CASTORIA

The Kind You Have Always Bought, and which has been in use for over 30 years, has borne the signature of Chas. H. Fletcher and has been made under his personal supervision since its infancy. Allow no one to deceive you in this. All Counterfeits, Imitations and "Just-as-good" are but Experiments that trifle with and endanger the health of Infants and Children—Experience against Experiment.

What is CASTORIA

Castoria is a harmless substitute for Castor Oil, Paregoric, Drops and Soothing Syrups. It is Pleasant. It contains neither Opium, Morphine nor other Narcotic substance. Its age is its guarantee. It destroys Worms and allays Feverishness. It cures Diarrhœa and Wind Colic. It relieves Teething Troubles, cures Constipation and Flatulency. It assimilates the Food, regulates the Stomach and Bowels, giving healthy and natural sleep. The Children's Panacea—The Mother's Friend.

GENUINE CASTORIA ALWAYS

Bears the Signature of

Chas. H. Fletcher.

The Kind You Have Always Bought

In Use For Over 30 Years.

THE CENTAUR COMPANY, 77 MURRAY STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

JAMES J. HILL BACK FROM EUROPE

Says the Trip Did Him Good and He Knows Nothing of Business.

Special to The Globe.

NEW YORK, April 9.—President James J. Hill arrived today on the Teutonic after five weeks' absence abroad. He was the most unpretentious looking passenger on the ship. Dressed in a long ulster, a muffler around his neck and topped off with an old brown slouch hat, he would never have been taken by one who did not know him for the powerful Western railroad magnate.

"I have simply buried myself from business of any sort," said Mr. Hill to The Globe correspondent, who boarded the steamer at quarantine. "I am as empty as a barrel. I have not watched the financial market and the first thing I shall do will be to ask questions myself. I cannot talk about the Northern Pacific or the Northern Securities decision or the International Mercantile Marine. No man knows less about the condition of business than I do. It is strange how absolutely ignorant of affairs a man can become in five weeks. The only thing I have noticed is that there is a certain interest in regard to the state of things in the coal regions. They don't seem quite to have settled things there as yet."

Mr. Hill was informed of President Roosevelt's optimistic comments in a speech about the work of his anthracite coal commission.

"It is a very good thing," said Mr. Hill, "if the president realizes the importance of his acts. It will be a very good thing for the country to realize this importance so seriously that all his acts will be prompted by calm consideration rather than by impulse."

The moment Mr. Hill stepped on the pier, without waiting to attend to his baggage, he, with his son and daughter, left the pier in a carriage and went directly to his apartments at Fifth avenue and Fifty-eighth street. Mr. Hill was accompanied by his daughter, Miss Clara Hill, whom he took abroad for her health. He said the trip had done both himself and his daughter much physical good, and that was what he went to Europe for.

Among the Teutonic's 105 cabin passengers were only six women, and Miss Clara complained of loneliness. Mr. Hill was pleased to hear that everything was ready at New London for the launch next Thursday of his ship, the four-screw steamer Minnesota, the largest craft ever built in the United States.

That reminds me. I must get those 700 votes for my friend by paying one year's subscription to The Globe.

Passionist Fathers Leave France.

PARIS, April 9.—The Passionist Fathers, who had been conducting the Anglo-American Catholic church here, departed for England today without a demonstration. Secular priests immediately took up the work usual during holy week. The services are proceeding uninterruptedly.

Nominated for Congress.

DODGE CITY, Kan., April 9.—C. F. Kline was today nominated by the Democratic convention of the Seventh congressional district to succeed Chester I. Long.

OLD LAWNS MADE NEW

BY APPLYING MAY'S LAWN DRESSING

IT'S CHEAP AND EFFECTIVE.

Use It Now and Watch the Grass Grow

CATALOGUE FREE L. L. MAY & Co. ST. PAUL MINN.

DESPERATE DEED OF A FARMER

Kills One Son, Tries to Kill Others and Commits Suicide.

Special to The Globe.

GRAND FORKS, N. D., April 9.—Yesterday afternoon Henry Albrieson, a German farmer aged thirty-five, living ten miles west of Langdon, while his wife was trading in town, took his five-year-old son to the granary and shot him, the child dying instantly. He then went into the house and suggested to his other three children, all of them being older than the one just killed, that they go with him to the granary. They had heard the shot and were suspicious and asked him what he had been shooting. He replied that he had just shot a hog. The children would not go with him and he went back and put the rifle to his own head and shot himself. He died today.

He left a letter to his wife stating that he was about to leave her and take the children with him. From remarks that he had let drop within the past few weeks in the presence of neighbors they are now satisfied that he contemplated suicide for some time. Domestic and business troubles are believed to have caused his act.

GUN BURSTS ON THE BATTLESHIP IOWA

Three Men Killed and Five Injured, Two Seriously.

PENSACOLA, Fla., April 9.—A disastrous explosion occurred on the battleship Iowa while the vessel was at target practice in the gulf. The forward port 12-inch gun burst from the premature explosion of a shell, twelve feet of the piece outside the turret being demolished. Three mn were killed and five injured, two seriously. The killed are:

FIRST-CLASS SEAMAN KIELE,
ORDINARY SEAMAN PERCELL,
GUNNERS' MATE BERRY.

The injured:

First-class Seaman Gaught,
Ordinary Seamen Thursdale, Brown, Marsdale and Purser.

The men killed and injured were on the second or gun deck at mess. Three pieces of the exploded gun, each weighing over a ton, passed downward through the spar deck, falling upon the men at mess, instantly killing the three named. All the men were horribly mutilated.

The heavy missiles after passing through the gun deck continued on to the third deck, where they came in contact with the armored deck, the heavy steel bringing them to a stop, thus saving the engineers and firemen who were at work below.

Some claim the explosion was caused by a defective shell and others think that the frequent firing of the pieces at Culebra during the winter added to the work done here during the past ten days so strained the piece that the force of the charge burst the gun.

SMALLPOX GERMS LAST THIRTY-NINE YEARS

Woman Takes Disease From Her Father's Clothes and Dies.

SCIPIO, Ind., April 9.—Thirty-nine years ago the father of Miss Minnie Peterson died of smallpox. Miss Peterson died of smallpox today, having taken the disease two weeks ago after she had opened an old trunk containing her father's clothes for the first time since his death. This is the longest time on record that germs of smallpox have continued deadly.

That reminds me. I must get those 700 votes for my friend by paying one year's subscription to The Globe.

VIOLATED SHERMAN ANTI-TRUST LAW

Continued From First Page.

milar rule that everyone is presumed to intend what is the necessary consequence of his own acts, when done willfully and deliberately, we must conclude that those who conceived and executed the plan aforesaid intended, among other things, to accomplish these objects.

Application of Sherman Act.

The general question of law arising upon this state of facts, is whether such a combination of interests as that above described, falls within the inhibition of the anti-trust act or is beyond its reach. The act brands as illegal "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several states or with foreign nations." Learned counsel on both sides have commented on the general language of the act, doing so of course for a different purpose, and the generality of the language employed is, in our judgment, of great significance. It indicates, we think, that congress, being unable to foresee and describe all the plans that might be formed and all the expedients that might be resorted to to place restraints on interstate trade or commerce, deliberately employed words of such general import as, in its opinion, would comprehend every scheme that might be devised to accomplish that end.

What is commonly termed a "trust" was a species of combination organized by individuals or corporations for the purpose of monopolizing the manufacture of, or traffic in, various articles and commodities which was well known and fully understood when the anti-trust act was approved. Combinations in that form were accordingly prohibited; but congress, evidently anticipating that a combination might be otherwise formed, was careful to declare that a combination in any other form, if in restraint of interstate trade or commerce, that is, if it directly occasioned or effected such restraint, should likewise be deemed illegal. Moreover, in cases arising under the act, it has been held by the highest judicial authority in the nation, and its opinion has been reiterated in no uncertain tone, that the act applies to interstate carriers of freight and passengers as well as to all other persons, natural or artificial; that the words "in restraint of trade or commerce" do not mean in unreasonable or partial restraint of trade or commerce but any direct restraint thereof; that an agreement between competing railroads which requires them to act in concert in fixing the rate for the carriage of passengers or freight over their respective lines from one state to another and which, by that means, restricts temporarily the right of any one of such carriers to name such rates for the carriage of such freight or passengers over its road, as it pleases, is a contract in direct restraint of commerce within the meaning of the act, in that it tends to prevent competition; that it matters notn whether, while acting under such a contract, the rate fixed is reasonable or unreasonable, the vice of such a contract or combination being that it confers the power to establish unreasonable rates and directly restrains commerce by placing obstacles in the way of free and unrestricted competition between carriers who are natural rivals for patronage; and finally that congress has the power, under the grant of authority contained in federal constitution to regulate commerce, to say that no contract or combination shall be legal which shall restrain interstate trade or commerce by shutting off the operation of the general law of competition. United States vs. Trans-Missouri Freight Association, 166 U. S., 290; United States vs. Joint Traffic Association, 171, U. S., 305; Addyston Pipe & Steel Co. vs. United States, 175, U. S., 211.

Violated Anti-Trust Act

Taking the foregoing propositions for granted, because they have been decided by a court whose authority is controlling, it is almost too plain for argument that the defendants would have violated the anti-trust act if they had done, through the agency of natural persons, what they have accomplished through an artificial person of their own creation. That is to say, if the same individuals who promoted the Securities company, in pursuance of a previous understanding or agreement so to do, had transferred their stock in the two railroad companies to a third party or parties and had agreed to induce other shareholders to do likewise, until a majority of the stock of both companies had been vested in a single individual or association of individuals, and had empowered the holder or holders to vote the stock as their own, receive all the dividends thereon and pro rate or divide them among all the shareholders of the two companies who had transferred their stock—the result would have been a combination in direct restraint of interstate commerce, because it would have placed in the hands of a small coterie of men the power to suppress competition between two competing interstate carriers whose lines are practically parallel.

It will not do to say that so long as each railroad company has its own board of directors they operate independently and are not controlled by the owner of the majority of their stock. It is the common experience of mankind that the acts of corporations are dictated and that their policy is controlled by those who own the majority of their stock. Indeed, one of the favorite methods in these days and about the only method, of obtaining control of a corporation is to purchase the greater part of its stock. It was the method pursued by the Northern Pacific and Great Northern companies to obtain control of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroad; and so long as directors are chosen by the stockholders, the latter will necessarily dominate the former and in a real sense determine all important corporate acts. The fact that the ownership of a majority of the capital stock of a corporation gives one the mastery and control of the corporation was distinctly recognized and declared in Pearsall vs. Great Northern Railway, 161 U. S., 646, 671. The same fact has been recognized and declared by other courts. Pennsylvania R. Co. vs. Commonwealth, 7 Atl. (Pa.) 368, 371; Farmers' Loan & Trust Co. vs. New York & Northern Railway Co., 150 N. Y. 410, 423; People ex rel. vs. Chicago Gas Trust Co., 130 Ill. 268, 22 N. E. Rep 796, 802.

Power to Stop Competition.

In opposition to this view counsel cite Pullman Car Co. vs. Missouri Pacific Co., 115 Mo. 387, 596, but in that case the meaning of the word controlled, as used in a private contract, was the point under consideration, and what was said on the subject cannot be held applicable to cases arising under the anti-trust act when the point involved is whether the ownership of all the stock of the two competing and parallel roads vests the owner thereof with the power to suppress competition between such roads. We entertain no doubt that it does. Indeed we regard suppression of competition, and to that extent a restraint of commerce, as the natural and inevitable result of such ownership.

What has been done through the organization of the Securities company accomplishes the object, which congress has denounced as illegal, more effectually perhaps than such combination as is last supposed. That is to say, by what has been done the power has ben acquired (and provision made for maintaining it) to suppress competition between two interstate carriers who own and operate competing and parallel lines of railroad. Competition, we think, would not be more effectively restrained than it now is, under and by force of the existing arrangement, if the two railroad companies were consolidated under a single charter. It is manifest, therefore, that the New Jersey charter is about the only shield which the defendants can interpose between themselves and the law.

The reasoning which led to the acquisition of that charter would seem to have been that while as individuals the promoters could not, by agreement between themselves, place the majority of the stock of the two competing and parallel railroads in the hands of a single person or a few persons, giving him or them the power to operate the roads in harmony and stifle competition, yet that the same persons might create a purely fictitious person termed a corporation, which could neither think or act except as they directed, and by placing the same stock in the name of such artificial being, accomplish the same purpose.

Proposition Held Unsound.

The manifest unreasonableness of such a proposition and the grave consequences sure to follow from its approval, compel us to assume that it must be unsound, especially when we reflect that the law is administered by courts of equity, looks always at the substance of things—at the object accomplished, whether it be lawful or unlawful—rather than upon the particular devices or means by which it has been accomplished. So far as the New Jersey charter is concerned, the question, broadly stated, which the court has to determine, is whether a charter granted by a state can be used to defeat the will of the national legislature as expressed in a law relating to interstate trade and commerce over which congress has absolute control. Presumptively, at least, no charter granted by a state is intended by the state to have that effect or to be used for any such a purpose; and in the present instance it is clear that the state of New Jersey did not intend to grant a charter under cover of which an object denounced by congress as unlawful, namely, a combination conferring the power to restrain interstate commerce, might be formed and maintained because the enabling act under which the Securities company was organized, expressly declares that three or more persons may avail themselves of the provisions of the act and "become a corporation for any lawful purpose." Laws of New Jersey, 1899, p. 473.

This language is not merely perfunctory; it means, obviously, that whatever powers the incorporators saw fit to assume, they must hold and exercise for the accomplishment of lawful objects. The words in question operate, therefore, as a limitation upon all the powers enumerated in the articles of association which were filed by the promoters of the Securities company, so that, however extensive and comprehensive these powers may seem to be, the state of New Jersey has said, you shall not exercise them so as to set at defiance any statute lawfully enacted by the congress of the United States or any statute lawfully enacted by any state wherein you see fit to exercise your powers.

Attempted Grant Would Be Void.

But aside from this view of the subject, if the state of New Jersey had undertaken to invest the incorporators of the Securities company with the power to do acts in the corporate name which would operate to restrain interstate commerce, and for that reason could not be done by them acting as an association of individuals—then we have no doubt that such a grant would have been void under the provisions of the anti-trust act or at least that the charter could not be permitted to stand in the way of the enforcement of that act. The power of congress over interstate commerce is supreme, far-reaching, and acknowledges no limitations other than such as are prescribed in the constitution itself. Gibbons vs. Ogden, 9 Wheat. 1, 197; County of Mobile, vs. Kimball, 102 U. S. 691, 696, 697; Champion vs. Ames, U. S. (decided February 23, 1903). No legislation on the part of a state can curtail or interfere with its exercise; and in view of repeated decisions, no one can deny that it is a legitimate exercise of the power in question for congress to say that neither natural nor artificial persons shall combine or conspire in any form whatever to place restraints on interstate trade or commerce. United States vs. Joint Traffic Association, 171 U. S. 505; Addyston Pipe & Steel Co. vs. United States, 175 U. S. 211.

It is urged, however, that such a combination of adverse interests as was formed, and has been heretofore described, was lawful and not prohibited by the anti-trust act because such restraint upon interstate trade or commerce, if any, as it imposes, is indirect, collateral and remote and hence that the combination is not one of that character which the congress of the United States can lawfully forbid. The following cases are relied upon to ascertain the contention: United States vs. E. C. Knight Co., 156 U. S., 1; Hopkins v. United States, 171, U. S., 376; Anderson vs. United States, 171, U. S., 604. It is pertinent therefore to inquire in what way the existing combination that has been formed does affect interstate commerce.

How Commerce Is Affected.

It affects it, we think, by giving to a single corporate entity, or more accurately, to a few men acting in concert and in its name and under cover of its charter, the power to control all the means of transportation that are owned by two competing and parallel railroads engaged in interstate commerce; in other words, the power to dictate every important act which the two companies may do; to compel them to act in harmony in establishing interstate rates for the carriage of freight and passengers and generally to prescribe the policy which they shall pursue. It matters not, we think, through how many hands the orders come by which these aims are accomplished or through what channels; the power was not only acquired by the combination, but it is effectually exercised and it operates directly on interstate commerce, notwithstanding the maner of its exercise, by controlling the means of transportation, to-wit, the cars, engines and railroads by which persons and commodities are carried, as well as by fixing the price to be charged for such carriage.

The cases cited above and on which reliance is placed to sustain the view that the restraint imposed is merely indirect, remote, incidental or collateral, are not relevant for, as was fully explained in Addyston Pipe & Steel Co. vs. United States, 175, U. S. 211, 238, 240, 243, one of these cases (United States vs. E. C. Knight Company) dealt only with a combination within a state to obtain a practical monopoly of the manufacture of sugar, and it was held that the combination only related to manufacture and not to commerce among the states or with foreign nations; that the fact that an article was manufactured for export to another state, did not make it an article of interstate commerce before transportation had been begun or necessarily subject it to federal control, and that the effect of the combination then under consideration, on interstat commerce, was at rest only incidental and collateral. But while commenting on its previous decision in United States vs. E. C. Knight Co., the court took occasion tosay, in Addyston Pipe & Steel Co. vs. United States, 175 U. S., 246, that when a contract is made for the sale and delivery of an article in another state, the transaction is one of interstate commerce, although the vender has also agreed to manufacture the article so sold, and that combinations to control and monopolize such transactions would be in restraint of interstate commerce.

Case Does Not Apply.

In the other case (Hopkins vs. United States and Anderson vs. United States) it was held that the business of the members of the Kansas City Live stock exchange, which was under consideration by the court, was not interstate commerce and that the act did not affect them and that even if they were so affected, the particular agreement which was involved did not operate as a restraint of interstate commerce. We fail to find, in either of these cases, any suggestion that a combination such as the one in hand, the object and necessary effect of which is to give to a single person or to a coterie of persons full control of all the means of transportation owned by two competing and parallel lines of road engaged in interstate commerce, as well as the power to fix the rate for the transportation of persons and property, does not directly and immediately affect interstate commerce. No combination, as it would seem, could more immediately affect it.

Again, it is urged, tentatively, that if the existing combination which the government seeks to have dissolved, is held to be one in violation of the anti-trust act and unlawful, then the act unduly restricts the right of the individual to make contracts, buy and sell property, and is invalid for that reason. With reference to this contention it might be suggested (as it has been by the government) that as the situs of the stock which the Securities Company has bought is in the states of Wisconsin and Minnesota, which respectively chartered the Northern Pacific and Great Northern Companies, and as the stock owes its being to the laws of those states, and as each state has forbidden the consolidation of competing and parallel lines of railroad therein and has likewise prohibited any consolidation of the "stock and franchises" of such roads—the contention last mentioned is entitled to little consideration in the case at bar.

Defendants Are Answered.

But waiving and ignoring this suggestion, the argument advanced in behalf of the defendants is met and answered, so far as this court is concerned, by the decision in Addyston Pipe & Steel Co. vs. United States, 175 U. S. 228-229, where it is said inter alia "under this grant of power to congress (the power to regulate commerce between the several states and with foreign nations) that body, in our judgment, may enact such legislation as shall declare void and prohibit the performance of any contract between individuals or corporations where the natural and direct effort of such a contract will be, when carried out, to directly, and not as a mere incident to other and innocent purposes, regulate to any substantial extent, interstate commerce * * *.

We do not assent to the correctness of the proposition that the constitutional guaranty of liberty to the individual to enter into private contracts, limits the power of congress and prevents it from legislating on the subject of contracts of the class mentioned. * * *

It has been held that the word "liberty" as used in the constitution was not to be confined to the mere liberty of persons, but included, among others, a right to enter into certain classes of contracts the purpose of enabling the citizen to carry on his business. * * * But it has never been, and in our opinion ought not to be held, that the word included the right to enter into private contracts upon all subjects no matter what their nature and wholly irrespective, among other things, of the fact that they would, if performed, result in the regulation of interstate commerce, and in violation of an act of congress upon that subject. The provision of the constitution does not, as we believe, exclude congress from legislating with regard to contracts of the above nature, while in the exercise of its constitutional right to regulate among the states. On the contrary, we think the provision regarding the liberty of the citizen is to some extent limited by the commerce clause of the constitution, and that the power of congress to regulate interstate commerce comprises the right to enact a law prohibiting the citizen from entering into those private contracts which directly, and substantially, and not merely indirectly, remotely, incidentally and collaterally regulate to a greater or less degree commerce among the states.

"Liberty" Is Restricted.

We cannot so enlarge the scope of the language of the constitution regarding the liberty of the citizen as to hold that it includes or that it was intended to include a right to make a contract which in fact restrained and regulated interstate commerce notwithstanding congress, proceeding under the constitutional provision giving to it the power to regulate that commerce, had prohibited such contracts." These observations, as a matter of course, preclude further controversy over the power of congress to limit to some extent the right to make contracts when enacting laws for the regulation of commerce between the states.

Learned counsel for the defendant further contend as follows: That the anti-trust act was not intended to include or prohibit combinations looking to the virtual consolidation of parallel and competing lines of railroad, although such a combination operates to stifle competition; that no relief can be granted to the government in this instance because the combination or conspiracy of which it complains has accomplished its purpose, to-wit, the organization of the Securities company and the lodgment of the majority of the stock of the two railroads in its hands before the bill was filed; and finally that the combination proven was one "formed in aid of commerce and not to restrain it;" in other words, that it was one formed to enlarge the volume of interstate traffic and thus benefit the public.

The Court Dissents.

The court cannot assent to either of these propositions. The first, we think, is clearly untenable for the reasons already stated and fully disclosed in the decisions heretofore cited. Concerning the second contention, we observe that it would be a novel, not to say absurd, interpretation of the anti-trust act to hold that after an unlawful combination is formed and has acquired the power which it had no right to acquire, namely, to restrain commerce by suppressing competition and is proceeding to use it and execute the purpose for which the combination was formed, it must be left in possession of the power that it has acquired, with full freedom to exercise it.

Obviously the act, when fairly interpreted, will bear no such construction. Congress aimed to destroy the power to place any direct restraint on interstate trade or commerce, when by any combination or conspiracy, formed by either natural or artificial persons, such a power had been acquired, and the government may intervene and demand relief as well after the combination is fully organized as while it is in process of formation. In this instance, as we have already said, the Securities company made itself a party to a combination in restraint of interstate commerce, that antedated its organization, as soon as it came into existence, doing so, of course, under the direction of the very individuals who promoted it.

Relative to the third contention, which has been pressed with great zeal and ability, this may be said: It may be that such a virtual consolidation of parallel and competing lines of railroad as has been effected, taking a broad view of the situation, is beneficial to the public rather than harmful. It may be that the motives which inspired the combination by which this end was accomplished were wholly laudable and unselfish; that the combination was formed by the individual defendants to protect great interests which had been committed to their charge; or it may be that the combination was the initial and a necessary step in the accomplishment of great designs which if carried out as they were conceived, would prove to be of inestimable value to the communities which these roads serve and to the country at large.

We shall neither affirm nor deny either of these propositions because they present issues which we are not called upon to determine, and some of them involve questions which are not within the province of any court to decide, involving, as they do, questions of public policy which congress must determine. It is our duty to ascertain whether the proof discloses a combination in direct restraint of interstate commerce—that is to say, a combination whereby the power has been acquired to suppress competition between two or more competing parallel lines of railroad engaged in interstate commerce. If it does disclose such a combination, and we have little hesitation in answering this question in the affirmative, then the anti-trust act, as it has been heretofore interpreted by the court of last resort, has been violated, and the government is entitled to a decree.

Decree to Be Entered.

A decree in favor of the United States will accordingly be entered to the following effect: Adjudging that the stock of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern companies, now held by the Securities company, was acquired in virtue of a combination among the defendants, in restraint of trade and commerce among the several states, such as the anti-trust act denounces as illegal; enjoining the Securities company from acquiring or attempting to acquire further stock of either of said companies; also enjoining it from voting such stock at any meeting of the stockholders of either of said railroad companies or exercising or attempting to exercise any control, direction or supervision or influence over the acts of said companies or either of them by virtue of its holding such stock; enjoining the Northern Pacific and Great Northern companies, respectively, their officers, directors and agents, from permitting such stock to be voted by the Northern Securities company or any of its agents or attorneys on its behalf, at any corporate election for directors or officers of either of said companies and likewise enjoining them from paying any dividends to the Securities company on account of said stock or permitting or suffering the Securities company to exercise any control whatsoever over the corporate acts of said companies or to direct the policy of either; and finally, permitting the Securities company to return and transfer to the stockholders of the Northern Pacific and Great Northern companies any and all shares of stock of those companies which it may have received from such stockholders in exchange for its own stock, or to make such transfer and assignment to such person or persons as are now the holders and owners of its own stock originally issued in exchange for the stock of said companies.

The Globe's Popular Voting Contest has caught the town. Pay your subscription and get votes for a friend.

R·I·P·A·N·S

The simplest remedy for indigestion, constipation biliousness and the many ailments arising from a disordered stomach, liver or bowels is Ripans Tabules. They have accomplished wonders, and their timely aid removes the necessity of calling a physician for many little ills that beset mankind. They go straight to the seat of the trouble, relieve the distress, cleanse the affected parts, and give the system a general toning up. The five-cent packet is enough for an ordinary occasion. The family bottle, 60 cents, contains a supply for a year. All druggists sell them.

Are You Popular?

THE

GLOBE'S

Great Complimentary Tours

A free trip to any point in the United States. Six persons selected by the readers of The Globe will be sent on an outing tour to any point in the United States which they may select. The time of going and the selection of various routes presented will be the choice of the successful contestants.

Four Consolation Prizes

A Ticket to Chicago, Omaha, Des Moines or Kansas City

Will Be Given to Each of the Four Next Highest---Making a Total of

Ten Free Trips

The Plan

The St. Paul Globe has decided to send six people to any point in the United States which they may select on an enjoyable outing tour. The readers of the paper are to decide who shall go. In every issue of the paper will appear an official coupon, which, when filled out and voted as designated and deposited in the ballot box in the business office of the Globe, will be counted for the person voted for.

The six persons receiving the most votes, as stated, will be given their choice of trip.

Remember—any point in the United States may be selected.

To—for instance—

New York.	Los Angeles.
Boston.	San Francisco.
Baltimore.	Seattle.
Philadelphia.	Salt Lake City.
Washington.	Denver.
New Orleans.	Niagara Falls.

The items of expense defrayed by the Globe will be the railroad and sleeping car fare, meals on trains and one week's board at point of destination.

In addition to this a consolation prize of a ticket to Chicago, Omaha, Des Moines or Kansas City and return will be given to the four next highest, making a total of ten grand prizes.

The RULES ordinarily adopted in contests of this kind will govern. The votes will be counted every day and the standing of the various contestants published daily until the close of the contest.

Extra votes will be given for every cash payment made on one subscription to either old or new subscribers, for—either the daily only, daily and Sunday, or Sunday Globe only, as follows:

$1.00	on subscription	100 votes
$2.00	"	200 "
$3.00	"	400 "
$4.00	"	500 "
$5.00	"	700 "

No votes will be given for a cash payment unless the amount exceeds $1.00, but it may be for back subscription, as well as advance.

This is on the basis of one vote for every one cent paid, although no extra votes will be given for less than $3.00 paid at one time.

Where remittance is made by mail it must be stated positively that the same is to be entered as credit for votes.

This contest is open to any man, woman or child living in any town or state, and no effort will be spared to make the entire contest fair and impartial, and no favoritism will be shown anyone.

If you are not a subscriber to The Globe order it at once and credit your votes to a friend.

Contest Closes June 6th, 1903, 9 p. m.

...THE...

GLOBE'S Free Trip Contest.

OFFICIAL COUPON

Good for one vote for

.....

Street.....

Town.....

State.....

Ask for a voting certificate when you send in your remittance.

CUT OUT

THIS COUPON AND VOTE YOUR CHOICE.

I CURE VARICOCELE IN ONE VISIT HYDROCELE

TO STAY CURED

No Cutting or Pain

I want every man afflicted with

Varicocele, Stricture, Contagious Blood Poison, Nervous Debility, Hydrocele

or allied troubles to come to my office, where I will explain to him my method of curing these diseases. I invite in particular all men who become dissatisfied with treatment elsewhere. I will demonstrate to your entire satisfaction why I can cure you permanently. My consultation is free and my charges for a perfect cure will be reasonable and not more than you will be willing to pay.

Consultation Free.

Master Specialist.

Certainty of Cure

is what you want. I give you a legal guarantee to cure you or refund your money. What I have done for others I can do for you. One personal visit is preferred, but if it is impossible for you to call, write me a description of your case as you understand it, stating your symptoms, your occupation, etc., and you will receive in plain envelope a scientific and honest opinion of your case free of charge.

All Medicines Furnished FREE Until Cured

WRITE People who live in the smaller outside towns of in the country should write for examination and advice free. Many cases can be cured by home treatment.

HEIDELBERG MEDICAL INSTITUTE

Cor. Fifth and Robert Sts., St. Paul, Minn.

Hours—8 a. m. to 8 p. m. Sundays—8 a. m. to 1 p. m