

# The Ligonier Banner.

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

LIGONIER, NOBLE COUNTY, INDIANA, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1908.

VOL. 43-NO. 31

## PRESIDENCY A FAMILY AFFAIR

Son-in-Law Longworth Lets the Cat Out of the Bag.

As it is understood that the Taft family is related to the Longworth family, the public declaration of Nicholas Longworth, President Roosevelt's son-in-law, that the presidency is to be kept in the Roosevelt and Taft families is a matter for other persons to take notice of. In order that there may be no charge that it is all a "Democratic lie," the following dispatches are reproduced from the Indianapolis Star, Republican state organ:

Rock Island, Ill., Oct. 2.—Theodore Roosevelt for president again eight years from now, was the declaration of the president's son-in-law, Congressman Nicholas Longworth, in a speech today here on the grounds of the Tri-state Exposition to an audience of several thousand persons, who cheered the sentiment again and again. Mr. Longworth's statement was made during the course of a eulogy and defense of the president's administration. He first proposed that the Republican leader for the next eight years be W. H. Taft, the nominee for president, who, if elected, as the speaker declared he was confident he would be, should be returned to that office for a second term.

Following Mr. Taft as president, seriously declared Mr. Longworth, Theodore Roosevelt should be returned to the chair for the next eight years.

Evansville, Ind., Oct. 4.—Congressman "Nick" Longworth, who, with James S. Sherman, spent a great deal of his time today reading from the various newspapers of the country references to his speech at Rock Island, Ill., Friday, in which he declared Taft ought to be elected president for four years and then returned for another four years, and at the end of that time give way to Roosevelt for two more terms.

Congressman Longworth said he made the statement in all seriousness and he was delighted that most of the papers "played up" the story on their first page.

Congressman Longworth cut out all dispatches on the Rock Island address he could find and especially those that had been run on the first page of the various papers, and said he would send them to Mr. Roosevelt.

The congressman smiled, and as he tucked the clippings into his vest pocket, replied:

"There is another one for 'Teddy.' I will have a raft of them to send to him and I feel certain he will be delighted."

## TAFT PAPERS ALMOST READY TO BOLT.

Many of the papers that have been supporting Taft are having a hard time keeping themselves in line. The Springfield Republican is putting in a good deal of time attacking the Republican party. The Chicago Inter Ocean whacks Roosevelt every day, and the Chicago News is also dissatisfied. In New York the Times criticizes Taft's foolish speeches and the Sun finds Roosevelt intolerable. And the Post, which started out bravely for Taft, now speaks of Taft's tariff arguments as "vagarious" and as "silly" and "shocking." In the course of an editorial it says:

"The panic of 1907 and the hard times which followed, coming at the height of that [the Republican] party's ascendancy and with its tariff in full vigor, disposed at once of the 'workman's full dinner pail' as a campaign argument, and that nothing was left except to tell the farmer, who is fortunately still prosperous, that the Republican party makes the wheat grow and the foreign markets bid for it, whereas the Democrats, with their Wilson bill in 1894, blighted the corn crop and prevented the buying of wheat." This was, perhaps, the origin of Mr. Taft's vagaries; the talk about "the tariff bill which went below 50 cents a bushel" is not a whit more specious, irrelevant and altogether silly than the argument to the factory hands four and eight years ago. But it was not for Mr. Taft to drag the pitiful stuff to light again. We need not speak of the shock which his use of it has caused to people whose support of him had been based on belief in his wisdom and good sense."

## THE PANAMA CANAL SCANDAL.

Everyone remembers the secrecy with which the Roosevelt administration carried through the negotiations which resulted in the purchase of the interests in the old French company. The United States paid for the French rights \$40,000,000. It was announced that the payment of that sum was a great boon to the thousands of French peasantry who held stock in the company. And now it turns out, according to a Paris dispatch to the Chicago News (a paper which has been supporting Taft) that a syndicate of Americans, including J. Pierpont Morgan, Charles P. Taft (a brother of the Republican candidate), William Nelson Cromwell and others bought up the French interests for about \$3,500,000 and turned the property over to the United States for \$40,000,000, making a profit of over \$36,000,000.

## UNEARTHING A SCOUNDREL

It turns out that the man who has caused intimidating letters to be put in the hands of employees of many large shops is one M. M. Mulhall. He has worked under the name of the "Workmen's Protective Association," which is the name he signed to all of his "scare" letters. On being run to earth he said he was working under the instructions of the Republican national committee.

It appears also that he has been on close terms with the Republican state committee and the Republican county committee at Indianapolis. From other evidence it is also clear that he is a tool of VanCleave of the National Manufacturers' Association. Mulhall's headquarters in Indianapolis adjoined the office of the "Employers' Association," which provides "strike breakers," that is, men to take the places of striking workmen.

Chairman Ruckelshaus of the Republican county committee at Indianapolis, speaking of Mulhall and his work, said:

"I understand he represents the Republican national committee and that he has his own line of work to do. The first I heard of him was when Fred Sims, acting chairman of the state committee, told me about him. I understand that Mulhall has been doing some very effective work."

"Very effective work" along the coercive line seemed to please the Republican managers, but it did not please the labor organizations and other fair-minded citizens. The Indianapolis labor organizations held a meeting and denounced Mulhall and his nefarious work and ordered 50,000 circulars printed for distribution among the workmen of the city, showing him up. The unearthing of Mulhall and his scheme will turn thousands of votes from the Republican party, for which he was working.

## HANLY'S RELATIONS WITH PINKERTON DETECTIVES.

Now that Governor Hanly is abroad in the state declaring that he is not a "cheap man" and that he would have refused to take the governorship at \$5,000 a year, it is recalled that in addition to having the legislature allow him \$9,800 a year for salary and house rent, he persuaded it to put \$40,000 a year into his hands for "contingent" and "emergency" expenses. It may be interesting to the taxpayers to know the way in which some of this fund has been used. A few items taken from the records in the state auditor's office, show, among other things, that the governor has been a good customer of the Pinkerton detective agency. Payments made to the Pinkertons are as follows:

Oct. 5, 1907, Pinkerton & Co.	\$1,540.00
June 11, 1908, Pinkerton & Co.	\$1,663.50
Total	\$3,203.50
Payments to four other detectives, including his friend, R. Harry Miller	\$666.74
To another "investigator," Will W. Failing	140.00
Grand total for detectives	\$4,010.24

We do not undertake to say that the above sum is all that Governor Hanly has paid to detectives out of his contingent fund, but it is large enough to show the close relations between the present governor of Indiana and the Pinkerton detective bureau.

## Cannot Stand Heast.

(Indianapolis News.)

Wagner A. Ross, candidate of the Independence party for congress in the Indianapolis district, has notified the Heast managers that he will not make the race and has volunteered his services to the Democratic state committee. He is a lawyer, and four years ago was connected with the speakers' bureau of the Republican state committee.

Ross charges the Independence party leaders here with breaking faith with him when he was being urged to accept the congressional nomination. He says the party managers promised to boom his candidacy, to pay his expenses and to spend money and effort in seeking to bring about his election. Since the nomination, Ross says, the party managers have done nothing, and have refused to listen to his complaints.

"Then, too," said Ross, "I became disgusted with the whole Independence movement. It is simply a one-man act, fair, dominated, controlled and financed by Heast for personal reasons. Character assassination seems to be the chief object, and this I disapprove of as I do of the other yellow journalistic methods employed on the political platform. My brief connection with the party revealed to me that I should have nothing to do with the movement."

The Heast men are left in the lurch by the withdrawal of Ross from the ticket, as it was with difficulty they succeeded in filling the nomination. Several leaders of organized labor were urged to allow the honor to fall on them, but each refused.

## WILL PROSECUTE FOR COERCION OF EMPLOYEES.

Chairman Jackson Issues Strong Statement Calling Attention to the Law.

Reports of attempted intimidation of employees having been brought to his attention, Chairman Jackson of the Democratic state committee, at once announced his purpose to resort to the criminal laws to stop such cowardly practices. In a published statement he said:

"Special information has come to me that certain corporations and other employers of labor, whose names are in my possession, are attempting to coerce and intimidate their employees into giving support to the Republican party, contrary to their political beliefs. An especially offensive circular letter, signed 'Workmen's Protective Association,' is being delivered to employees in several Indianapolis shops. This letter may not be a fraudulent device of the Republican state committee, but its distribution with the knowledge and consent of employers is sufficient to make them parties to the offense.

"The statutes against coercion and intimidation are broad enough to cover, and do cover, acts of the kind which the concerns whose names are in my possession have either done or permitted to be done in their establishments in the interest of the candidates on the Republican ticket.

It may as well be understood now as at any time that neither the purchasing and law-abiding public nor the Democratic party will submit to the perpetration of these outrages on independent citizenship. A fund of \$5,000 has been set aside by the Democratic national committee to prosecute all persons who violate the coercion laws. The Democratic state committee has reserved a fund for the same purpose. Besides, I will pay \$25 to each person who furnishes to the Democratic state committee evidence which will contribute to the conviction of any person, firm or corporation guilty of the cowardly and contemptible crime of debauching or attempting to debauch, coerce or intimidate employees.

"Not only will the specific statutes against intimidation and coercion be invoked, but every other honorable means available will be used to stop the partisan and disreputable practice to which attention is called. It is time that Republican corporations, firms and persons employing labor should be taught that the impudent coercion or attempted coercion of their employees will not again be tolerated, and that such a practice will prove to be disastrous to those who undertake it. Public sentiment will no longer endure the peculiarly vicious offense against American citizenship.

"The purchasing public will demand to be, and will be, informed as to the identity of the firms, persons and corporations who engage in this short-sighted and partisan business, and will from the facts, make up their minds as to who are and who are not worthy of the patronage of fair-minded persons."

## HANLY "NOT A \$5,000 MAN."

The difference between the cost of a high moral and suspiciously virtuous Governor like J. Frank Hanly and a plain, everyday man and Democrat like Claude Matthews merits the thoughtful consideration of taxpayers. Not only Matthews, but Gray, Hovey, Porter, Hendricks and others were content with a \$5,000 salary and other moderate appropriations for the governor's office. But not so Hanly. He wants it understood that he is a high-priced man. In a speech at Crawfordsville on October 5th he said:

"I told you when I was a candidate that if the salary was to be kept at \$5,000 that I did not want the office. I told you that I was not a \$5,000 man. I have tried to make good and I can truthfully say that I have saved the state hundreds of thousands of dollars."

The governor does not give the figures showing how or where he has "saved the state hundreds of thousands of dollars"—and he can not do so—but the figures showing the cost of the governor's office under him and under Matthews are at hand. The figures given below are the appropriations for the governor's office during the terms of Hanly and Matthews. For the Hanly appropriations see Acts 1905, p. 502, and Acts 1907, p. 671. For the Matthews appropriations see Acts 1893, p. 361, and 1895, p. 304. And here is the result:

Cost under Hanly (4 years).....\$227,900

Cost under Matthews (4 yrs.).....49,280

Increased Cost Under Hanly.....\$178,620

Governor Hanly, of course, contends that all of this immense sum was spent properly. But why did he need so much more than his Democratic predecessor?

In the 1893-4 so-called Democratic "panic" there were seventeen bank failures. In the 1907-8 panic in Roosevelt's administration, forty-three banks stopped payment and hundreds more arbitrarily limited the amounts that depositors could draw.

## COULDN'T STAND SHELTON.

Even Lt.-Gov. Woodruff, a Trust Character, Said the Present Treasurer of the National Committee, Would Jeopardize the State Ticket.

George R. Sheldon, treasurer of the Republican National committee, whose trust interests are well known, was compelled, under fire, to withdraw from the New York state ticket in the fall of 1902 when he was eager to accept the office of Lieutenant-Governor. His connections with the trusts and especially those owned and dominated by J. Pierpont Morgan and other favored trusts, became such an issue at that time that Governor E. B. Odell fought against his name being placed on the ticket. Odell even went so far as to wire Timothy Woodruff that he would not run on the same state ticket with Sheldon. United States Senator Thomas C. Platt was determined to have Sheldon on the ticket and informed the Republican leaders at the state convention at Saratoga that Sheldon's name would remain on the slate. The wires between the convention city and Albany were kept hot, and finally Governor Odell was compelled to take a train for Saratoga in order to prevent Sheldon's name from appearing on the ticket. Governor Odell went direct to Senator Platt's home in Saratoga and, after a conference which lasted until 2 o'clock in the morning, Platt yielded and Sheldon's name was withdrawn and F. W. Higgins was nominated for the office sought by George R. Sheldon.

When it was announced that Sheldon would not be on the ticket those hundred delegates in front of Platt's house cheered the glad tidings.

Lt.-Gov. Woodruff, when asked at that time why he objected so strongly to Sheldon, said:

"I have no personal animosity toward Mr. Sheldon. I believe that the objections that have been raised to him are of the gravest sort and that they jeopardize the state ticket."

Gov. Odell had this to say a day before Sheldon's name was taken off the slate:

"I fought against George R. Sheldon because his business connections imperiled the whole ticket."

## PROTECTING DEPOSITS IN BANKS.

An Ohio Example of Taft's Position and Oklahoma's Proof of Bryan's Position.

One of the planks of the Denver platform favors guaranteed bank deposits. Mr. Bryan addressed the Ohio legislature in February favoring guaranteed deposits. Former Governor Herrick subsequently addressed the legislature in reply to Mr. Bryan, opposing any such protection for banks and bank depositors.

Mr. Taft, in his speech of acceptance, denounced the plank of the Denver platform, which declares for a national law for banks similar to the Oklahoma law for state banks, thereby coinciding in the views of Mr. Herrick and opposing the views of Mr. Bryan.

Below are two dispatches showing what Mr. Bryan stands for and what Mr. Taft stands for.

## THE OHIO WAY.

Cleveland, O., Aug. 17.—The creditors' committee, charged with an investigation of the affairs of the defunct Farmers and Merchants' bank, the cashier of which, Henry W. Galloway, is under arrest charged with embezzlement, tonight reported that the depositors will be forced to shoulder a loss of \$415,000.

The report, made in a meeting of 2,800 depositors, charged the deficit to Galloway, alleging his speculations proved disastrous to the institution.

## TAFT STANDS FOR THIS.

THE OKLAHOMA WAY.

Guthrie, Okla., May 21.—Within one hour from the time H. H. Smock, Oklahoma banking commission, had taken charge of the International Bank of Cologne he had authority to pay the depositors in full, though the bank's cash and available funds in other banks fell \$22,000 short of the total amount of deposits. The commissioner was able to do this under the operation of the new banking law, and this is the first time it has been called into use.

## BRYAN STANDS FOR THIS.

The Republican National committee says it gets no money from the Standard Oil company. Does that concern, then, give its money direct to Republican candidates?

## Australian Bushmen.

Although the bushmen of Australia are the very lowest in the scale of intelligence, they possess a rare instinct that equals that of many animals and is in its way as wonderful as man's reason. It is almost impossible for them to be lost. Even if they be led away from their home blindfolded for miles, when released they will willingly turn in the right direction and make their way to their nest homes, and, though these are all very similar, they never make a mistake.

## Fool and Sage.

The fool and his money are parted. Not long did they stay in cabots, but the fool is the cheeriest hearted and gladdest of human galsots. His neighbor is better and wiser, six figures might tell what he's worth, but, oh, how folks with the old miser would fall off the edge of the earth—Emporia Gazette.

## DO THE PEOPLE RULE?

All the Recent Publications Convince the Voters that Trusts Control Legislation.

After all the excitement over the publication of the Standard Oil letters, showing that trusts control legislation, has reached the stage where the voters sift the wheat from the chaff of sensational publications, what will be the logical conclusion in the minds of the voters? It will be:

1.—That the people do not rule because the national law-makers legislate to suit the trusts. More trusts exist today than ever, and the people suffer more from them, and they practice more extortion.

2.—That the party in power is the party through which the trusts rule. The Republican party is now in power. It writes all the national laws. In a speech in the last Congress, Mr. Sherman (candidate for Vice-President), declared that the Republican party assumed all responsibility for everything that has been done and for what has not been done. That is right. The trusts write the tariff laws passed by Republican votes. If the magnates are not punished criminally, it is because Republican officials fall in their tracks.

For eleven years the Democrats have had no power to frame Federal laws or to execute a Federal statute. If everything in America is all right as to Federal laws for eleven years, the Republican party deserves the credit. If "evils have crept in" the Republicans are responsible. The only hope for a change lies in the election of Bryan.

Suppose some individual Democrat has been employed by a trust. He could not get a law passed, he could not get "an immunity bath," he could do nothing effectively for the trusts unless a majority of the Republican Congressmen favored the trust measures. The Republican orators can not escape responsibility by trying to pick out some Democrat who has been employed by a trust. Recent disclosures prove that the people do not rule, but that the trusts owe their existence and fatness to Republican laws and Republican officials.

## SHAKING DOWN THE TRUSTS.

Chas. G. Dawes Visits Wall Street and Promises Republican Party Will Be Good.

Under New York date line of Sept. 19 the daily papers of the country publish a dispatch from which the following is taken:

"The visit of Charles G. Dawes, of Chicago (formerly Controller of the Currency), had more influence than anything else in arousing Wall Street uneasiness. Mr. Dawes came to New York primarily to raise money for the Republican congressional campaign committee, and he gave the people he called upon very clearly to understand that the Republican majority in the house is in danger.

"Wall street has steered itself against the importunities of political canvassers for funds, but Mr. Dawes' visit was unquestionably impressive. The people who saw and heard him were convinced that he really meant what he said when he announced that unless means were taken to arrest the current and change the situation the Democrats would swing into control of the popular branch of congress and probably elect president. Mr. Dawes did not confine his visit alone to bankers and financiers. He devoted a good share of his attention to leading representatives of the manufacturing interests. He carried away some money, but not nearly as much as he had hoped for."

The New York World has cartoons showing a Standard Oil can taking the place of the dome in a picture of the Capitol at Washington. Good! It is another evidence that the people do not rule at Washington, but that the trusts rule through the agency of the Republican party. As to legislation, Mr. Sherman, candidate for vice-president, said "The Republican party is willing and ready to accept full responsibility." Exactly. And the Standard Oil and other trusts rule through that party. The only way to prevent such rule is to elect Bryan.

## A City and Its Press.

In some respects a modern city resembles a vast commercial house. In commerce advertisement is the secret of success, and the most successful coadjutors of the municipality in the development and puffing of a capital are the newspapers. And here Berlin is lacking. Her press is on a hopelessly low level, impoverished, without enterprise, under the thumb of the authorities. In London, New York and Paris the press has a voice in the running of the city—London Outlook.

## A Roundabout Reply.

"Darling," said a young husband, "what would you do if I should die? Tell me!"

"Please don't suggest such a thing," was the reply. "I can't bear the thought of a stepfather for our little boy!"

## Unselfish.

She—George, is that one of those clergies I gave you for your birthday? He—No. I'm saving those for my friends. She—You dear, self sacrificing, unselfish man!

When a man borrows trouble, the interest eats up the principal.—Kansas City Star.

## A DELIBERATE UNTRUTH.

Roosevelt, Taft, Hughes and others have said that the Democratic party has done nothing against the trusts. This statement is not true. The Democratic party has done practically all that has been done against the trusts. Roosevelt has talked about the trusts, but he has not only done nothing to suppress the old ones, but has allowed hundreds of new ones to be formed during his administration. On the other hand the Democratic party wherever it has been in control, has passed and enforced laws to curb these commercial pirates. The Democrats have had no control of the national government for twelve years, but in every state where they have been in power the trusts have been forced to obey the laws made to stop their aggressions. Roosevelt, Taft, Hughes and the rest know that this is so. They purposely and deliberately misstate the truth.

## THE SECRET CONTRIBUTIONS OF 1904.

(From the Commoner.)

Prior to election day in 1904 Democrats learned that representatives of the special interests were providing the Republican party with campaign funds. Mr. Roosevelt hotly denied the accusation, denouncing the Democrat who made it as a liar.

Later it developed that E. H. Harriman had collected \$260,000. This money came from Standard Oil officials and others, the detailed contributions being as follows:

Edward H. Harriman	\$ 50,000
H. McK. Twombly (representing Vanderbilt)	25,000
Chauncey M. Depew, personal	25,000
James Hazen Hyde	25,000
Equitable Life	25,000
J. Pierpont Morgan	10,000
George W. Perkins (New York Life Insurance Co.)	10,000
H. H. Rogers, J. D. Archibald, William Rockefeller (Standard Oil Co.)	30,000
Cornelius N. Bliss, personal	10,000
James Speyer and banking interests	10,000
"Seven friends" of Senator Dewey (\$5,000 each)	35,000
Sent to Mr. Harriman in smaller donations	20,000
Total	\$260,000

Does anyone believe that Mr. Roosevelt would have dared tell the people, prior to election day, that these men had contributed \$260,000 to his campaign fund?

But Mr. Roosevelt insists that the people must trust the Republican managers and that the source of the Republican party's campaign fund will not be revealed until after the election.

And Mr. Taft—Mr. Roosevelt's candidate for the presidency—echoes this Roosevelt sentiment."

## ROOSEVELT AND HEARST.

Two years ago President Roosevelt—who is now working hand-in-hand with Hearst for Taft—sent Secretary Root to New York to deliver his opinions of Hearst, in a speech at Utica. Listen to what Mr. Root, declaring that he spoke for the president, upon that occasion, had to say about Mr. Hearst:

"I say to you with his [Roosevelt's] authority, he regards Mr. Hearst as wholly unfit to be governor, as an insincere, self-seeking demagogue, who is trying to deceive the workmen of New York by false statements and false promises.

"Listen to what President Roosevelt himself has said of Mr. Hearst and his kind. In President Roosevelt's first message to congress, speaking of the assassin of McKinley, spoke of him as inflamed by the reckless utterances of those who on the stump, in public press, appeal to the dark, evil spirits of malice, greed, envy, and sullen hatred. The wind is blown by men who preach such doctrine, and they cannot escape their share of the responsibility for the whirlwind that is reaped. This applies alike to the deliberate demagogue, to the crude, foolish, visionary who, for whatever reason, apologizes for crime or excites aimless discontent.

"I say by the president's authority, in penning these words with the honor of President McKinley's murder fresh before him, he had Hearst specifically in his mind. And I say, by his authority, that what he thought of Mr. Hearst then, he thinks of Mr. Hearst now."

And the question now is, what, aside from Hearst's support of Taft, has Hearst done to win the president's approbation?

Who are the Republican candidates, anyhow? Is Hanly or Watson the candidate for governor? Is Roosevelt or Taft running for president? As a matter of fact it seems as if the Republican party is so badly demoralized that there is no certainty about its program. It doesn't "know where it is going, but it is on the way."

## HURRAH FOR GEORGIA!

At the election for governor last week Georgia gave the Democratic candidate a majority of 100,000 over the Republican-Hearst combination. The vote was heavy and Democratic gain is nearly 40,000 over four years ago. There is no stopping the Democratic tidal wave. Every state election so far held shows that it is irresistible.

## TRYING TO "EXPLAIN" THEIR EXTRAVAGANCE.

John Billheimer, Republican candidate for state auditor, has taken his turn at the task of trying to explain the enormous increase in the cost of the state government since the Republican party has been in power. Governor Hanly first tried his hand at the job, and then came Candidate Watson. All that these men have been able to do has only emphasized the fact that for twelve years the people of Indiana have been bled by a horde of political cormorants who looked upon the taxes paid by the people as partisan plunder.

Neither Hanly, Watson nor Billheimer, nor any other Republican speaker or newspaper has disputed the fact that the same offices in the state house which cost \$431,900 a year under Democratic rule, cost last year, under Republican administration \$925,470, as shown by the appropriation acts.

Governor Hanly cannot deny that the annual appropriation for his office is now \$58,550, as against \$12,020 under Matthews. And Mr. Billheimer cannot deny that the appropriations for the state auditor's office are now \$64,620, as against \$12,800 under the last Democratic state auditor.

Nor can they or anybody else deny that the appropriations for all of the other state offices have been increased in like proportion until the aggregate of increases amounts to \$493,570 a year more than was found necessary by the Democrats.

Hanly, Watson, Billheimer and all the rest of the "explainers" fall back upon the fact that certain state offices prior to 1895 drew fees in addition to their salaries. This is true, but it affected only the individual compensation of the official and bore no other relation to the expense of the office. But these fees were not allowed nor drawn by Democratic officials after the taking effect of the fee and salary law passed by the Democratic legislature of 1891, which exempted persons then in office from its operations.

The Indianapolis Star, Republican state organ, comes to the rescue of the wasters of public money. In an editorial a column long it says that "Mr. Marshall, candidate for governor of Indiana, also raises the cry of extravagance in regard to Republican state administrations, and makes many loose assertions in regard to tax levies and the cost of operating the various state offices and institutions."

Mr. Marshall has, indeed, raised the "cry of extravagance," and he will continue to raise it, but he has not made a single statement which is not in accordance with the facts and susceptible of proof by the official records. He has kept himself strictly within the truth, and it is the bare truth that causes such panic among the tax-payers. The Republican officials and their organ are only trying to distort the facts and twist the figures, hoping thereby to muddy the water and mislead the voters, but they will not succeed.

## "NOT THE CASE AT ALL," SAYS WATSON.

In a speech at Hammond on Oct. 3, Mr. Watson, one of the Republican candidates for governor—Mr. Hanly not being present—had the following to say on the county option bill:

"My fellow citizens, the baby has been born and it is named. Now, some parties are saying that we propose to put all saloons out of business right off. That is not the case at all. The law simply provides that the people of Lake county, if they want to have local option, they can have it; but before they can get it 20 per cent of the entire voting population of the county, which at this time would be more than 5,000 voters, must first sign a petition to the county commissioners asking for a special election."

From the above extract it will be seen that Mr. Watson wanted the people of Hammond to understand just how difficult it is going to be to apply the county option law in their county. He was particularly anxious that the Hammond saloon keepers should know that they were not to be "put out of business." Such a thing, he declared, was "not the case at all." But just listen to Jeems in a different locality!

## STARVING CHILDREN

Innocent Victims of Trust Rule and "Republican Prosperity."

Fifteen thousand school children starving in Chicago—among the causes, lack of employment of parents, and the constant increase in the cost of living without a corresponding increase in wages!

This is the startling announcement made in the daily newspapers of Chicago and which has brought gloom and consternation to the managers of the Republican national committee in that city. They have been preaching prosperity and the "full dinner pail" through the continuance of the Republican party in power and the maintenance of a high tariff. The Republican newspapers of Chicago without exception have given this Republican claim the lie direct. In publishing with big headlines the report of the special committee appointed to investigate the conditions in public schools, they show that thousands of children are suffering from hunger and actually dying from starvation in the great industrial and commercial city of Chicago.

Here are the headlines running across three columns of the paper, from the Chicago Inter Ocean (Republican):

## HUNGER MENACES 20,000 PUPILS IN CITY SCHOOLS MANY BEG REFUSE TO EAT

Starting Conditions in Chicago Shown by Report of Investigating Committee, Who Find Starvation Has Many Victims.

## 5,000 Have No Meal in Morning.

Body Asks Food for Children, Some of Whom Have Forgotten Taste of Butter, Living on Dry Crusts Earned by Heroism of Mothers Who Go to Bed Fasting.

The Tribune (Republican) heads its article:

## HUNGER STALKING IN CITY SCHOOLS

Five Thousand Pupils Don't Know What a Full Meal Means and Ten Thousand Others are Underfed.

The Record-Herald (Ind. Republican) heads its story with:

## THOUSANDS OF PUPILS SUFFER FROM HUNGER

The Inter Ocean begins the horrible story telling of the starving of the little ones in the midst of