

years the plant was leased to a corporation, and the mains outside the city limits were sold for \$102,000." Now, what do you suppose the city of Toledo's municipal lighting plant wanted of "mains outside the city?" The "tainted news" bureau sayeth not. If it had explained that mystery, the taint would have exposed the putridity of the lie. For the Toledo plant was not an artificial lighting plant at all; it was a natural gas plant, drawing its supply from a field adjacent to Toledo. Hence "the mains outside the city." The reason the city gave up this plant was not because municipal ownership was a failure, but because the field from which it drew its natural gas began to give out. It is now entirely exhausted, unless for the supply of small quantities to private companies and farmers on their own lands. The natural gas now consumed in Toledo is pumped from West Virginia fields. This is done by private companies, not because Toledo wished it that way but because she was so tied up with legal red tape that the companies were at a great advantage. They could supply communities along the line, while Toledo could sell only to Toledo; and if this disadvantage had been out of the way, or other fields near Toledo had been available, the companies could get options secretly, whereas Toledo could do nothing without making her intentions public in advance. While the Toledo natural gas field held out—that is, during those "seven ruinous years" of the San Diego Union's epitaph—the city of Toledo had a lower rate for natural gas than any other large city in the country. But Toledo never had a municipal lighting plant in any such sense as the San Diego Union's "epitaph" implies. Of course the San Diego Union did not work up those "epitaphs" itself.

They were supplied by one of the bureaus for the manufacture of "tainted news" which Big Business patronizes and bright young newspaper men with a mouldy sense of honor work for. The "epitaphs" supplied to the San Diego Union included the Philadelphia, Pa., the Hamilton, Ohio, the Norwich, Conn., the Lowell, Ind., the Galena, Ill., the Brunswick, Mo., the Bowling, Ohio, and the Casselton, N. D., lighting plants—every epitaph doubtless wholly false or grossly misleading, as those we have investigated were—Elgin and Toledo.—The Public, Louis F. Post's paper.

BRIBERY

Bribery does not consist merely of the payment of money to induce a representative of the people to betray the trust reposed in him. Both in morals and in law the promise of any consideration of value to the person whose vote is at issue to influence him to change his attitude is bribery. The testimony of Representative Henry A. Shephard of Jerseyville before the senate committee which is investigating the charges relating to the seat held by Senator Lorimer makes Shephard's case fall clearly within this category.

Representative Shephard testified that he refused all pleas to vote for Lorimer for senator until Lorimer himself promised that neither J. W. Becker, deputy postmaster, nor W. P. Richards, postmaster and candidate for reappointment, should be made postmaster at Jerseyville. When Senator Frazier of the investigating committee asked Representative Shephard if he would have voted for Lorimer for senator if he had not made this promise the reply was: "No, sir; under no circumstances." These assurances, according to Shephard's testimony, were given by

Lorimer in person, not by any intermediary.

Traffic in jobs is, no doubt, looked upon by many as a less offense than bribery by the use of money. Transactions of this nature, however, constitute bribery under the law. The two forms of corruption are commonly found in operation together—Chicago Daily News.

NEW JERSEY'S SENATORIAL RACE

New Jersey elected a democratic legislature in November. This legislature will elect a United States senator this winter. James E. Martine, an old time democrat of that state had received a majority of the democratic votes of the state at the senatorial primary which was also held in November. When it was learned that the democrats had carried the legislature the bosses of the state at once raised a hue and cry against Martine, the people's choice. They claim he is not of senatorial caliber and could not represent New Jersey with proper dignity.

Martine may not be a great man, but he seems to be an honest one. He has been known in his native state for years as a farmer orator, a free trader and an all around opponent of privilege. He was recently interviewed upon his views on pending questions and had this to say: "I am a democrat. I have always supported Bryan. I am opposed to the protective tariff, to the ship subsidy and every kind of public favor for private interests."

Any man holding such views is not too weak to be a member of our house of lords, but gives sufficient evidence of having opinions that are at variance with, and would be a menace to the prevailing ideas of that body. All power to the arm of Governor Wilson, who is trying to elect

Martine over ex-Senator Smith, who has a record of service in the senate that President Cleveland called one of "perfidy and dishonor."—South Bend (Ind.) New Era.

THE LEGEND OF "O. K."

It is quite a respectable legend to say that the cracker manufacturing firm of "O. Kendall & Sons" stamped its initials on its product and thus gave the soldiers of the civil war a synonym for excellence. But there are in existence at least two other perfectly healthy theories. One is that Sam Houston absorbed "O. K." from a phrase current among the Indians with whom he spent that strange interval in his career; the other, that Andrew Jackson spelled it "ol' korrek" and then abbreviated. Neither of these explanations may be right. But their chronological effect would be to place the starting of "O. K." at a date before the civil war.—Chicago Evening Post.

THE WORST OF EQUALITY

Philip Snowden, the socialist member of the British parliament whom Rev. Charles F. Aked entertained in New York, has a keen intelligence—an intelligence so keen, indeed, that Mr. Snowden can even see the flaws in his own party.

Thus, at a dinner in New York, he said, replying to a toast on equality: "The words of equality is that we only wish to share it with our superiors."—Kansas City Post.

VALUABLE HELP

"I understand that your wife collaborates with you?"
"Yes, her work aids me immensely."

"I don't believe I have ever seen any of her writings."
"She doesn't write, she prepares my meals."—Houston Post.

Now About Clean Food

Another Splendid Opportunity to Bring Out Facts

When the "Weekly" which sued us for libel (because we publicly denounced them for an editorial attack on our claims) was searching for some "weak spot," they thought best to send a N. Y. Atty. to Battle Creek, summoned 25 of our workmen and took their sworn statements before a Commissioner.

Did we object? No. On the contrary, we helped all we could, for the opportunity was too good to be lost.

Geo. Haines testified he inspected the wheat and barley, also floors and every part of the factories to know things were kept clean. That every 30 minutes a sample of the products was taken and inspected to keep the food up to standard and keep out any impurities, also that it is the duty of every man in the factories to see that anything not right is immediately reported. Has been with the Co. 10 years.

Edward Young testified had been with Co. 15 years. Inspector, he and his men examined every sack and car of wheat and barley to see they were up to standard and rejected many cars.

H. E. Burt, Supt., testified has been with Co. over 13 years. Bought only the best grain obtainable. That the Co. kept a corps of men who do nothing but keep things clean, bright and polished.

Testified that no ingredient went into Grape-Nuts and Postum except those printed in the advertising. No possibility of any foreign things getting into the foods as most of the machinery is kept closed. Asked if the factory is open to the public, said "yes" and "it took from two to three guides constantly to show visitors through the works." Said none of the processes were carried on behind closed doors.

At this point attys. for the "Weekly" tried to show the water used was from some outside source. Testified the water came from Co.'s own artesian wells and was pure.

He testified the workmen were first-class, high-grade and inspected by the Co.'s physician to be sure they were all in proper physical condition; also testified that state reports showed that Co. pays better wages than the average and he thought higher than any in the state.

F. B. Martin, Asst. Supt., testified Grape-Nuts made of Wheat, Barley, Yeast and Water. Anything else? "No, sir." Postum made of Wheat, Wheat Bran and New Orleans Molasses. Statements made on his experience of about 10 years with Co.

Testified bakers are required to wear fresh white suits changed every other day. Said had never known of any of the products being sent out that were below the high standard of inspection. Asked if any one connected with the Postum Co. had instructed him how to testify. Said, "No, sir."

Horace Brown testified has been with Co. 9 years. Worked in Grape-Nuts bake shop. Testified the whole of the flour is composed of Wheat and Barley. Attys. tried to confuse him, but he insisted that any casual visitor could see that nothing else went into the flour. Said machinery and floors always kept clean.

So these men were examined by the "Weekly" lawyers hoping to find at least one who would say that some under-grade grain was put in or some unclean condition was found somewhere. But it was no use.

Each and every man testified to the purity and cleanliness.

As a sample take the testimony of Luther W. Mayo.

Testified been with Company about 10 years. Now working in the bakery department making Grape-Nuts. Testified that the ovens and floors are kept clean and the raw products as they go in are kept clean. Also that the wearing apparel of the employees has to be changed three

times a week.

Q. Do you use Postum or Grape-Nuts yourself at all?

A. Yes, I use them at home.

Q. If from your knowledge of the factory which you have gained in your ten years at the factory you believed that they were dirty or impure in any way, would you use them?

A. I do not think I would. No.

Asked if any one on behalf of the Company had asked him to testify in any particular manner. Stated "No."

All these sworn depositions were carefully excluded from the testimony at the trial, for they wouldn't sound well for the "Weekly."

Think of the fact that every man swore to the purity and cleanliness so that the Atty. for the "Weekly" was forced to say in open court that the food was pure and good.

What a disappointment for the "Weekly!"

But the testimony showed:

All of the grain used in Grape-Nuts, Postum and Post Toasties is the highest standard possible to obtain.

All parts of the factory are kept scrupulously clean.

None of the workmen had been told how to testify.

Most of them have been from 10 to 15 years with the Co. and use the products on their tables at home.

Why do their families use the products, Grape-Nuts, Postum and Post Toasties, that they, themselves, make?

"There's a Reason"

Postum Cereal Co., Ltd.,
Battle Creek, Mich.