

The Richmond Palladium and Sun-Telegram

Published and owned by the PALLADIUM PRINTING CO. Issued 7 days each week, evenings and Sunday morning.
Office—Corner North 9th and A streets.
Home Phone 1121.
RICHMOND, INDIANA.

Rudolph G. Leeds—Managing Editor.
Charles M. Morgan—Business Manager.
O. Owen Kuhn—News Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION TERMS.
In Richmond \$5.00 per year (in advance) or 10c per week.

MAIL SUBSCRIPTIONS.
One year, in advance \$5.00
Six months, in advance 2.50
One month, in advance45

RURAL ROUTES.
One year, in advance \$2.00
Six months, in advance 1.25
One month, in advance25

Address changed as often as desired; both new and old addresses must be given.

Subscribers will please remit with order which should be given for a specified term; name will not be entered until payment is received.

Entered at Richmond, Indiana, post office as second class mail matter.

WINTER PLANS.

Those of us who live in what is the country, compared to the great metropolitan towns of New York and Chicago, can hardly realize what the coming of winter means to thousands and thousands of fellow creatures. Now is the time of year when the ho-ho, that curious product of society, does his best to be arrested and be given lots of "time" so as to pass the winter months in comfort. It is true that by applying to the proper authorities he might be given a place to sleep and work for his board in one of those asylums for the poor which have lately sprung up. But the "Bo" wants none of this. There are too many questions asked: the work is hard; and there are too many baths and necessary accompaniments of things righteous to please him. In fact, he can even smash windows and bum a dinner of a restaurant with impunity at this time of year for the police are wary about finding a winter nest for the tramp.

Those of the upper classes of the proletariat are still hanging around the bulletin boards of the great metropolitan papers with that look of despair which is only a preliminary to crime and worse. The writer not long ago saw thousands of such men in languid hopeless attitudes waiting for the afternoon edition of a great paper in Chicago. These were men who were about down and out. Most of them were of the type which is becoming more and more prevalent in this country. They are city bred men who had learned to do only one thing and who, lacking employment in that one specialty, are utterly incapable of doing anything else to support themselves.

Then, there are those who are used to the life in the cities and who can subsist very comfortably on a few cents a day. Indeed five cents will go a very long way toward keeping a man alive in a great city and, provided he knows the ropes, he can sleep comfortable in the packing cases back of business establishments. Those who have decived the saloon in the large city, are doubtless right, but they fail to realize that the saloon as run for the "submerged fifth," in the cities, furnishes a meal for five cents including a large mug of beer, which is not to be despised. In the absence of any other place where equal facilities for comfort and social life, which is not condescending and cheerful, it is small wonder that the cheap saloon is the most popular place in the squalid life of these people. Here it is indeed that the first news of work comes to the ear that has been strained to hear that word. The cheap saloon is as full of news to the underworld as are the bazaars of the orient. Long before any of the benevolent employment bureaus have news of a "good thing," these nerve centers have the news and eager men who do care to work are on the spot. Of course the "Bo" sleeps on. He is past working.

And thus it is that just at the beginning of winter the city—that is, the real city, begins to lay its plans for the on coming season when sleeping in the open will be a source of discomfort and the snow and rain will beat in through tattered garments.

The hollow-eyed men are still standing hopelessly at the newspaper bulletin boards incapable of doing work if they could get it. The Underworld is making its winter plans in much the same way that the Upperworld is planning a season in Palm Beach or other winter resorts.

And we in the country and the country towns are beginning to think of those two great festivals of American life, Thanksgiving and Christmas.

Let us give thanks!

It is not a pretty picture is it?

THE MELLLOWING OF JOHN D.

The reminiscences of Mr. John D. Rockefeller and his testimony on the witness stand in the trial which is going on in New York in a suit to dissolve the Standard Oil company, reveal a change in that gentleman's attitude and nature. Although Rockefeller has retired from his activities in the directorate of the company, which

is indissolubly connected with his name, his interest in the great corporation which he was instrumental in building up is a matter of pride. He evidently relates with relish the small beginnings of the company from its capital of \$4,000 to its present enormous bulk. He talked of it as a thing which would stand as a fitting monument to his brain and shrewdness.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.

It is enough to say that none of Tammany's candidates ran ahead of Bryan which proves that the organization was loyal. Next he will say that Tom Taggart knifed him. Here he has a better case on circumstantial evidence, because Bryan fell far behind the state ticket.</