

THOUSANDS OF MILLIONAIRES

Made by the Tariff—But Not One Is a Farmer.

[From a speech by Hon. B. F. Shively at Shoals, Oct. 12, 1908.]

When the rising tide of artificial prices on iron, steel, woolen and cotton goods, and on glassware and crockery and furniture, farm implements, all forms of building material, and substantially everything that goes onto the farm, struck the farmer, was he to protect and recoup himself by writing up the prices of his own products? Right there came the rub. The farmer stands between two markets, neither of which he controls. Others fix the prices at which he must buy. Others fix the prices at which he must sell. American agriculture is an expert industry. In some of its staples it has been export since before the American Revolution. This industry has no combination at home with which to limit production, write up artificial prices to the American people, and unload surplus at low prices abroad. Such a combination is impracticable and impossible, and, if possible, could only spell ultimate misery and starvation to society. Millions of bushels of American wheat and corn and millions of pounds of American beef, pork and cotton go every year to the great surplus market of western Europe. Not a bushel nor a pound would go there but for the higher price paid there—at least enough higher to pay the cost of transportation. Wheat is sowed some place on this earth every day of the year. Wheat is reaped some place on this earth every day of the year. * * * The surplus grain from all these fields is poured into the surplus markets of western Europe in competition with the surplus grain from the American farmer. In that surplus market the level of prices is fixed, and from there the downward incline plane of prices extends backward past every farm and ranch in the United States. On any day of the year, except in rare instances due to purely local and temporary causes, the price of wheat is lower in New York than at Liverpool, lower in Chicago than at New York, lower in St. Paul than at Chicago, lower at Fargo than at St. Paul.

To this market, dominated by the competition of the whole world, the farmer brings his wheat, his corn, his beef, his pork and his cotton. If the price of the staples in his annual output rises, it is a rise that attends the same staples produced by the pen of South America, the ryot of India, the fellah of Egypt and the former serf of Russia. The rise in the level of farm prices in the last ten years, due to an addition of three billion dollars to the volume of the world's gold, was general and uniform throughout agricultural countries, but during all this time International Harvester Company farm machinery could be and has been purchased cheaper in any other agricultural country of the world than could the American farmer buy it at the door of the American factory where it was made. American mills, barb wire, shovels, axes, watches, sewing machines and scores of other articles have been and are now sold cheaper in the foreign markets than at home. * * * Even some of the products of the farm, after they leave the farm, are so manipulated by domestic trusts as to almost double the price to the consumer without increase received by the farmer. By reference to the market reports in the files of the Indianapolis newspapers, it will be found that on April 7, 1888, hogs were quoted at \$5.35 per hundred, and the best bacon at 9 1/2 to 10 cents per pound; on April 14, same year, hogs \$5.75 and the best bacon at 11 cents; on May 14, hogs \$5.75 and the best bacon 11 1/2 cents, and on March 14, 1889, hogs \$4.85 to \$5.00 and the best bacon 11 1/2 cents. These, of course, were wholesale prices. The quotations today and the record of actual sales show hogs at from \$5 to \$7 per hundred and the best bacon at 21 cents per pound. Here is an increase of about \$1.00 per hundred on hogs and over \$10.00 per hundred on the bacon taken from the hog, and not one cent of the excess increase on the bacon goes to the farmer who produced it. The same thing is measurably true of all other parts of the hog. The meat trust controls the situation, lays the consumer under contribution, gathers in the profit and invites the farmer to support the tariff that supports the trust.

The farmer's selling prices are world's prices. He labors in competition with the whole agricultural world. Duties of \$100 per bushel on his wheat and corn and per pound on his beef, pork and cotton could not protect him. The duties on wheat, corn, beef, pork, hay, cabbage and other farm products in the Dingley schedules are purely political duties. These duties cannot secure to the farmer higher prices on his sales. They are placed in the statute only to cajole and deceive him into the support of other duties which plunder him on his purchases. The system leaves him to sell his product at prices dominated by the competition of the whole world and to purchase his necessities at high artificial prices fixed by domestic monopoly, induced, licensed, fortified and perpetuated by affirmative acts of his government at Washington. If he enjoys any degree of

prosperity, it is in spite of the fly in his wheat, the rust in his oats, the smut in his corn, the cholera in his hogs, the bots in his horses and the Dingley tariffs in his market, and not because of them.

The steel, lumber and other trusts may capitalize the taxing power of the government and write up the prices of their product 100 per cent; the farmer cannot capitalize his \$1 wheat into \$2 wheat, nor his 75-cent corn into \$1.50 corn. He may cast away the sickle, the cradle, the reaper, the Marsh harvester and bring on the self-binder, the grain drill, the corn-shredder and other improved forms of farm machinery to multiply his producing power, lessen cost, decrease waste and to increase economy in making, storing and marketing his product. The cunning device of high artificial prices on all things he must buy sponges up the profits and absorbs the gains arising from the cheapening forces of skill and invention. Whatever of margin between receipt and expenditure he has left at the end of the year is the remnant of the harvest left by the licensed locusts of monopoly which swarm his buying market and pluck him on all that he brings onto his farm or into his household. If he has money in bank, it is usually the fruits of stinting economy, pinching self-sacrifice and deprivation on the part of himself and family, rather than the natural reward of his industry. The natural rewards of American agriculture are ambushed away in the pennies, nickels, dimes and dollars picked up by and concealed in the fictitious prices charged for trust-controlled goods, and who are turned in splendid streams of unearned increment into the coffers of government favorites, some of whom startle the country as much by their ostentatious charity as do others by their ostentatious profligacy. American farmers have been creating splendid fortunes and making millions by the thousands, but to this hour not one on the American farm.

HOW WILL YOU VOTE?

Will You Vote for Yourself, or to Give More Millions and Power to the Trusts?

Do you want to vote more millions into the coffers of the trusts and more power into their hands to crush you? Or do you intend to vote for your own interests? In other words, are you going to vote for Taft and Sherman, or Bryan and Kern?—for Marshall or Watson? A letter just sent to many persons in Indiana by the Republican national committee, asking for contributions and saying that "Bryan's election will be dangerous," has printed at its head, as members of the advisory committee, etc., the names of the following men:

Charles F. Brooker, head of the brass trust, and vice president of the New York, New Haven & Hartford railroad, against which a government suit is now pending in the federal courts.

Charles Nagel of Missouri, one of the general attorneys of the Standard Oil company. This Standard Oil representative is in charge of Republican national campaign headquarters in Chicago.

Frank O. Lowden, multimillionaire son-in-law of the late George M. Pullman, and now the head of the great Pullman Palace Car trust, to which the travelling public pays tribute.

T. Coleman Du Pont, the head of the powder trust, which is fighting a suit against dissolution.

Boise Penrose, the political "boss" of the corrupt political machine in Pennsylvania.

George R. Sheldon, the personal representative of J. Pierpont Morgan, in the capacity of director in all his trust companies, and who collected trust money for the election of Governor Hughes of New York.

William Nelson Cromwell, the legal representative of Edward H. Harriman, and probably the greatest trust lawyer in the United States.

Fred W. Upham, the "fat fryer" for the Republican party in the West, and the man who wrote letters to corporations whose property he assessed by virtue of his position as a member of the board of review in Chicago.

This is a fine outfit to advise the farmers and business men of the West how to vote. Two of the signers are heads of corporations which are fighting for their existence in the courts. Of course these men think Bryan's election dangerous; that is natural when one becomes acquainted with their connections. But there is not a legitimate business man in the nation, small or large, who has any reason to fear a Democratic victory.

TRUST MONEY ALL GOES TO TAFT

William Nelson Cromwell, the legal representative of E. H. Harriman, and the Wall street lawyer who engineered the Panama deal—which made a "profit" of \$36,000,000 for the syndicate made up of himself, Pierpont Morgan, Charles P. Taft and others—was the first big contributor to the Republican campaign fund. He gave \$50,000 to the Republican national campaign slush fund. Andrew Carnegie, head of the steel trust, has made a donation of \$20,000 toward financing the election of Judge Taft. These are a few of the contributions from trust sources that have reached the public, and indicate very clearly on which side the trust interests are arrayed in this campaign.

GUARANTEEING BANK DEPOSITS

Democratic Position Sound—Landis and Hughes Disagree.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND LIQUOR LEGISLATION

[From a Speech by Hon. S. M. Ralston at Lebanon, Oct. 14, 1908.]

"We pledge ourselves to legislation under which the national banks shall be required to establish a guaranty fund for the prompt payment of the depositors of any insolvent national bank, under an equitable system which shall be available to all state banking institutions wishing to use it."—Democratic National Platform.

Now it would seem that this plank of our platform appeals so favorably to the people that scarcely anyone puts up an argument against it. Republican orators have, as a rule, up to date, had but little use for any platform; and I apprehend that no one has any trouble in accounting for the course they have pursued in abandoning the platform of their own party.

Governor Hughes of New York, however, has felt that this plank in our platform was growing so rapidly in popularity that some sort of a showing should be made against it, and he has recently therefore attacked it.

And what are his objections to it? I want to state them fairly. He says:

(1) "An honest institution complying with the restrictions of the law should not be saddled with the results of other men's misdeeds.

(2) "It will lead to reckless banking by enabling men without the proper resources to go into the banking business.

(3) "The guaranty fund would take money out of circulation and deprive it of the power to earn interest."

If he has pointed out any objection in addition to these to this plank I have been unable to discover it. Are these sufficient to condemn the policy our party suggests?

I cannot recall any restrictive legislation touching commercial matters to which his first objection does not apply with the same force as it does to the proposal to guarantee the depositor against loss. It will hardly do to insist that all restrictive legislation should be repealed because it imposes additional burdens upon honest men.

And how is it as to his second objection? Men cannot organize a banking corporation unless they comply with the law providing for such corporations. They must have the necessary capital—the necessary resources—and the law governing banking should be made so strong that designing men cannot thwart it. If every bank is required to contribute to the payment of the depositors of a failing institution, then every bank will become an insurer of every other bank. There would thus be created a spirit of watchfulness from ocean to ocean against reckless banking. So under such a method it would be impossible, when we consider the duties of regular bank examiners, for a bank to go very far wrong before its assets would be seized by the government.

In his third objection the governor assumes the fund would have to be held as dead capital. The plank in question does not go into detail as to how the fund shall be kept or handled. It simply declares for a principle, and if the principle is sound it will not do to say that the statesmanship of our country cannot devise a rational scheme by which the people can enjoy the benefit of the principle.

Now my fellow citizens, I want to congratulate you that all Republicans do not take the view of the bank guarantee proposition that Gov. Hughes does. One of the most eloquent appeals I have read in favor of a law guaranteeing depositors against loss was made by a Republican. It is true he has not been repeating his speech since his party adopted the Chicago platform, but I am going to give him credit for still holding the same views he expressed in the speech to which I refer, until he repudiates them. The distinguished Republican to whom I refer is our handsome and brilliant representative in congress, Hon. Chas. B. Landis. The speech was made on the occasion of his last nomination at Frankfort, March 5th, 1908. I read what he said on this subject:

"I would also put into the bill a provision subjecting all national banks to a small tax to raise a fund out of which depositors who lose money in banks that fail shall be reimbursed. To restore confidence to the people in the banks—to my mind that is the chief object now to be attained. The failure of one great bank in New York leads the depositors throughout the country to fear a failure of their local bank, and the quiet yet steady withdrawal of deposits sets in. Soon there are runs upon the banks and then there is a panic. If the depositors knew that Uncle Sam had the custody of a fund out of which he could pay any depositor who lost a dollar in a national bank, there would be no run on a national bank. I cannot but think that a provision of this character added to our present currency law would

do more to restore immediate confidence and revive the business of the country than any other that has been suggested. It is a matter of common information that the banking associations are liable under the law for twice the amount of their capital stock. Say a bank is capitalized at \$100,000; the stockholders are liable for \$200,000. But the bank accepts deposits to an unlimited extent, up to \$500,000. There is one-half of the deposits with no other guarantee than the integrity and business ability of the banker. No one can borrow money from a bank, and rightly so, without giving security. No man can be expected to deposit money in a bank without a feeling of absolute security, and if the government provided such a fund as I have mentioned for reimbursement, the depositor would have this feeling of security.

"I am glad to say that there is not a single national banker in this district with whom I have talked or corresponded, and I have been in touch with nearly all of them, who does not endorse this proposition. They feel that the small tax that they would have to pay—not to exceed one-eighth or one-sixth of one per cent—would be offset many times by the increased deposits that would force legislation of a similar character for private and state banks and in the end the depositor would have absolute security. This would give confidence to the depositor in the private and state bank, and with full confidence on the part of all depositors, coupled with closer investigation and inspection, I feel that a panic similar to that through which we are now passing would be next to impossible.

Thus it is seen, so recent as last March, Mr. Landis favored guaranteeing depositors against loss, for the reasons:

1. It would prevent runs on banks.

2. It would do more to restore confidence and revive business than any other scheme suggested.

3. Because there is no guarantee for one-half of the deposits, as banks now do business, except the integrity and business ability of the banker.

4. No man can be expected to deposit money in a bank without a feeling of absolute security.

5. Because all the bankers in this district with whom he has communicated on the subject, and he has been in touch with nearly all of them, favor it.

6. The small per cent a bank would have to pay toward the guarantee fund would be offset many times by increased deposits.

7. It would render next to impossible a panic like the one through which we are now passing.

I am always amazed at the lucidity with which a Republican can argue in support of a Democratic proposition, when he champions it. What a world beater the average Republican orator would be if he had under his feet a whole Democratic platform.

Governor Hughes could state only three objections to this plank, while Mr. Landis without any apparent effort, stated seven reasons—all sound. I submit—in support of it.

Minors Can Buy Whisky.

There has not been an election in Indiana since 1892 at which the Republican party did not receive the solid support of the liquor and brewery interests of this state. Anyone calling this statement in question discloses his ignorance or want of sincerity. These influences have helped to elect Republican presidents, Republican governors, Republican United States senators and Republican state tickets, and yet Republican leaders have always managed to have a smile for the temperance advocate. They have smiled upon him while they have had a hearty hand for the saloon champion. True to their methods in the past, they are now seeking to make a campaign asset of their party's liquor legislation, while they continue to hold on to the hand of the saloon keeper.

I am not charging or intimating that there has been no good legislation on the liquor question while the Republicans have controlled the legislature, for such a statement would not be warranted; but I do charge that while the Republican party professes to be the great champion of temperance, its leaders and managers have constantly striven to placate the liquor interests and hold them in line for Republican tickets.

But while I have conceded that there has been some proper legislation on this subject by this party, it does not follow that all its liquor legislation should be approved. Everyone recalls the demand of the people for blind tiger legislation at the last regular session of the general assembly of our state, and that it was at that session that the law, known as the blind tiger act, was enacted.

Section 13 of that act relates to sales of liquor by druggists and makes it unlawful for a druggist to sell or give away intoxicating liquor, except on the written prescription of a reputable physician engaged in the active practice of his profession. This act was approved Feb. 13, 1907. It proved to be an unpopular act. Druggists and liquor men generally denounced it and the leaders of the Republican party hastened to make peace with them. To appease their wrath the same legislature enacted the law known as the Beardsley act, which contains no emergency clause and which was approved and went in force March 16, 1907—one month and three days subsequent to the approval of the blind tiger act.

SHALL THE PEOPLE RULE?

Let Them Assist In Bearing the Legitimate Expenses of the Campaign to This End.

TO THE EDITOR:

There are no secrets in this Campaign. Strictly practicing what he preaches, Mr. Bryan would not win victory with tainted money paying the election expenses.

Not a dollar is to be accepted which requires any promise, either express or implied, other than for HONEST, IMPARTIAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. Bryan will enter the White House absolutely free from entangling alliances, free to serve all classes of honest citizens alike, or he will not enter at all.

Hence the course is plain. The campaign of Bryan and Kern must be conducted by the people.

The people must pay the necessary campaign expenses if they want public servants who will serve their interests.

Special interests and favored classes, having secured "SWOLLEN FORTUNES" by purchasing favors in the past with MILLIONS CONTRIBUTED TO CONTROL ELECTIONS, stand ready to give MILLIONS MORE FOR CONTINUED FAVORS. But that class never gives a dollar unless it buys a pledge.

Mr. Bryan says, from March 4th, 1909, "LET THE PEOPLE RULE."

This can come only if the people pay their own bills, and control their own elections.

"BEWARE OF THE TRUSTS 'BEARING GIFTS.'"

That policy of the favored few buying a mortgage on the Government meant that the Candidate for President knew a few people only in an entire State.

Bryan says, "We will take the cause of PEOPLE'S RULE home to the people and will know people in every country."

You can serve the grand cause of popular government.

Your paper reaches the fireside of the patriot who loves his country for his country's GOOD; as distinguished from the greedy possessor of swollen fortunes who loves his country only for his country's GOODS.

Please carry this letter in BOLD TYPE at the mast head of your paper.

Asking every one who favors Government by the people to pay you, at once, as many dollars as he can spare to aid the Campaign for BRYAN, KERN AND PEOPLE'S RULE. You forward these gifts of honest hearts and homes every two weeks to the Treasurer of the Democratic National Committee, with the name of each contributor and the amount given. The Treasurer will forward you a certificate like the copy enclosed for each one, asking you to deliver these certificates.

Once more, you should be a part of the Great Organization bearing the Lamp of Light to every nook and corner of Free America.

Our Country is for the People; its Government must be by the People.

Sincerely,

NORMAN E. MACK,
Chm. Democratic Nat. Committee.
M. C. WETMORE,
Chairman Finance Committee.
HERMAN RIDDER,
Treasurer.

Chicago, Aug. 15, 1908.

Campaign Contributions.

The Democrat is authorized to act as agent for the raising of funds for the legitimate campaign expenses of the democratic party this year, and solicits contributions in any sum over 50 cents.

All moneys received will be receipted for and the names of the contributors published in The Democrat, unless otherwise requested, and every penny of the amounts forward to the proper headquarters.

This, remember, is a people's campaign, and the people who seek relief from existing political evils should respond and pay the legitimate expenses thereof.

This popular appeal for funds for financing the campaign should meet with a liberal response. Few people are too poor to spare a dollar or two for so worthy a cause, and many can and will give much more.

Send or hand in your contribution at your earliest convenience.

Notice of Hearing of Ditch Report

(County of Jasper) ss.

I, the Jasper Circuit Court, to November Term, 1908.

Cause No. 94.

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF WILLIAM HEILSCHER, ET AL. FOR DITCH.

To Charles F. Hendricks, John W. Burget, V. E. Foxworthy, James R. Alexander, Myron L. Bickford, Peter Leisenfeldt, William Fleming, Mary Ann Stallwood, Lois Wilson, Jellies, Ira Shoemaker, Julius A. Spencer, John McLaughlin, Don H. Cagoy, Joseph Haigh, Jasper County, Chicago, Indiana, and Southern Railroad company, you and each of you are hereby notified that the Commissioners in the above entitled cause have filed their report therein, in the office of the Clerk of the Jasper Circuit Court, and the hearing upon said report has been by the judge of the Jasper Circuit court ordered to be held at the Court Room in the Chicago house in the City of Kennesaw, Jasper county, Indiana, on Thursday, the 12th day of November, 1908.

the same being the 4th Judicial day of the November term of said Court.

You are further notified that your name appears in said report, and your lands are described therein as being affected by the location and construction of the proposed drain upon and along the following described route, to wit: Commencing at a point on the East line of the West half of the North-east quarter of Section 18, Township 31, Range 6 west in Jasper County, Indiana, and immediately North of the Chicago and Eastern Illinois Railroad, thence north to stake 41, a distance of 4,100 feet; thence North 40 degrees east to stake 52, a distance of 1,100 feet; thence east to stake 36 plus 50 a distance of 4,450 feet; thence North 63 degrees east to stake 104 plus 80 a distance of 820 feet; thence North 20 degrees east to stake 140 plus 30, a distance of 3,540 feet; thence North 57 degrees east to stake 154, a distance of 1,250 feet; thence North 65 degrees east to stake 157 plus 30 a distance of 330 feet; thence South 50 degrees east to stake 165 plus 50 a distance of 820 feet; thence North 80 degrees east to stake 199 plus 35 a distance of 3,385 feet; thence North 10 degrees east to stake 208 a distance of 865 feet; thence North 20 degrees east to stake 267 a distance of 5,900 feet; thence north to

stake 279 plus 50 a distance of 1250 feet; thence North 25 degrees east to stake 267 plus 50, a distance of 800 feet; thence North 63 degrees east to stake 319 a distance of 2250 feet; thence North 54 degrees east to stake 316 plus 50, a distance of 650 feet; thence north along the line of the Wheatfield ditch to stake 423 plus 28 a distance of 7,128 feet; and enters Lateral No. 5 to the Grover Smith Ditch, at a point 1000 feet South of the Southeast corner of Section 14, Township 31, Range 6, with a fall on the grade line of 29.40 feet in the entire distance.

J. W. HEILSCHER, et al.

Petitioners.

Attest: C. C. Warner,

Clerk Jasper Circuit Court.

[Seal.]

Notice of Collection of Assessments

Wuerthner Ditch.

Notice is hereby given to the owners of property assessed for the construction of the ditch in Newton Township petitioned for by Mary Wuerthner, et al., that the assessments for the construction of said ditch will be due and payable at the residence of the undersigned Superintendent in Newton Township, as follows:

One tenth of said assessments on the first day of December, 1908, and one-tenth of said assessments on the first day of each succeeding month until the total amount assessed for such construction is paid.

WM. AUGSPURGER,

Superintendent.

SHROPSHIRE RAMS FOR SALE.

I am offering early lambed, big, husky ram lambs, heavy bone, a good lot to select from.

THOMAS E. REED,

Remington, Ind.

R-R-3.

Phone 79-J.

FARM LOANS.

Money to loan on farm property

in any sums up to \$10,000.

E. P. HONAN.