

THE QUESTIONS ANSWERED

THE BULLETIN FEARS TO MEET THE ISSUES SO THE REVIEW ANSWERS.

PEOPLE SHOULD KNOW THE TRUTH.

Caswell Falls to Get into Juxtaposition.--Afraid of the Truth, He Seeks to Dodge the Issues.--The Review Call Him Down.

As our readers are well aware the REVIEW has tried to its utmost to get the democracy to discuss the principles and candidates of the present campaign. To this end we have published issue after issue a list of questions and have invited the Bulletin or any democrat to answer them.

The democratic leaders of this country have seen fit to absolutely ignore the questions all of which deal directly with the issues of this campaign. Every opportunity both of time and space have been afforded them, but their silence is that of a sphinx. Why is it? Is it not just and fair and honorable that these questions asked in the great joint debate of the campaign, be answered?

It looks very much as if the leaders fear to meet the issues fairly and squarely and seek to gain victory by appeals simply to partisanship and not to reason. It is an insult to the intelligence of the voters that these leaders expect them to blindly vote the ticket labeled "democratic" without any reason for doing so save the democratic label.

The REVIEW has asked these questions, given ample time for reply and as none is forthcoming we now propose to answer them candidly and fairly, being careful to state no untruth, nor half-truth, for we know that only in honest, fair dealing can the confidence of the people be gained. We ask our readers to give these questions and answers careful perusal, every one of them has direct bearing upon the issues and the candidates involved by the election one week from today. For convenience we reprint the questions and give the answers below. We challenge anyone to dispute the absolute truthfulness of any of the statements made.

THE QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

Does the treaty with Spain make any guarantees as to rights to be given Spanish commerce for the next ten years?

The treaty states specifically that Spain shall have free entry to the ports of the Philippines for the period of ten years. The agreement is such that no honorable nation can repudiate it.

Does the treaty make the United States responsible for the property rights and safety of foreigners residing in the Philippines?

It does, and the clause is unequivocal. Other nations would have just cause for claims for damages were not its provisions carried out.

What democratic senators voted to ratify that treaty?

We have not the list at hand, but as the senate was almost evenly divided and several republican senators voted against it, and as it required a two-thirds vote, it is safe to say that at least 40 per cent of the democratic senators voted for the ratification. Its passage was entirely non-partisan.

Is W. J. Bryan denouncing that treaty today?

Every daily paper contains accounts of his speeches denouncing the treaty and ridiculing its provisions.

Did not W. J. Bryan make a special trip to Washington to urge democratic senators to vote for the treaty the terms of which he is now denouncing?

He did, and it was due to his influence that a number of democratic senators voted for the treaty. They took Bryan's advice and he now abuses their action.

If any other man should do such a thing would you not call him a demagogue?

This question was asked the Bulletin and we cannot state what it would do, its course is too full of inconsistencies for any man to foretell its actions, but we feel safe in saying that any honest man would call such a person a demagogue.

Did or did not the Iowa democratic convention of 1899 endorse and reaffirm the national democratic platform of 1896?

The Iowa democratic platform reads as follows:

We, the democrats of Iowa, in convention assembled, unqualifiedly and unreservedly endorse the Chicago platform of 1896, in whole and detail.

Did or did not the national democratic platform of 1896 contain the paragraphs as above printed?

The national democratic platform relative to the money question reads as follows:

Recognizing that the money question is paramount to all others at this time, we invite attention to the fact that the Federal Constitution names silver and gold together as the money metals of the United States, and that the first coinage law passed by Congress under the Constitution made the silver dollar the monetary unit and admitted gold to free coinage at a ratio based upon the silver dollar unit.

We declare that the act of 1873, demonetizing silver without the knowledge or approval of the American people, has resulted in the appreciation of gold and a corresponding fall in the prices of commodities produced by the people; a heavy increase in the burden of taxation and of all debts, public and private; the enrichment of the money-lending class at home and abroad, the prostration of industry and the impoverishment of the people.

We are unalterably opposed to monometalism, which has locked fast the prosperity of an industrial people in the paralysis of hard times. Gold monometalism is a British policy, and its adoption has brought other nations into financial servitude to London. It is not only un-American, but anti-American, and it can be fastened upon the United States only by the stifling of that spirit and love of liberty which proclaimed our political independence in 1776, and won it in the war of the Revolution.

FREE SILVER.

We demand the free and unlimited coinage of both silver and gold at the present legal ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation. We demand that the standard silver dollar shall be a full legal tender, equally with gold, for all debts, public or private, and we favor such legislation as will prevent, for the future, the demonetization of any kind of legal-tender money by private contract.

Have or have we not hard times at present?

We all know that the times are the best ever seen by any nation at any period of the world's history.

Have or have we not monometalism at present?

We have, that is what Bryan is kicking about.

Would or would not a democratic victory resulting in democratic national supremacy be followed by free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1?

If the democratic party should be true to its repeated pledges free silver would be one of the first enactments of a democratic administration.

Why is the republication of a portion of your own national platform of 1896 as reaffirmed by your own state convention of 1899, distasteful to you?

We really can't see why it should be except for two reasons, 1st that the statements that "monometalism has locked fast the prosperity of an industrial people in the paralysis of hard times" is a good deal of a joke at the present writing, and 2dly, that the democrats realizing that free silver is losing popularity wish to hide it in the back ground and while clinging to it hope to get into power by forcing new questions upon the people.

What portion of Mr. Blume's record do you point to with pride?

Give it up.

How many motions did Mr. Blume make in the legislature? What were they?

From the records we find that he made three.

1st. He moved that the report of the committee on his little legalizing bill be adopted.

2d. He moved that the aforesaid bill be passed.

3d. We find in another place that he actually moved "the previous question."

Was a petition of 300 names headed by J. B. Romans presented to Mr. Blume during the legislature? Did he comply with the petition?

There was. On the only occasion in which he had an opportunity he voted directly opposite to the prayer of the petitioners.

What bill did Mr. Blume present to the legislature, aside from a legalizing act relative to ordinances passed by the town council of Arion?

ONE.

In what respect is Mr. Kuehl better qualified to fill the office of treasurer than Mr. C. E. Price?

Give it up. We have found no one who can answer this question.

In what respect is Harry Huntington as well qualified for surveyor as Morris McHenry?

Harry is a genial good fellow, not a surveyor however.

Has or has not M. N. Smith made a good coroner, and have his official acts been at all times consistent with humanity and a proper respect for the dead?

He has not. His actions have been such that all who know of them are unanimous in the opinion that no man with a spark of decency or humanity about him would have been guilty of them.

Was Mr. Dolliver's statement correct that the 10th clause of the constitution of the Philippine republic (?) states in substance, "Aguinaldo shall be president, and he shall not be held responsible for anything he may do?"

It was.

Would not such a government, headed by a president not accountable to any one for his acts, amount to an absolute despotism?

It looks that way to us, what do you think about it?

Do you honestly think such a government would be better for the real liberty and personal rights of the people than the control of the United States?

We should hate ourselves were we so craven, so unpatriotic, so utterly unworthy of our free institutions as to think that any other government on earth could equal America in its liberty, its security for personal rights and its grand civilization. What do you think about this?

What reason have you to believe that the government under which you live would be more oppressive to the people of the Philippines than to the people of Iowa?

The American flag has meant liberty and civilization and prosperity wherever its bright folds have waved, why should it not bring blessings to the people of the Philippines as it has to other peoples of all the earth. To question this is to question the integrity of our government.

Did any authorized official of the United States ever take any steps toward making an Anglo Saxon Alliance?

Never. On the contrary such actions have been specifically denied by the secretary of state.

If not why do you and other democrats make such a blow about one?

Simply to appeal to the prejudices of voters, that is all and he who is fooled thereby is not wise.

Did Theo. C. Blume allow the use of his name as an independent candidate for superintendent in 1891. Was he nominated, and was his name printed in their ticket more than a month?

He did, and the files of the REVIEW or Bulletin will prove it.

Is it not true that Blume withdrew his name from the independent ticket not because he was opposed to running against a regular democratic nominee, but because he secured a position in Illinois?

It is.

Is it not true that the deposits in Iowa banks have increased nearly \$50,000,000 since January 1, 1899? Is this an evidence of prosperity or of hard times?

They have. We should say it was an evidence of prosperity but it certainly means hard times for the democratic party.

Have not the bank deposits in Denison increased over a quarter of a million dollars since January 1st?

They have, an inquiry at the banks will prove this statement.

Is it not a fact that a least one half of this money belongs to the farmers of this vicinity?

The cashier of one of the banks states that he has examined the question and asserts that fully sixty per cent of the deposits belong to farmers.

Were the farmers robbed of this money by buying "Oak" stoves or how was it done? Is not the rise in hard ware due to the demand for iron products by railroads, building trades and manufacturers is greater now than ever before in the history of our country.

The first part of this question we will leave for the principal owner of the Bulletin to answer; as for the second part, we would say that it is very largely due to this cause, the iron mills of the county have enough orders ahead to keep them running day and night for a year. Under such circumstances is it a wonder that iron is high?

Does not Bryan declare free silver to be the issue of the day?

He most assuredly does.

Why do you not answer these questions? Is it lack of courage or lack of brains that keeps you silent?

We leave this for the people to decide but we would suggest that it is a good deal of both.

Why was the representation in the last democratic convention based on the vote of two years ago instead of the vote of last year as is customary?

Because the vote in some townships favorable to the ring candidates was light last year and the gang could more easily control the convention by basing the representation on the vote of two years ago. This proceeding was, we believe, without precedent in Crawford county.

Was it not a put up job in order to beat Jones, Jepsen and Shaw Van?

Events justify the opinion that it was.

Did not the editor of the Bulletin sign the petition, headed by J. B. Romans, which Mr. Blume turned down?

He did. Of course he did if Romans headed it.

If the Bulletin editor was right at that time, was not Mr. Blume wrong? Certainly.

Please give a list of the cases Mr. O'Hare has had before the district court?

Impossible, he has had none.

Has Mr. O'Hare ever voted in this county?

No. He has been a resident of the county about eight months and has never voted in the county.

Has he ever paid any taxes in this county, even a poll tax?

No.

Why do you so studiously avoid mention of free silver in your paper wherever possible?

Because it is hoped to obscure this issue which is distasteful to many democrats and to win by false issues.

If the principle of "no government without the consent of the governed" is a just one, why would it not apply as well in Alabama as Luzon?

One would think it would, but it would not serve democracy's purpose so nothing is said about it.

Is the principle above quoted carried out in the Solid South?

Of course not. Democratic congressmen have openly boasted that it is not, is it carried out in the republican

north? Is it carried out in Iowa?

Yes, we all know that it is.

Would you be in favor of a national law having for its purpose the carrying out of this principle throughout the United States?

The democratic party would oppose such a law to the utmost extremity. Their talk about no government without the consent of the governed is in the face of the facts, the sheepest and cheapest hypocrisy.

Rev. Father Nugent will make a political speech here this week. We know Father Nugent personally and he is a good talker and a man of strong purpose. He is a fervent supporter of free silver and democracy and will doubtless make a good speech. As to the Philippine question, however, we would rather take the word of Father McKinnon, who has been there and knows, than the words of Father Nugent, who is simply supporting the democratic party as he has for many years. We doubt very much if Rev. Nugent sanctions the billing of his speech as "lecture", we know him to be far too manly to wish to sail under false colors.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And so is nailed one campaign lie of which Mr. Caswell is the author.

At this late date in the campaign the Bulletin has seen fit to ask us a list of questions many of which are absurd and others are manifestly unfair. The Bulletin does not show its good faith by answering the REVIEW's questions and we have answered them ourselves in this issue. As the Bulletin was not before us until nearly noon today and as the REVIEW goes to press this afternoon we have neither time nor space to make answer in this issue. We promise our readers to do this on next Friday, fully, fairly and freely with no such cowardice as has been shown by the Bulletin. The only difference between the REVIEW's questions and those of the Bulletin are that the former are fair and based upon the truth while the latter are largely based upon what the Bulletin knows to be false and untrue. For instance the question as to a supposed \$10,000 campaign fund. Mr. Caswell knows his insinuation is a lie, a lie so palpable and absurd as to be ridiculous. The republican party in Crawford has no money save that contributed by individual republican residents of Crawford county, and any reasonable man knows that it would be impossible to collect one-twentieth part of ten thousand dollars from these sources for campaign purposes. The republicans have enough money for legitimate expenses, no money for beer or bribes or "sociables" such as the democrats have been holding throughout the county. And