in that state who have repudiated Parker and all his Wall street adherents. All that Ohio needs to poll a big populist vote is to get candidates in the field and their names on the ticket. There was a conference of the members of the people's party of the Thirteenth congressional district of Ohio held at the court house, in Tiffin last Wednesday for the purpose of starting a petition to get presidential electors on the ticket. Every other congressional district in the state should immediately take the same action.

LINCOLN Sept. 1

One Day Only TUESDAY, Sept. 1, 1904

EXHIBITION GROUNDS 22nd AND RANDOLPH STREETS.

THE WORLD'S LARGEST, GRANDEST, BEST AMUSEMENT INSTITUTION. AMERICA'S REAL REPRESENTATIVE SHOW.

3 CIRCUSES 3 STAGES TRUTHFULLY ADVERTISED

BARNUM AND BAILEY GREATEST SHOW ON EARTH

HONORABLY PRESENTED 1000 WONDERS 2 MENAGERIES

86 CARS, 5 TRAINS, 500 HORSES WORTH \$175,000. ALL THE BEST AMUSEMENT IDEAS. PERMANENT WINTER QUARTERS BRIDGEPORT, CONN. FOREIGN OFFICES: 3 CROSBY SQUARE, LONDON, ENGLAND. 8 RUE DE PORT MAISON, PARIS, FRANCE.

MAIN BUSINESS OFFICE: NEW YORK CITY. CONDUCTED ON SOUND BUSINESS PRINCIPLES—DAILY EXPENSES \$12,000.

THE ONLY CIRCUS EXHIBITING IN NEW YORK

Coming Undivided, Just as it Gladdened the Nation's Metropolis. Containing Numberless Marvelous Attractions which Only this Institution can Present.

Six Sublime, Surpassing, Superb, Sensational, Surprises

Reproduction of the Gorgeous Delhi Durbar Just as the Grand Ceremonial Pageant was Produced in India, with Living Representatives of the Orient.

Elephants, Camels, Sacred Beasts, Cars, Floats, Men, Women and Children.

ANCILLOTTI, THE MODERN ARIEL In the Death-Defying Deed, Looping The Gap SOLO AND CHICO, The Marvelous Unicyclists Executing a Carrying Act while Descending a Ladder on One Wheel.

VOLO, The Wizzard Volitant, In a Wild, Rush Ride Down an Inclined Chute and Aerial Flight



A Full Herd of Giraffes. 3 Herds of Elephants. 2 Doves of Camels

BABY ELEPHANT AND MOTHER.

Smallest Horse in the World, Jumping Horses, Leaping Ponies, Gymnastic Feats, Acrobatic Acts 100 Thrilling Acts, 200 Expert Performers. Huge Collection of Living Human Curiousities. Exhibition of Model U. S. War Ships. Troupes of Midgets. Russian Dancers and Performances by the Prodiges.

THE GRANDEST AND MOST COSTLY SHOW EVER PROJECTED

Two Exhibitions Daily, at 2 and 8 P. M. Doors Open an Hour Earlier.

General Admission, including seat with foot-rest 50c. Children Under 10 Years 25c.

Reserved folding seats, 25 cents extra. Grand stand seats, 50 cents extra. Box seats, \$1.00 and \$1.50 extra. Private boxes, with six seats, from \$9.00 to \$12.00, according to location. All tickets are double-number d tickets—one half is taken up on entering the other half is returned to purchaser, insuring them the seats their respective tickets call for. Private box and \$1.00 chairs for sale at RECTOR'S PHARMACY, Cor., 12th and O Streets and on the grounds at hours of opening. All seats have foot-rests. All tickets sold at regular prices. Beware of parties charging more.

SUPERB AND SURPRISING NEW TRIUMPHAL STREET PARADE

With Allegorical Floats and 40-Horse Team, at 10 o'clock A. M.

Will Exhibit at Omaha, Monday, September 12th. Beatrice, Wednesday, September 14; Falls City, Thursday, September 15.

NOT RADICALS.

The Press-Knickerbocker of Albany, New York, says:

"In 1896, only a section of the country seemed to have the thought of the populists. Today, every state in the union is considered as the field of a party which stands for democracy in everything."

That statement is accurate but the Press-Knickerbocker makes a mistake when it says:

"When the populists first sprang into public notice, they undoubtedly were extremely radical in their views on many things. But time and reverses have chastened them, and today they are upholding principles which apply to the nation."

The populists are advocating exactly the same things now they did when they came into existence as a party in 1892. There has been no change. They were Jeffersonian democrats then and are Jeffersonian democrats now. The Press-Knickerbocker has been led into this error by the universal slandering and misrepresentation of the populist party and its principles that has been indulged in by the eastern press for the last eight years. The platform adopted at Springfield only reiterates the demands that the party has always made. Populists never were radicals and are not radicals today. Their voting strength comes from the most conservative citizens of the nation, the farmers.

The southern democratic editors are supremely disgusted with Tom Watson

and they dip their pens in gall whenever they write a line about him. They don't seem to believe there was a meeting at Cooper Union, or if they consent to acknowledge that fact, they declare that it was an affair of no importance. The southern democrat has always been the most malignant assailant of populists to be found in all the land.

Under the provisions of the revenue law adopted by the last republican legislature and signed by the present "incumbence" in the executive chair of Nebraska, it is allowable for assessors to deduct from the valuation of the total property of business and other large concerns, the amount of their indebtedness. That is to say that among the assessable properties of all concerns, must be scheduled the total amount of credits, and from these credits may be deducted the amount of their debts. Suppose a business establishment is taxed upon a full valuation of \$100,000, and it has outstanding moneys due it in the sum of \$25,000. But it owes \$10,000. This \$10,000 shall be deducted from the amount, leaving a total assessment against the firm of \$115,000. This could not be criticized under the present system of taxation, if the same principle were applied to all alike. But it is not. A farmer or a working man may own a property worth \$2,000. He may have credits due him in the sum of \$500. He may owe \$1,000. But he is taxed upon \$2,500 just the same. Is this a fair distribution of the burdens of taxation?