

and worked on the farm during the summer. After completing his education in the common schools, he finished his education with a two years' course at the state normal at Peru. In 1877 was married to Miss Anna R. Stephens; has four bright children—Nellie M., aged 13; Wayne, aged 10; Benton, aged 8, and Master Arthur, aged 3 years.

Mr. Marsh followed farming and school teaching during the winter months until 1884, when he sold out and engaged in the drug business. In 1887 he was elected county clerk on the republican ticket, was re-elected in 1889 by an increased majority. At the expiration of his four years' term as county clerk, was the unanimous choice of the republicans of the county for



GEORGE W. MARSH

county treasurer and was elected. Was re-elected county treasurer, serving eight years as county clerk and treasurer.

In 1886 he was elected mayor of Falls City for one year. At the expiration of his term as county treasurer he engaged in business, which he subsequently sold out, and assumed editorial control of the Falls City Journal—one of the ablest county newspapers in the state.

Mr. Marsh has served as congressional committee man for his county, and chairman of the county central committee. The people will have no cause to regret his election to the high office of secretary of state.

Are Times no Better?

While democrats continue to lie about prosperity and assert that times are no better now than they were under Cleveland, it will perhaps be interesting to review some of the calamity events of that time, not for the purpose of converting the politically blind editorial writers and speakers but to enlighten those whose senses are not closed to reason and who may understand and admit that at least one kind of democratic argument is founded entirely on fiction.

The following items are taken from the files of a leading daily paper published during the dark days of 1893-94: There are 3,000 idle workmen at Akron, Ohio.

The wool workers at North Oxford, Mass., have accepted a cut of 10 per cent in wages.

Positions in the Pittsburg bolt and nut factory that formerly commanded \$16 a week are now filled by men working for \$5 and \$6 a week.

Employees of Peoria street railways are hereafter expected to work 15 hours a day instead of 12 without a raise in wages.

Thousands of the unemployed of New York gather at the Brooklyn bridge early every morning to read the first editions of the papers in order to be the first to answer advertisements offering work. It is estimated that there are 135,000 idle people in New York who would work if they had an opportunity.

The number of cigar makers out of employment in New York is estimated at 10,000.

Chicago police say every freight brings into that city from one to 20 hungry men.

There are 124,000 idle people reported in Chicago; 45,000 in the building trades alone.

Fifteen cigar makers thrown out of employment at Grand Island by the closing of one of the factories. Endstreet estimates 801,000 idle people.

Philadelphia wire mill closed down throwing 1,500 men out of employment. Dun's review of 1893 says in commercial disaster and industrial depression it was the worst for 50 years.

Pittsburg has 2,500 men employed in the parks out of charity.

The miners at Salineville, Ill., on a strike against a 15 per cent reduction and day laborers against a 30 per cent reduction in wages.

There are 20,000 idle coal miners in Ohio.

State Labor Commissioner Brentinger says there are 38,000 people out of employment in Colorado.

A cotton factory at Winstead, Conn., has shut down, throwing 1,700 hands out of employment.

There are 15,000 idle men in Patterson, N. J.

Ten thousand men out of employment at Toledo, Ohio.

Rather than accept a 35 per cent reduction in wages 500 miners at Mercer, Pa., have gone out on a strike.

IS STATES EVIDENCE

World-Herald Placed in the Witness Chair Against Democracy.

PERTINENT QUESTIONS DODGED

By Bryan Which Are Propounded to Him by a Prominent Pennsylvania Democrat—Beating Around the Bush to Save His Political Bacon.

OMAHA, Neb., Oct. 1.—If the fusionists had started in their campaign by destroying the back files of the newspapers of their party, they might have robbed the republicans of some valuable campaign literature. But they didn't, and must suffer the consequences.

The Omaha World-Herald is the recognized organ of fusion, not alone in Nebraska, but in the west. The following figures taken from the issue of the World-Herald of July 10, 1896, and July 10, 1900, not only serve to prove a most significant distinction between the prices this year and those of four years ago, but they show conclusively that prices have advanced and that the people are much more prosperous now than then.

Table with 2 columns: Item and Price. Items include Cows, Heffers, Calves, Bulls, Stags, Stocks and Feeders, Hogs, Veal, Green Hides, Wheat, Wheat, car load, Rye, Flax seed, Flour, Corn, Oats, No. 2 Red Wheat, No. 2 Cash Corn, No. 2 White Oats.

There are 19 articles enumerated above—every one grown on the farm—and the aggregate per cent of increase in price approximates 1,093. Divide this by 19, the number of articles, and you will find that the average increase in the price of each article is approximately 57 1/2 per cent.

This is a campaign oratory, it isn't mass of confusing figures; it is simply a compilation showing the prices the farmers of Nebraska received for their products under a democratic and republican administration respectively, as shown by market quotations published in the Omaha World-Herald.

An increase of 57 1/2 per cent. in the commercial value of a crop means a great deal to each individual farmer in Nebraska. It means a great deal to the state of Nebraska and all its people, for, when the farmers are prosperous, all lines of industry are correspondingly stimulated. It means that the same amount of farm products will net the farmer more than double the amount this year as compared with 1896.

This is exactly the difference between republicanism and democracy as applied to the farmer and the farming industry, for today the republicans are in power and in 1896 the democrats were in power.

In the light of such facts it is difficult to believe that the democratic ticket will receive any material support from the farmers of Nebraska.

Since it is proven by these figures that democratic policies enacted into law cause a decline in the price of farm products, and that republican policies, when enacted into law, cause an increase in the price of farm products, what more is necessary to convince the farmer that it is to his interest to vote for and uphold the republican ticket and party?

"Well," but Bryan says, "there is danger of imperialism."

Suppose he does, does that make it so? He said in 1896, in his speech at Baltimore, that if McKinley was elected it would mean four more years of hard times.

The above figures from his own party organ disprove that assertion, say nothing of the abundance of evidence of prosperity manifest everywhere.

And Bryan says, "There is danger of militarism."

Suppose he does, does that make it so? He said in 1896 that if McKinley was elected the wages of labor and the prices of farm products would fall just as sure as the stone that is thrown up.

Again the figures from his own party organ disprove his assertions, say nothing of the purchase of new homes, the cancellation of farm mortgages, the increase in bank deposits, especially in the smaller towns and villages, the decrease in interest rates and the music of a million hammers in the various factories.

Yes, Bryan says a great many things, but every time his philosophy has been put to a practical test it has been found faulty, weak and vulnerable.

You will notice, however, that there is one thing Bryan isn't saying, and that is, he isn't saying anything about the low prices, hard times and industrial distress under democratic rule four years ago.

Incidentally loquacious as he is, he isn't saying anything about that. You have often heard of a doctor advising his patient to go away from his business on a pleasure trip so that he may forget about the cares and troubles that are endangering his health?

Well, that is why Bryan is advising the people that there is "danger of imperialism and militarism." He wants them to forget their cares and troubles of four years ago when the democrats were in power, not particularly for the benefit of their health, but for fear that they will take their memory along with them into the voting place and vote against him.

That is the "danger" Bryan is endeavoring to guard against.

FIGURES FOR PLAY TOYS. You will remember that Bryan played with figures in his 1896 speeches. He had enough figures and exclamation points to build a rail

ence around Nebraska. He hasn't got them today. This time the figures are all against him. Read the above figures from his Omaha organ and you will see why he is letting figures alone in this campaign.

In 1896 Bryan said the hard times were "caused by a scarcity of money and that the only source of relief was in the free coinage of silver."

He was wrong again. The people discovered the "source of relief"—William McKinley and the republican party. They defeated silver, elected McKinley and unexampled prosperity followed.

DEMOCRACY AND TRUSTS. The real position of the democrats on the trusts question was shown in congress last June, when a proposed constitutional amendment intended to prevent, regulate and destroy trusts was defeated by democratic votes.

The amendment was as follows: "Congress shall have power to define, regulate, prohibit or dissolve trusts, monopolies or combinations, whether existing in the form of a corporation or otherwise. The several states may continue to exercise such power in any manner not in conflict with the laws of the United States."

This amendment, if incorporated into the constitution, would no doubt accomplish the purpose for which it was intended. But it was defeated, and by democratic votes.

When it came to a vote, requiring as it did, a two-thirds majority, 154 voted for it and 132 against it. Of the 154 who voted for it 150 were republicans. Of the 132 who voted against it 130 were democrats.

This very clearly defines the attitude of both parties on the trust question. Political parties, as well as individuals, should be measured, not by their words, but by their deeds. This rule is founded on apostolic doctrine and it is a pretty safe one to follow.

Viewed in this light the Bryanites, instead of being opposed to trusts, as they loudly proclaim, appear to be in sympathy with them.

Trusts or combinations intended to restrict legitimate competition, organized primarily for the purpose of arbitrarily fixing and regulating prices, are necessarily injurious to the people and should be stamped out. But who is going to do the stamping out?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

Are you going to look to a party that, when it had an opportunity to provide a remedy, went over bag and baggage to the enemy—the democratic party? Are you going to look to a party that lined up its votes in congress in solid phalanx and defeated a proposed constitutional amendment intended to crush this evil? Are you going to do this and desert the republican party, which not only cast all but four of the 154 votes cast in congress for the amendment, but has written into the statutes of the United States every word of law that appears there against trusts?

at the Omaha Commercial club yesterday three gentlemen representing varied interests talked significantly of the political situation. The conversationalists were C. S. Hayward of the Williams & Haywood Shoe Co., G. R. Williams, a farmer well known throughout Douglas county, and E. A. Willis, president of the Omaha Pressmen's union, and the conversation ran like this:

Mr. Williams—Mr. Hayward, in your opinion, would the election of Mr. Bryan have any effect upon the manufacturing and jobbing interests?

Mr. Hayward—Yes; it would undoubtedly have a bad effect. It would take us back to the conditions of 1896, when the stability of our currency was seriously threatened and money tightened up. Four years ago, it will be remembered, manufacturing concerns throughout the country were in a bad way. Some of the mills were shut down completely and the others were greatly curtailed in operation.

That condition was brought about by bad tariff legislation and the free silver agitation, and both of these evils would be upon us again in the event of democratic success this year.

Mr. Willis—the workmen of the cities have as much at stake in this campaign as do the manufacturers, for they are the first and greatest sufferers when the mills close down. Thousands of men were out of work four years ago, and now many of the big factories are unable to get so many operators as they desire. Right here in Omaha from 20 to 50 per cent. of the members of the different labor unions were unemployed in 1896, while this year every union reports its full membership at work. I should think that the enforced idleness of a large number of workmen in the cities would have some effect upon the farmers. What do you think of it, Mr. Williams?

Mr. Williams—Well, of course, the farmer's prosperity depends very largely upon a favorable market, and you can't have a very good market when thousands of men in the cities are unemployed. During the four years of hard times, from 1893 to 1896, there was an immense falling off in the domestic consumption of farm products. The government statistics show that the average decreased consumption of wheat in the United States was over sixty million bushels a year for the four years, and the per capita consumption of corn dropped from 30 bushels in 1892 to 14 bushels in 1896. This great slump in the domestic market had its effect upon the foreign market, of course. No matter how bountiful the crops may be the farmer can have no good times when the markets are poor.

Mr. Willis—The decreased consumption of wheat and corn in the United States during the four years of 1892-6 was undoubtedly due to the inability of the unemployed workmen of the cities to provide a comfortable living for their families. There must have been even a greater decrease in the consumption of meats.

Mr. Williams—Undoubtedly so. At South Omaha Stock Yards the cattle receipts for the seven months of 1900 ending July 31 was 424,236, as against 229,324 for a like period in 1896—a gain of nearly 100 per cent. The hog receipts for the first seven months of this year were 1,121,171, as against 717,976 for the corresponding period of 1896.

Mr. Hayward—No one will deny that we are having general prosperity at this time. Farmers are having good crops and good markets, workmen in the cities are having steady employment at good wages, and the manufacturers and jobbers are enjoying a constantly increasing business. Do we owe any measure of praise to the republican party for all this?

Mr. Willis—I think we do. I know that hundreds of big mills in the east that were closed by democratic tariff tinkering have been reopened by wise republican tariff legislation. Without these mills in operation thousands of men would be out of work, and to that extent our general prosperity would be impaired.

Mr. Hayward—We must thank the republican party also for sound financial legislation, which has restored confidence and returned money to circulation. If this government should undertake the unlimited coinage of silver at a fixed ratio of 16 to 1 we could have nothing like stability for our currency, and without a stable circulating medium there could be no confidence. The election of Mr. Bryan would drive capital into its hiding place again, and the farmer, the workman and the manufacturer and jobber would suffer the consequences.

Mr. Willis—I think the workman would suffer first, because a cessation of industrial activities must necessarily and immediately follow the withdrawal of capital from its natural channels of usefulness. When capital avoids permanent investment and temporary employment, improvements of all kinds cease, factories all over the country are hampered in their operations and workmen are thrown out of their jobs by the hundred.

Mr. Williams—Are you gentlemen of the opinion that Mr. Bryan is any more reliable in prophecy today than he was in 1896?

Mr. Hayward—Mr. Bryan may be a gifted man, but he is not a quality that he lacks. In 1896 he predicted all sorts of dire results from a McKinley victory. According to his views, the election of McKinley meant a contraction of currency, lower prices for products of use so less work and less wages for the laboring man, more debt and higher interest for the farmer and a continuation of the hard times generally.

Mr. Willis—As far as the laboring classes are concerned Mr. Bryan's prophecies of 1896 have not materialized, workmen have not only found the demand for their services enlarged, but their hours shortened and their wages increased. In Omaha, in 1897, the Pressmen's union scale was \$16 to \$18 a week for ten hours' work today the pay is the same for nine hours' work. The Plasterers', Bricklayers' and Stonemasons' Tenders union had in 1896 a scale of 15 to 17 1/2 cents per hour; today their scale is 24 cents per hour, and they have an eight-hour instead of a ten-hour day. The Plumbers' union scale was 45 cents per hour in 1896; now it is 50 cents; the Bricklayers' union wage

scale in 1896 was 50 cents per hour; now it is 55 cents. The Carpenters' union scale was 30 cents per hour, now it is 40 cents. The Painters and Decorators' union has advanced its scale from 30 cents to 35 cents, and the Sheet Metal Workers wages have been increased from 27 1/2 cents to 35 cents per hour. I might go on and show similar increases in all the trades, but I have given sufficient facts to demonstrate that Mr. Bryan's prophecy of lower wages has not been fulfilled.

Mr. Williams—And as to farmers, Mr. Bryan was also mistaken. The prices paid for all kinds of farm products have advanced from 10 to 200 per cent. Money is easier to get and interest rates are lower by from two to three per cent.

Mr. Hayward—As to the contraction of currency which Mr. Bryan predicted as a certain result of the defeat of his free silver scheme, I might say that it has not come true. The per capita circulation in 1896 was \$21.10; on May 1, 1900, it was \$26.53.

WHY THE DEMAND? During the first eight months of this year the number of head of live stock received at South Omaha more than doubled the number received during the corresponding months of the democratic year of 1896. For the first eight months of 1896 the receipts were 1,305,822, and for the first eight months of 1900, 2,722,021. This tremendous increase of receipts has been accompanied by steadily advancing prices. The loans and discounts of the Union Stock Yards National bank have increased 148 per cent, and the deposits 204 per cent during the past four years. All of this is a certain indication of prosperity not only at South Omaha but throughout the country. South Omaha would not be enjoying the benefits of a rapidly growing stock market and packing industry unless there was a good demand from the country at large for meats. Why the demand? Because under an administration that guarantees safety to business interests in general by providing a sound financial system and a protective tariff the factories have been kept in operation, labor has been employed and all workmen have been enabled to provide adequately for themselves and their families. If we are to have cheap money, no confidence and even a partial shutting down of American mills, the demand for meats and all the other necessities of life will slacken and South Omaha, with its live stock and packing interests, will be one of the first and greatest sufferers. The people of this city can have no good reason for desiring a change.

LIVE STOCK. The tremendous increase of business at the South Omaha live stock market is an unflinching sign of prosperity. It indicates a strong and advancing market for the products of the farms, which would be impossible without general prosperity among the workers of the cities. The following table shows the live stock receipts at the stock yards for the first eight months of this McKinley year and for the corresponding eight months of the democratic year of 1896:

Table with 2 columns: Item and 1896. Items include Cattle, Hogs, Sheep, and Horses.

Here is an increase in the number of cattle received of 62 per cent; hogs, 88 per cent. In other words, 155,000 more cattle, 702,664 more hogs and 567,967 more sheep were marketed at South Omaha during the first eight months of this year than during the corresponding months of 1896. This immense increase in the number of cattle, hogs and sheep received at South Omaha indicates a corresponding increase in the demand for meat which could not have appeared had the industrial conditions of 1896 continued.

It might be said that the receipts at South Omaha have been increased by the additions to the packing houses at that point and that a large number of stock raisers who formerly shipped to Chicago are now marketing at South Omaha, but this would not weaken the assertion that the increase in receipts shows a corresponding increase in the general demand, for the receipts at Chicago have also been advancing steadily during the past four years.

With the heavy increase in receipts there has also been a steady advance in price. Steers, for instance, sold July 31, 1896, at from \$2.75 to \$3.70, and on July 31, 1900, they brought \$5.50; hogs sold July 31, 1896, at \$2.75, and July 31, 1900, the price was \$5.00; sheep on July 31, 1896, ranged from \$2 to \$5.50, and on July 31, 1900, from \$4 to \$5.45. This shows conclusively that the farmers and stock raisers of this section of the country are not only selling a great deal more stock now than they were in 1896, but they are receiving much better prices.

Another certain indication of prosperity for all those connected with live stock interests is furnished by a comparison of the latest statement of the Union Stock Yards National bank with the statement of the same institution dated October 6, 1896. In 1896 the loans and discounts amounted to \$746,727, and now they sum up \$1,858,280, showing an increase of \$1,111,553, or 148 per cent. In 1896 the deposits amounted to \$1,096,770, and now they foot up \$3,329,168, showing an increase of \$2,242,398, or 204 per cent.

MAY WON'T PLAY. Lady Francis Hope (once May Yobe, of burlesque renown) refuses to act in America. She says she's tired of the whole business and is going back to England. Plans for the New York appearance of Lady Francis had been made at the Savoy theater, but the Savoy is in the throes of litigation, and nothing is doing there in the amusement line. Her ladyship has snubbed several anxious Americans who are willing to arrange for a New York debut. Last week, for instance, she turned down an offer of \$1,500 a week to appear in vaudeville at Koster & Bial's.

SILENT ON THE SHORTAGE.

Fusionists Painfully Silent on the \$100,000 Deficiency In the Public Funds.

Bryan Embraces the Tammany Tiger and Boss Croker is Winking the Other Eye.

Omaha, Oct. 1.—Governor Poynter and the fusion newspapers, as well as all of the fusion leaders, are painfully silent on the report that at the end of Poynter's term there will be a deficit or shortage in the public funds of no less than \$100,000.

Their answer to this is abuse of Republicans, but abusing Republicans will hardly satisfy the tax payers, who will have to go into their pockets and pay the bills.

The fusionists have boasted of the savings they have made in managing the state institutions. How does this compare with facts?

Four years ago they pointed to the reduction in the amount asked of and appropriated by the legislature. The result was that at the end of the first two years there was a deficiency amounting to nearly \$100,000. Two years ago they came to the legislature with a demand for more money than had ever before been required, with a large deficiency and any number of unpaid claims. The legislature two years ago, not only made a large deficiency appropriation, but appropriated more than \$2,000,000 for the two years ending in 1901. All this has been squandered and will require \$100,000 more to pay unpaid bills and labor claims.

The shortage in the penitentiary fund alone will amount to about \$30,000. There are at least 11 institutions that will come in with shortages ranging all the way from \$3,000 to \$10,000, and in some instances the amount will be even larger.

This amount added to the amount appropriated will run the expense of maintaining these institutions to a higher figure than has ever before been reached in the history of the state.

These statements are based, not upon observation alone, but upon the showing made by the official records in the auditor's office at Lincoln.

It is useless, therefore, for the fusion leaders to deny them, for two reasons: First, because they are absolutely true and substantiated by the official records; and, secondly, because it is only a few months until the legislature meets and then all the facts will have to come out. When the legislature meets and the various institutions make their wants known, when the request for a deficiency appropriation of at least \$100,000 is made