irman Hanna Names October 31 Flag Day for Loyal Republicans.

TY OF PATRIOTIC CITIZENS.

Recognition of the Fact that the Party is Fighting for National Honor.

One does not have to go very far to cek the reason for the profuse display the national emblem in this campaign. tt can be found in the Chicago platform. The spontaneity of its selection as the appropriate badge of sound-money chamms is wonderfully significant. There sems to have been little inclination on the part of Mr. Bryan's followers to question the right of the advocates of sound money and protection to display the national colors as the proper insignia their cause. The only lamentation card was the Altgeldian wail, which always expected when the stars and stripes are flung to the breeze.

The rivalry as to who could make the at lavish display of the national emm has been confined to the ranks of a supporters of McKinley. There has n no perceptible effort on the part of the Popocrats to wrest it from those who are fighting to maintain the nalional credit. There seems to be a general assent to the proposition that the ag does not go with the Chicago plat-

This tacit recognition of the fact that the flag is the one suitable emblem of the sauce for which our party is contending something new in our American poli-Meretofore there has been a patriotic rivariy between the Republicans and the Democrats in our national cammaigns as to which side could make most rofuse display of the stars and stripes. It is a circumstance that will mean much to loyal friends of good government and will be a potential factor at the polls in

Recognizing this fact, Chairman Hanat the national committee suggests hat October 31, the Saturday before election, be observed as "fing day" in every city and town, on which day every money and national prosperity shall disday the national colors from his home nd his place of business. The suggesion is a most commendable one and bould meet with an enthusiastic re-

spouse all over the nation. Let every man who intends to vote for the preservation of our national honor ignify his patriotic intention by dislaying a fing on Saturday, October 31. It will be a significant object lesson in patriotism to hundreds of thousands who may be wastring between sound money and repudiation. Remember the day-Saturday, October

31 .- Chicago Times Herald.

THE FARMERS' TOOLS.

Efficiency of Agricultural Implements Greatly Increased Since 1873.

The silver advocates have had so many their pet theories absolutely demoi hed by collision with hard facts that they are now resorting to deliberate misepresentation in hope of breaking the force of the various exposures they are meeting. They have attempted to make much expital out of the decline in the price of wheat during the last few years, the cheapening in the cost of production the machine that now cuts the grain of the use of new and improved machinery and the rapid enlargement of the \$310 to \$325. A better and more capable nercial surplus of wheat in other mat-growing countries than the United tates they have undertaken to deny

In a speech at the Central Music hall mber 19, Gov. Altgeld in ater to answer the arguments proited by Carl Schurz in an address in he same hall earlier in the campaign, saking of the decline in wheat, said: a truth is that there has been scarceany improvement in machinery for ing and harvesting wheat in the last

sich a statement is a severe reflection ther upon the inventive genius American manufacturers and the proreceive spirit of American farmers or son the singerity of Gov. Altgeld him-

The truth is that the greatest improve-

ents in farm implements and machinery hat have marked the latter half of the teenth century have been made ince 1873. Not only has the retail price d all classes of implements used on the rm been very much reduced during at time, but the efficiency of the maary itself has been even more enor I increased. Taking the harvester it has been so improved during the at twenty years that one man can now amplish what required the labor of in 1873, so that instead of there ing "scarcely any improvement in maery" for harvesting wheat, the imrements in the harvester slone are requires one-fifth of the labor cost

To entirely overthrow this last perverof truth, with which silver men are ing to bolster up a losing cause, reces of some of the principal farm ry have been secured from leadmanufacturers showing the cost to farmer in 1873 and the cost in 1898. the wheat crop begins with the plow. ring statement from the Chilled Plow works of South

We manufacture plows alone and in year 1878 chilled plows of the numnd 40 were the leading pat-The same numbers are very sed at this fime and our com-are accordingly based on them: a sers the retail price of the No. 30 wa

s for these plows in 1873 re-cents each; now retail at 30 or these plaws in 1972 retailed at now retail at \$2 each.
I these plaws in 1872 retailed at how retail at \$1 each.
I these plaws in 1872 retailed at partial at 28 cents each.
Items in about the same ratio.
Irentian and quality of the platter than in 1872.
I before and Company of Authorse and Company of Com IT WILL BE A "STRIKE."



-Cincinnati Times and Star.

own retail prices show the enormous reduction of the price to the farmer. Their statement in full is as follows:

"Farm machinery is not only very much cheaper but far more efficient at the present time than it was in 1873. There is hardly any comparison between the two. The harvesters and binders which now harvest the great wheat crops of this country and Europe, were not known until 1878, but the best of farm implements and machinery made in 1873, when compared with those made in 1896 by the leading manufacturers of the country, would look coarse and cumbersome and would not be purchased and used by any farmers at the present time

The difference in retail prices is also very marked;

Mowers.				\$100	\$75 te	\$40
Itespers			,	125	50 to	, w
Combined	1110	wer	and re	175	75 to	63
Harvester	am	1 bin	der	*300	160 to	1:27
Tedders.				75	352 14	
Mowers, Itespers Combined er Harvester Tedders, Rakes, *1878,	• • • •			60	20 (
100000	3 %					

The Deering Harvester company of Chicago, quoting from their retail prices of their various classes of machinery in 1873 and 1806, make the following statement, showing the decreased cost and increased efficiency of farm machinery: "The twine binder was unknown in 1873, but the Marsh harvester, a much

more primitive machine, in which the binding was done by men riding on the machine, topiled at \$200 to \$225. The twine binder retails today at from \$100 for cheaper machines to \$145 for the Decring roller and bull-bearing ma-"The self-rake reaper, which is now

sold at from \$60 to \$70, sold for \$190 to \$210 in 1873. Mowers sold in 1873 for from \$90 to

\$115, according to the make and width of the cut. Machines of vastly greater efficiency sell today at from \$35 for cheaper machines to \$45 for the Deering roller and ball bearings.

When the wire binding attachment was added to the old Marsh harvester from 1876 to 1879 the combined machine sold for \$300, of which \$120 was for the attachment and \$180 for the harvester. Wire binders are not sold now, baving been superseded by the twine binder. In the world. Its retail price was then machine is sold today, as above intimated, at but little over one-third that price. Binder twine, for use on these machines, sold in 1883 at from 15 to 25 cents per pound. It was, of course, unknown in 1873. Today a much better twine retails at from 61/2 to 12 cents per pound, according to quality. This stendy decrease in price does not

mean a decrease in quality and efficiency. On the contrary an upward tendency in the mechanical construction and quality of material has been as marked as the downward movement in prices. This possible by the use of economical methturned out by a single firm.

The old mower, for which the farmer paid in the neighborhood of \$100, had but meager means for adjustment, and were neither as efficient nor as durable as machines that retail today at \$40. The old self-rake reapers which retailed at \$200 were primitive and clumsy as compared with the \$65 machines of to-

The Deering twine binder today, running on roller and ball bearings, cost \$100 less than the old Marsh harvester and requires two less men and two less horses than did that machine. In other fully. In other words, it roday words, one man and two horses can handle more grain with the Deering rollharvest grain that it did twenty years er-bearing twine binder than three men and three horses could handle in 1875 with a Marsh harvester that cost the

farmer \$100 more money. These statements of leading manufacturers of high-grade farm machinery. merely emphasizes what any man of ordinary intelligence already knew in a general was and what every wheat-grower in the country knew by practical experience, that the last twenty years have been marked by wonderful improvements in the efficiency of farming tools accompanied by no less marked reduction in the retail price. When Gov. Altgeld and the lesser lights of Populism claim that no part of the decline in wheat is the result of improved machinery and methods, they simply run contrary to facts which are patent to every observer and put themselves in a false position by denying truths that are as well known as the multiplication table.

Bryan applied for the press agency of theatrical company, and failed to get H. But his present advertisement is such that he could have a score of such agencies by asking. He has the talking qualities of a first-class agent for theat-

Col. Ingersoil says to one of his ardent silver critics: "Yes, many things are cheaper since the crime of 1873, especial-y talk. Bryan ought to be able to

A Comparison Between the Policy of the Republican and Democratic Parties.

LEGISLATED FOR AGRICULTURE

John M. Stahl Tells Why the Farmer Should Stand by His Friends.

John M. Stahl, a practical Illinois farmer, and a land owner in Missouri, Kansas and Nebraska, who is the editor of the Farmers' Call, Quincy, and also secretary of the Farmers' National Congress, is a man who has made his way from poverty to affluence, by the use of his own head and hands. His prominence in the Grange, Farmers' institutes and all movements calculated to better the condition of American agriculture, gives weight to his judgment and makes his v. vs on all public questions of value.

In a recent interview be discusses the relation of the American farmer to the two great political parties and points out the fact that in legislation the Republican party has always kept the interests of agriculture in view. He says:

"It must be said to the credit of the farmers of the United States that they bave never asked for more at the hands of Congress or lesser legislative bodies than they were ready to have granted to others, or for legislation that they did not believe would be of benefit to all the people. No exception to this is the most persistent political question in our history. No other question has been an important issue in so many campaigns. The second act passed by the Congress of the United States was a tariff act. The bill was introduced and discussed before Gen. Washington was inaugurated President and the bill was enacted into law two months before the passage of the law creating a treasury department. Tariff for protection and tariff for revenue, ad valorem duties and specific duties, etc., were thoroughly discussed while the first tariff bill was pending; and there have been few with the decline in price-has been made | did not engage the lively attention of the American people. It was inevitable, ods in construction, and by labor-saving therefore, that the tariff should have machinery, rather than by any decrease the frequent consideration of a reprein wages paid. The cost of producing sentative agricultural body meeting to each machine has also been reduced by discuss proposed legislation and to recthe tremendous number of machines ommend to the favorable consideration of legislative bodies such measures as are deemed worthy of that recommendation. Such a body is the Farmers' National Congress and at its last annual meeting it adopted the following reso-

> Whereas, it is an established principle with both of the great political parties that a tariff on imported goods adequate to meet he expenses of the government should be levied; therefore, Resolved, that we demand the same meas-

> ure of protection for agricultural industries that is given to other industries. At the meeting referred to there were delegates from states in which are more than four-fifths of the farmers of the country, from California to Florida and from North Dakota to Texas. The resolution was adopted without one dissent ing vote. As the honorable gentleman who has been master of the National Grange for eight years past and many other prominent officials of the Grange were present as delegates, the resolution may justly be taken as expressing the sentiments of the Grange also. Certainly the Farmers' National congress being composed of farmers, should not have demanded less; and, as it is nonpolitical and unpartisan, it could not consistently say more. Similar resolutions have been adopted at previous meetings.

Protection Under McKinley Law.

The McKinley law gave to agricultura industries the same measure of protection that it gave to other industries. Horses, hay, potatoes, onions, eggs, barley, fruits, wool and other products of the Democrats hastened to remove the duties on farm products or to remove the flow altogether, and the Wilson law does not give the same measure of protection to agricultural industries that it gives to other industries. Wool is a striking example of this. The McKinley law gave it proper protection, and while that law was in effect only a very short time, it

was in effect long enough to show that under its operation our production of wool would rapidly increase to the ultimate benefit of the entire community. The Democrats hastened to put wool on the free list, while retaining a substantial duty on the product of the mill and the mine. In 1880 there were in the United States 42,599,079 sheep, valued at \$90, 640,300; in 1803 there were 47,273,553 sheep, valued at \$125,900,264; in 1896 there are 38,298,783 sheep, valued at \$65,167,735. Under the McKinley law the value of our sheep increased \$35,208, 895; the Wilson law has taken from the value of our sheep \$60,741,529, or very nearly one-half. Under the Wilson law the importation of wool has doubled and the price of the domestic product has been balved. The McKinley law gave to wool and other farm products the just and equal protection demanded by farmers; the Wilson law removed this protection, and, discriminating against the farmer, singled out wool growing as the one considerable industry to feel the full force of a disastrous free trade policy. Reciprocity.

At its annual meeting in 1800 the Farmers' National congress passed resolution in favor of reciprocity; and that it yet ... vors reciprocity is shown by the following resolution at its last meeting:

Resolved, that the Farmers' National congress has listened with profound interest to the able and instructive address of Separ Francisco Jayler Yanes of Venezuela on The Commercial Belations of American Re-

Resolved, that to secure reciprocal trade between the United States and the Spanish American republics, this congress favors legislation for reciprocity, commercial treaties, and aid for steamship lines sufficient to answer all the purposes of such trade,

The benefits to our agriculture from fair reciprocal arrangements were so apparent that the resolutions were adopted by a practically unanimous vote, though in the congress were delegates of all shades of political belief. The peculiar relation of reciprocity to agriculture appears from a reading of the reciprocity publican in both branches since trusts section of the McKinley law:

That with a view to secure reciprocal trade with countries producing the following articles, and for this purpose, on and after the first day of January, 1802, whenever, and so often as the President shall be satisded that the government of any country producing and exporting sugar, molasses, cof-fee, tea, and bides, raw and uncured, or any of such articles, imposes duties or other ex- several states, or with foreign nations, is ductions of the United States, which in view of the free introduction of such sugar, molasses, coffee, ten and bides into the United States may deem to be reciprocally opequal or unreasonable, he shall have the power and it shall be his duty to suspend, by proclamation to that effect, the provisions this set relating to the free introduction such sugar, molasses, coffee, tea and hides, the production of such country, for such time as he shall deem just, etc.

Although in effect only a short time he reciprocity arrangement made under McKinley law demonstrated the great benefit that reciprocity would be to our agricultural interests. Space will fact-the advance in value coincident years since in which these questions permit of the citation of only one case in point: Our production of wheat so far exceeds our needs, while the exportation of Russia and Argentine has so rapidly increased that it is of the highest importance to our farmers that our wheat markets be enlarged. The ability of reciprocity to do this is shown by our flour trade with Cuba. In less than four years under a reciprocity arrangement this trade increased 480 per cent., while in the first year after the arrangement was terminated it decreased 42 per cent. All the reciprocity arrangements would have been of much benefit to our agricultural interests; and the Democrats hastened to terminate them.

Home or Foreign Sugar, Which?

Each year we send abroad more than \$100,000,000 for sugar. All doubt of our possessing the soil and climate over a sufficient area to produce from beet the sugar we now import, has been removed. Our natural advantages for the production of beet sugar are such that, notwithstanding the higher wages paid here. aid given our beet sugar industry equivalent to that which has been given to their beet sugar industries by France and Germany by means of bounties, exemption of land from taxation, etc., would undoubtedly rapidly build up our sugar production. The McKinley law, by means of a bounty, gave to our beet angar industry the encouragement that the history of the industry in Germany and France has shown to be wise and highly advantageous to the nation. Under the operation of the McKinley law our production of beet sugar rapidly increased. Here are the figures:

1891..... 12,004,838 Had the McKinley law bountles been

rive a direct benefit from a protective few years have produced at home, not should have his vote. duty on those articles, were given just only the four thousand million pounds of and satisfactory protection; and thus the sugar we now consume, but the increased McKinley law met the proper wishes and consumption due to our increased poputhe just and reasonable demands of the lation. It is probable that no other farmers. As soon as they had the power, piece of legislation in our history has

more profitable use. The \$75,000,000 in the course of the debate: imported, for the more than one hundred million dollars of gold or its equivalent sent abroad each year for sugar would have been kept at home. Home or Foreign Wool, Which?

All these advantages—the use of land, the employment of labor, the increase of domestic commerce and of our circulating medium, the retention of goldwould follow also from a production of the 250,000,000 pounds of wool that we annually import under the Wilson law: a production that would follow from the steady and continued aid of such protection as was given by the McKiuley law. Surely so far as tariff legislation is concerned, the farmer, whether he regards only his own interests or looks beyond them to the interest of his country, will have no difficulty in deciding which party should have his vote. His decision will be all the easier and surer because of the record of the candidates for President. Mr. Bryan declared in Congress, January 13, 1894, "It is immaterial in my judgment whether the sheep-grower increase of the business of the offices, it receives any benefit from the tariff or was found that the increase of the businot . . I am for free wool." He voted for free wool, for the repeal of the sugar bounties and for the abrogation of the reciprocity arrangements. Mr. Me-Kinley, it is needless to say, has been and is, in favor of reciprocity, just protection to wool and other farm products. and such reasonable encouragement of out beet-sugar industry as other countries have found profitable. In contrust with what Mr. Bryan said about tariff on wool is what Mr. McKinley said when introducing his tariff bill into the If there is any one industry which appeals

with more force than another for defensive duties it is this, and to no class of citizens office department has discontinued the should this House more cheerfully lend legis free delivery in the villages in which it lative assistance, where it can properly be dohe, than to the million farmers who own sheep in the United States. We cannot at ford as a nation to permit this industry to be longer crippled.

This shows Mr. McKinley's regard for the welfare of agricultural industries and Mr. Bryan, also, may be judged by his utterances on the same subject.

Republicans and Trusts, Farmers have been consistently and persistently opposed to trusts. This hostility has been exaggerated in the vociferous and sweeping denunciations trusts by the Populists. The farmers of this country are well aware that there are more trusts that, while nearly and quite controlling the production and sale of certain articles to their sure and liberal profit, have nevertheless, by reason of the economies of the aggregation of capital, the employment of best talent in directing, and of producing and handling large quantities, made the prices of the articles to the consumers less than they were before and probably less than they would be if the trusts were not in existence. Nevertheless, the farmers of this country believe that the principles underlying trusts are wrong and that in the aggregate trusts are a serious injury to business and wield a power that will present to human nature a temptation too strong to be resisted, except in a few cuses, to us. that power with political sion enacted a law parties and legislative bodies, for improper ends; in short, that the trust is an enemy to the people and a menace to the nation, there being some exceptions to prove the rule. Representative agricultural bodies have very frequently condemned trusts and asked for legislation that would end them, or at the legst, would subject their affairs to such public knowledge and control as would remove their power for evil. A representative agricultural body has never pronounced in favor of trusts. The position of the farmer as regards trusts is that occupied by our economists and by nearly all our population, hence, it is sanctioned by scientific research and reasoning and by the common sense. In accord with the wishes of farmers and in compliance with their requests, the Fifty lirst Congress, which was the first Congress Rehad assumed prominence in this country, hastened at its first session to mass "n

against unlawful restraints and monopolies," which declares that: Every contract, combination in form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in rehereby declared to be Hiegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding \$5000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both of said punishments in the discretion of the

bill to protect trade and commerce

Every person who shall monopolize or shall attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several states or with foreign nations, shall be guilts of a misdemennor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$5000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one rear, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court. That word "person" or "persons," wher

ever used in this act, shall be deemed to in cinde corporations and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of either the United States, the laws of any of the territories, the laws of any state, or the laws of any foreign country.

This act is so comprehensive in its defi nition of a trust, which it made illegal that it was clearly the purpose of those who made it a law, that no trust should

Democracy and Trusts. Contrast with the action of the Fifty-

first Congress the action of the Fifty third Congress—the first one Democratic in both branches since trusts attained to prominence in this country-which, at its regular session, put into the coffer of the Sugar trust, by means of the Wilson law, a bonus of \$18,000,000 on the sugar then in its hands; and by the same law made a profit for the Whisky trust of about \$10,000,000 on the whisky withdrawn from bond after it became certain that the tax on whicky would be increased and before the law went into effect, and, in addition, the Wilson law increased the allowance for wastage while in bond and lengthened the bonded perior from three to eight years. The Fifty-third Congress legislated against trusts, but only those of which importers are members and which deal in imported articles. Domestic trusts have remained undisturbed by Democratic legislation. No effort has been made by the Democratic administration to enforce the anti-trust legislation of either the Fiftyfirst or the Fifty-third Congress, though frequently reminded of its duty by the agricultural and other papers, including even a leading New York Democratic paper. So far as their attitude toward trusts is concerned, the farmer ought not to have any difficulty in deciding which our farms, the producers of which de continued, we would in a comparatively of the two leading political parties

long and general attention bestowed on the tariff or in the treatment of evils that have been so acridly denounced as the trusts, but that farmers have rightfully considered to have a direct and considerable effect on agricultural interests the Democratic and the Republican parties have recently made records equally

plain and significant. Who Favors Rural Mail Delivery In the debate on the postoffice appropriation bill in the House March 6 hat.

wages paid to farm and factory labor | Mr. Pickler said: "It seems that the would amount to \$75,000,000 per annum. is no effort to improve the service for country people," and on the same day small profit and of which we produce an Mr. Loud, chairman of the House comexcess, like wheat, would be put to a mittee on postoffices and postrouds, said

more promising use. The \$10.000,000 in the course of the deductions for the each year would swell our domestic commerce by at least four times that amount. If we had produced our own sugar instead of gold having been exploited and devoted to regulation. sugar instead of gold having been ex-ported during the past three years—an in other words, while you gentlemen from export that has widely hurt our indus-fries and business—gold would have been imported, for the more than one hundred all of that increase has been used in the large cities.

In fact, the amount thus diverted during the last fiscal year was \$670,000, whereas the increase in the appropriation for country mail service was only \$500,000; so that notwithstanding the successful efforts of the friends of the farmers to secure an appropriation to better his mail service, there was actually less money spent on that service than before, because the Democratic administration of the postoffice department used elsewhere, as it has in previous years, the money specifically appropriated for the improvement of country mail service: This is in striking contrast with the Republican administration of the postoffice department. Mr. Wanamaker secured appropriations for experiments infree mail delivery in villages and be faithfully expended these appropriations. In a communication to the Senate be stated that after making an allowance equal to the previous average aunual uess of the offices due to the free daily delivery had more than paid for that delivery. In some cases the profit from free delivery was quite large. In New Canaan, Coun., for example, the village in which free daily delivery was first introduced, and in which the experiments were conducted for five years, the average annual income of the office was \$523, while the free delivery cost only \$200. A business that yields un average annual profit of 1611/2 per cent., part of the period being a time of panic and depression, is a good business indeed; yet the present administration of the postwas established by Mr. Wanamaker. The results from experiments in vil-

lages indicated, as Mr. Wanamaker foresaw that they would, the practicability of free daily delivery to farmers; and he secured from the Fifty-second Congress an appropriation for experiments in free mail delivery to farmers, and an appropriation for this purpose was made by the Fifty-third Congress at both sessions. The language of the appropriations was mandatory, but both Mr. Bissell and Mr. Wilson have refused to expend these appropriations. The mail has become a very important factor in the prosperity, welfare and enjoyment of the people. In the attitude of the Republican and Democratic administrations toward rural mail service and the efforts made to improve it, the farmer will find excellent aid in deciding for which party to vote.

Who Forfeits Land Grants?

For some years the farmers of the country have been demanding that the grants of lands to aid in the construction of certain railroads, should be declared forfeited where the conditions of the grants had not been complied with. The Fifty-first Congress-the first Cougress Republican in both branches since the demands for the annulment of these grants had been made-at its first see-

That there is hereby forfelted to the l'ulted States, and the t'nited States hereby resumes the title thereto, all lands beretofore granted to any state or to any corporation to aid in the construction of a railroad opposite to and coterninous with the portion of any such rallroad not now completed and in operation, for the construction or benefit of which such lands were granted; and all such lands are declared to be a port

of the public domain. This law should have much weight with the farmer in determining what ticket he will rote, for, aside from restoring considerable areas to the public domain to the profit of the national treasury, it showed that a Republican Congreen did not fear to enact righteous laws for the people and against some of the most powerful corporations in the country-in marked contrast to the subserviency to trusts and corporations of the Democratic Congress that we have had

Who Opened Foreign Markets?

For some years certain European antions one of which, at least, while preaching free trade, practiced the pretection of certain farm products in the extent of prohibitory decrees had exstraint of trade or commerce among the cluded our animal products and live animals for their markets or had subjected them to vexatious and profit-destroying regulations, because it was alleged, they were frequently unwholesome or diseased. Our farmers were well sware that this allegation was an untruthful subterfuge, and they demanded such inspection of our slaughtered animals and live animals offered for export that foreign governments could not plead discuss among our animals as a justification for excluding those products of our farms from their markets. Everyone familiar with our live stock interests, knows that this was a matter of great moment to them. The Fifty-first Congress, that did so much for the farmer, made meat inspection laws that fully met the wishes our stock-raisers, and that, being faithfully administered by Secretary Rusk, accomplished all that was expected of them. It is unfortunate that be his own utterances and actions the present secretary of agriculture should have shown a different attitude toward those wise laws. In determining which licket he shall vote, the farmer will certaints compare the department of agriculture under Secretary Rusk with it under his successor, who began his career as secretary of agriculture by insulting organized farmers, and who has made the truly remarkable record of not missing even one opportunity to show, along with his total lack of sympathy with farmers, not only his complete ignorance of our agricultural interests, but either an witer inconscity or a completely successful indisposition to learn.

16 to 1 Not Wanted.

The currency plank of the Chicago platform certainly does not express the sentiments of the National Grange; and at its last annual meeting, in Atlanta, Gu., October 10-16, 1895, the Farmers National congress voted down all of the 16 to 1 free silver coinage resolutions presented, and adopted resolutions in which it declared that it was emphatically in favor of the use of both gold and silver as the money of ultimate redemption and was in favor of the free coinage of silver by international agreement at a ratio to be agreed upon.

It is but justice to the Democratic party to say that, until recently, through its long career, it was friendly to agri culture. As long as it was inspired be Jefferson and Jackson it had a jealess regard for our agricultural interest, but has drifted away from its old course it is inspired by those who hold strange doctrines; and while thousands and be dreds of thousands of Democrats are the friends of the farmer, the present Desse. cratic party, as an organization to elect men to enact laws and others to adminpublican party, careless of the welfare of our agricultural industries; and, of eren greater weight with the American furmer, careless of that financial interity that must underlie the welfare ail industries and which is essential to the honor and glory of all nations.

NINE.