

THE PEOPLE'S PILOT.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE
PILOT PUBLISHING COMPANY (Limited),
OF
North Western Indiana.

DAVID H. YEOMAN... President.
WM. WASHBURN... Vice Pres.
LEE E. GLAZEBROOK... Secretary
J. A. MCFARLAND... Treasurer.

LEE E. GLAZEBROOK, EDITOR.

THE PEOPLE'S PILOT is the official organ of the Jasper and Newton County Alliances, and is published every Friday at
ONE DOLLAR PER ANNUM
If paid in advance. If not paid in advance, \$1.25 per year will be charged to all subscribers.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.
Displayed Advertisements.....10c per inch
Local Notices.....5c per line.

Entered as second class matter at the post office in Kosselae, Ind.

Kosselae, Friday, Dec. 7, 1894.

THE Democrats held their own better in Nebraska than in any other state in the Union. Here the fight was for free silver and the gallant, brainy Bryan took the lead.

WHILE the Republican party cannot find enough mean things to say against the Populist party yet it allied itself with Populism in several of the southern states in the recent election.

THE New York Herald calls attention to the fact that the Populists of the United States instead of being "busted" in the last election increased their national vote by 600,000, while both old parties showed a falling off. Suppose they repeat this ratio of increase in 1896? Is there statesmanship enough in the Democratic party to prevent it?—Chicago Times.

THE dead Pops seem to give neighbor much more concern than the live Democrats. Perhaps it is the spirits of the departed that are haunting him for the wicked and false things he has said. For every wicked act, for every false word, punishment will come in one way or another, neighbor, either in this world or the next. You know how unreasonable and unfair you were with Populism when it was in the flesh, now you and its ghosts fight it out.

DAY by day the Populist claim that rail roads should be run by the government is being accentuated by actual tests. The North-eastern railroad recently fell into the hands of the state of Georgia, being abandoned by the owners as worthless. The state having guaranteed the bonds, took the road and operated it. The result was that the road last year paid all operating expenses, interest on the bonds, and turned \$12,000 into the state treasury. Let the government take the whole lot of them and do likewise.—Facts and Figures.

THE people voted against protection in 1884, in 1890 and in 1892. In 1875 the Republicans increased the tariff and in 1876 the Democrats carried the country. In 1883 the Republicans decreased the tariff and the next year the country went Democratic. In 1890 the Republicans greatly increased the tariff and the next election went Democratic. In 1894 the Democrats slightly decreased the tariff and the country went Republican. The pendulum has been swinging for twenty years.

Republican.	Democratic.
1872,	1876,
1880,	1884,
1888,	1892,
1894.	

What kind of a tariff do the people want anyhow, or does tariff have anything to do with our elections.

We are living in the shadow of an unbridled plutocracy, caused created and cemented in

no slight degree by legislative, aldermanic and congressional action; a plutocracy that is far ever crossed the horizon of the world's history, and one that has been produced in a shorter consecutive period; the names of whose members are emblazoned not on the pages of their nation's glory, but of its peculations, who represent no struggle for their country's liberties, but for its boodle; and whose octopus grip is extending over every branch of industry; a plutocracy which controls the price of the bread we eat, the price of the sugar that sweetens our cup, the price of the oil that lights our way, the price of the very coffins in which we are finally buried.—Gen. Lloyd Brice, in North American Review.

THE Republican published a long article taken from the New York Tribune, written by R. G. Hore, in which he predicts the downfall of the Populist party, because, as he terms it, it howls calamity. What did Owen, Landis, Beveridge and all the other Republican speakers do, that were sent here during the last campaign? They did nothing but howl calamity. The Republican speakers were instructed by the state central committee not to meet the Democratic and Populist speakers in joint discussion, for they knew that in joint debate the fallacies of the Republican arguments would be exposed. They did the bidding of their masters and howled calamity. Will the Republican please inform its readers why it is right for a Republican to howl calamity and wrong for a Populist to do so?

NEIGHBOR took up four columns of valuable editorial space last week to prove the death of the dead. If Populism be dead, is it necessary, is it really the part of common sense that all this labored argument be advanced to prove its death to the people? Why the living spending so much time with the dead? Neighbor, there are great living questions that your party must meet, give it the benefit of your counsel, let your light shine before it; your space is too valuable to be wasted upon the dead. There must be something in the appearance of this dead body that neighbor fears some might mistake for signs of life, or else there is surely a lingering doubt in his mind about the reality of this death he labors so hard to prove. The dead are peaceable and harmless, neighbor; then go not to the grave to meet your country's foes, but turn your blade upon the living, active, devilish Democrats and let the dead Pops rest in peace, if you know they are dead. If neighbor believes Populism is dead he will show much more sense and give much more proof of that belief by saying much less upon the subject.

The Tariff.

The tariff question is beginning to get in its discordant note among the protectionists themselves. The Chicago Tribune is flaying a prohibitory tariff contemporary for calling "low tariff Republicans" political heretics. It cites Tom Reed and Senator Sherman as advocates of moderate tariff and wants to know if they are to be read out of the party. Mr. Medill, the editor-in-chief of the Tribune, has never been a protectionist, and formerly his paper openly denounced the protective tariff theory. Of late, however, the Tribune has been trotting in the protection harness. The McKinley law will never be re-enacted. There are too many Republicans who are opposed to it, and there is a growing feeling among all classes that a system which benefits a few at the expense of the millions, is wrong in principle and disastrous in practice. The average tariff advocate himself be-

lieves that an excessively high tariff is highway robbery of the masses; and the Reeds and Shermans and Medills will be the men who will make the next tariff law is in favor of protection. If protection is adopted at all, it will be what is called moderate protection; and the new law is that future tariff legislation, if in the interest of protection, will be distinguished by the protection it gives certain articles and fails to give to others rather than a general wholesale raising of custom duties. Building a Chinese wall around the United States principally for the benefit of a few manufacturers is not a popular doctrine even among the rank and file of the protectionist party. Like most of our other legislation, the tariff legislation has been in the interest of the favored few. It takes care of the trusts and of the manufacturers, but it leaves the farmer to shift for himself.—The Farmer's Voice.

THE election figures showing the Populist vote for 1894 throughout the country makes an exhibit interesting and important, says the New York World. It completely refutes the notion that the Populists have received their death blow. They were defeated, it is true, in Kansas and Colorado—states that have been their stronghold—but they cast 600,000 more votes in 1894 than in 1892, and a party that gains 57 per cent. in two years is a force to be reckoned with. In the first place, the fact must be recognized that the Populist defeat in Kansas and Colorado was a defeat to Waite and Lewelling rather than of Populism. In 1892 the Democrats and Populists fused in Colorado and Kansas. That the Populist vote in Colorado should have increased under these circumstances from 54,000 to 67,000 is far from suggesting that the party is dead. In Kansas there is a loss of 45,000, but even so the Populist vote this year was 16,000 greater than the vote cast in that state for Cleveland in 1888. The largest gains were made in old Democratic states or in the states in which in recent years there has been least stability in party relations, where Republicans have abandoned their own party and gone to the Democratic party for relief, and, having been disappointed with crumbs instead of obtaining substantial relief, are now voting with the new party. Of the old Democratic states the chief gain of the Populists was made in North Carolina, their vote growing from 45,000 to 154,000. While they were aided by Republican votes they did not have the full strength of that party, for the independent Republicans ran a third ticket. As the Republican vote in 1892 in North Carolina was about 100,000 it is clear that the Populist vote, pure and simple, must have grown nearly, if not quite, 35 per cent. South Carolina became almost wholly Populist. In Georgia the Populist vote increased 54,000, or more than 100 per cent. In Texas it grew from 100,000 to 160,000. It fell off slightly in Virginia, but the party gained a foothold in Maryland and Delaware. In Alabama the alleged defection of a large part of the negro vote to Oates caused a falling off on the face of the returns. In most of the fusion states of 1892 the Populist vote fell off, but the popular unrest and dissatisfaction in the west which caused the revolt against the Republican party in 1890 and 1892 this year turned, in its disappointment, to the Populists. In Illinois the Populist vote increased from 22,000 to 138,000; in Indiana from 22,000 to 30,000; in Iowa, where Democracy has been steadily growing for a dozen years, from 21,000 to 35,000; in Michigan from 20,000 to 25,000;

in Minnesota from 20,000 to 88,000; in Montana from 7,000 to 15,000. In Nebraska the Democrats and Populists polled 83,000 votes in 1892, but this year the Populists alone polled 80,000. In Ohio the Populist vote increased from 15,000 to 49,000, and in Wisconsin, a state which the Democrats hoped they had won permanently, from 10,000 to 27,000. This increase means for one thing that in the west and South the people are dissatisfied with both the old parties. They have turned from the Republican to the Democratic party without obtaining relief. They believed the promises made them by the Democratic party only to find them broken through incompetent leadership, which was taken advantage of by Gorman, Brice and Smith. And they cannot be won back until Democracy's leaders and candidates are a guarantee that its pledges will be redeemed. In the meantime, Populism must be recognized as a serious factor in American politics.

To the People of Rensselaer and Vicinity.

GREETING.

The election is now as the World's Fair numbered with things that are past. But say? What of the long weary evenings which are approaching as fast as the car of time can carry them. The question of most importance that comes up in connection with this thought is, "What shall I do that I may gain the most benefit; and have them pass the least burdensome." The desession of past ages, is that reading, or the exercise of our musical talents are the most beneficial because by so doing we gain the golden fruit of intelligence which only the superhuman power can deprive us of.

We are prepared to furnish you with any books, magazines or newspapers published in this and foreign countries, in any language, at prices that will entirely please you.

We also make some very special offers on tea and coffee. Ours is also the exalted privilege of supplying the public with W. W. Thomas' pure oil complexion soap.

And unto those who are weary and would rest, we have that which will give you rest unto the uttermost, in the form of Laudem's Bros. new adjustable bed springs, for which we are the sole agents for this county.

Stepping over as it were the 10,000 grand bargains we are enabled to make you; we will close for this time, close with making an earnest appeal unto the kings and queens of the farm, entreating with them to get our prices on poultry, eggs and butter before contracting elsewhere.

We extend a most sincere and hearty invitation to the public to investigate our lines and modes of business. Trusting that we may in the future sail happily together in the grand old ship of friendship, upon the deep waters of the sea of business, we would subscribe as yours most truly.

For Specialties,
FREDERIC R. FIELDER & Co.
Rensselaer, Ind.
Office first door south of school house.

List of Patents.

Granted to Indiana inventors this week. Reported by C. A. Snow & Co., Solicitors of American and Foreign Patents, Opp. U. S. Patent Office, Washington, D. C.

W. Lash, Avilla, combined awning and fire and burglar proof shutter; J. D. Libey, Lima, scraper; I. G. Poston, Veedersburg, paving-block; W. S. Ralya & R. Coyle, Indianapolis, metal-straightening machine; W. P. Stevens, Muncie, combined label and price card.

SPEAKERSHIP RACE.

FIELD OF TWELVE CANDIDATES IN AT THE START.

Is the Position Worth the Prospective Strife?—Interesting Paragraphs in Review of the Political Lives of Some Past Speakers—Gossip of the Contest.

(Special Correspondence.)

INDIANAPOLIS, Dec. 4.—The campaign for the Indiana speakership, has not yet become lurid—not red hot. But I predict that it will. There are elements enough and candidates enough to make the topic one of interest already, and in this week's letter I point out some comparative history of unusual interest just at this time. The race is given greater attention than in recent years because more communities have a direct local interest through the aspirations of their own representative, but the fact that the house has changed political complexion gives to the Republican majority a degree of enthusiasm and to the Democratic minority a watchful interest in every proceeding.

He who ascends the mountain tops shall find
The loftiest peaks most wrapt in clouds and snow.
He who surpasses or subdues mankind,
Must look down on the hate of those below.

Thus wrote Lord Byron of ambition. Whether it is this sort of desire that impels an even dozen of Indiana's legislative lights to seek the "loftiest peak" of the house as speaker is beyond my province to determine in writing a review of the canvass, its incidents and features of interest. The list of aspirants to date is as follows:

B. M. Willoughby of Vincennes, Knox county.

F. E. Holloway of Evansville, Vanderburgh county.

J. G. Allen of Washington, Daviess county.

George B. Cardwell of New Albany, Floyd county.

Marshall Newhouse of Kingston, Decatur county.

C. F. Hesler of Steam Corner, Fountain county.

F. D. Merritt of Lagrange, Lagrange county.

Thomas T. Moore of Greencastle, Putnam county.

J. C. Adams and W. H. Leedy of Indianapolis, Marion county.

A. J. Stakebake of Winchester, Randolph county.

J. F. Stutesman of Peru, Miami county.

An analysis of the geographical location of the candidates, if that is to have anything to do with the race, shows that the south end has the most material to offer, and consequently most men between whom to divide votes. By congressional districts the Second and Seventh are the ones which seem destined to divide in their support, each having two announced aspirants. The others come one each from the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Eleventh and Twelfth districts.

Five of the candidates served during the last session of the general assembly, when they were in a minority of 63 to 37. These were Messrs. Allen, Hesler, Merritt, Newhouse and Stakebake. While the others were not members of the last house, some of them have previously had experience in legislative work.

It is asserted that J. M. Hunter of Williamsport and C. F. Remy of Columbus have been on the eve of announcing themselves as candidates for speaker, but that for some reason they have not yet done so. There may or may not be developments which will justify them in entering the race later on.

There is talk of a combination against Marion county (which is not noted throughout the state for her modesty), inasmuch as two aspirants are seeking to control enough votes to elect. Word has come down from the north that if the speakership will be given to that section the clerkship can be had for the south, but the friends of southern candidates send an answer to the effect that conditions must be reversed before they can enter the deal.

The nature of the canvass thus far has been principally by letter or circular, with an occasional visit to different localities by some of the more anxious.

The style of correspondence is clearly set forth in a quotation from a candidate given below, except that an additional biographical dissertation is attached to prove how great a man the candidate has already proven himself to be. But all this is tame to what it will be in a little while, when the real struggle for votes begins. The candidates come and go from the capital city quite frequently, often meeting here some of the members who have fled from home for a day to avoid a class of seekers after less important positions. The caucus will be held in the Denison house just before the meeting of the assembly. Sentiment as to the strength of candidates is likely to change before that date, so there would be an element of unfairness in saying what men now appear to be in the front, the entries having just been given the word "go."

Recognizing that it was not for the emoluments (the speaker gets \$2 a day more than the member on the floor) I have been seeking for a candidate who would tell me in a general way why any man was anxious to be chosen as the wielder of the gavel in a stormy assembly like Indiana general assemblies usually prove. I thought to get away from the stereotyped phrases of ambition, and honor, and pride, and ability, and pressure of friends, and all that sort of thing, and get into a man's secret longings. It proved a failure. I could summarize what was said by all and cover it in this quotation from one man: "In the broad and general sense I am not a candidate for the office or its emoluments, yet the position of speaker is one of such high honor that, while I am

fully advised of the great responsibility and meager compensation attached to the position, the impelling motive that prompts me to seek this important trust is certainly a laudable aspiration and worthy desire. Fortified with the belief that my experience in matters pertaining to legislation, coupled with an earnest purpose and unselfish aim to serve my fellowmen, justifies the modest belief that if considered competent and worthy I could creditably address myself to the duties of the chair and acceptably serve my people first and party next."

They all talk like that. If your readers have any doubt I would advise that they consult with your local representative for corroboration—for the representative has certainly been talked to or written to.

The history of the Indiana speakership makes an interesting study for the politician in particular and the public in general. Without going beyond the recollection of the present generation I have made researches for 24 years, with a view to corroborate or explode an existing belief that the speakership is the stepping stone to higher and better things politically.

In the session of 1871 William Mack presided over the house of representatives and at the succeeding session Vago again won the honor and William K. Edwards was chosen speaker. Neither of these gentlemen made a political record which has lived to the present day. David Turpie was made speaker in 1875. Ten years afterward he was elected United States senator, defeating ex-President Harrison after a contest of extraordinary interest. The fact that he had been speaker seems to have had no direct bearing upon the honor then bestowed and which he now holds.

The succeeding session put John Overmeyer of Jennings county over the house as guiding spirit. Republicans having a majority that year. Overmeyer was afterward chairman of the Republican state central committee, but since has identified himself with the Democracy, advocating the election of Cleveland. His brother David, by the way, was defeated in Kansas at the late election as the Democratic candidate for governor. He was also formerly a Republican.

In 1879 Henry S. Canthorn of Knox and in 1881 William M. Ridpath of Clay were at the head of affairs and in 1883 William D. Bynum of Marion was chosen to preside. Mr. Bynum is the only man in the years reviewed who appears to have secured direct political advancement from his service as speaker, for in the succeeding campaign the Democrats of the capital city district nominated and elected him to congress. He has been there continuously since, but will retire at the close of the present session in favor of Charles L. Henry, Republican.

Then came "Charley" Jewett of Floyd. He was prominent in '85 and succeeded to the management of Democratic campaign affairs of the state. There was talk of making him either governor or congressman, but nothing came of the movements and he resumed law practice.

Warren G. Sayre of Wabash was the speaker in 1887, the Republicans having carried the house in 1886. Mr. Sayre has been frequently spoken of for governor, but his name has never gone before a convention for that place. Under the Harrison administration he served as an Indian commissioner. He occupies, however, a prominent place in the councils of his party at the present time. Mason E. Niblack succeeded Mr. Sayre and served two terms. He was defeated for representative from Knox county in the last election, but is likely to be heard from again.

James B. Curtis of Marion presided the last session. He was talked of as a possible opponent of Mr. Bynum for the congressional nomination, but declined to enter the race. He is young, however, and it is not believed that his political ambition has been appeased.

This brings us down to the present struggle. Who is to be the next and what his political fate?

There is interest also in an analysis for these years of the location from which speakers have hailed. To begin with, it is shown that on Marion county the honor was conferred in 1875, 1883 and 1893. Knox had the place in 1879 and again in '89 and '91, two terms being given Niblack. Vigo had it in '71 and '73, and these two instances are, singularly enough, the only two in 24 years in which one county furnished the presiding officer for more than a single year. From Vigo to Marion, then to Jennings, then Knox, then Clay, then Marion again, then Floyd, then Wabash, then Knox and back once more to Marion has been the order of passing around the position.

With all the candidates and the support given them by friends, there comes thus early the cry of combinations. I do not believe that any such have been made to date. In fact, I feel sure of it. It would not be a good politician who would enter into an agreement with any candidate for clerk or doorkeeper at this period, before the strength of any particular man shall have more fully developed. These are things of the future. They are inevitable, however, and I will give them proper attention as they are more clearly defined.

It can hardly be regarded as true that a majority of the Republican members have expressed a first and second choice for the speakership, and that the second choice is most likely to succeed, as is asserted by a local daily paper.

Away back in 1816, when Indiana was a comparative wilderness and the capital was Corydon, Isaac Blackford presided over the state's first legislature.

Has the speaker any patronage? Yes, in one sense he has. He has the means of assisting men to prominence in the house by his committee appointments. He can punish an enemy or reward a friend. To be assigned to work of importance is of inestimable value to an ambitious politician. There are devils ways of seeking such recognition. It may be, therefore, that there is some truth in the assertion I have heard that some of the candidates for the position are only aspirants for the purpose of securing a pledge from a stronger candidate that a good place will be given him on some good committee. If this is true you may look for a lessening of the list on the night of the caucus, if not before.

Uno.