

Taverner Heard on Lobby Before House

Congressman Clyde H. Taverner has again risen in his seat to be heard in the lower house. This time it is on the lobby question, a subject which the Congressional Record says:

Mr. Taverner. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask unanimously consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of lobbies.

The Speaker. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Taverner) asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of lobbies. Is there objection?

Mr. Mann. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask my colleague whether it is his intention to insert in the Record one of his entertaining newspaper articles published throughout the country, so that Congress may have the same information that he gives to others?

Mr. Taverner. No. I can inform the gentleman that I think this will be even more interesting than any of my newspaper articles, should I get the permission.

The Speaker. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. Taverner. Mr. Speaker, in the election last fall the people elected members of Congress to revise the tariff on sugar and other necessities downward as one step toward the reduction of the ever-increasing cost of living.

Powerful lobbies are now in Washington endeavoring to persuade these members of Congress to break their pledges to the people and betray the consumers of the land, to the end that a few men, already rich beyond the dreams of avarice, may add to their swollen fortunes.

It was to place before the public this state of affairs that President Wilson made his now famous statement, in which, referring to these lobbies, he said:

Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, or so insidious a lobby. There is every evidence that money without a limit is being spent to sustain this lobby and to create an appearance of a pressure of public opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff bill.

In order that the public might know all of the facts about the condition alluded to by President Wilson, I introduced a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee of five members of the house of representatives to investigate the subject.

This resolution reads as follows:

Whereas it has been charged by the president of the United States and there is reason to believe that a powerful and insidious lobby, representing interests hostile to the passage of the pending tariff bill in the form adopted by the house of representatives, is in existence in Washington; and

Whereas newspapers are being filled with paid advertisements calculated to create an artificial public opinion against certain items of the tariff bill; and

Whereas it is charged and there is reason to believe that unlimited funds have been placed at the disposal of this lobby for the purpose of overcoming the interests of the public for the private profit of the interests which they represent; and

Whereas the public maintains no lobby and is powerless to reply to the paid advertisements of any lobby representing financial interests; and

Whereas bills are pending in Congress to regulate and control the operation of lobbies at the national capital, and it is advisable to gather any and all facts bearing on the aforesaid conditions and charges or in any way relating thereto as a basis for remedial purposes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That a special committee of five members be appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives to sit during the sessions of the house and during the recess of Congress for the purpose of investigating and reporting to Congress the facts in connection with the operation of any lobby or lobbies in Washington; said committee shall inquire into the sources whence any such lobby or lobbies are supplied with funds and the amount of funds so contributed; and shall also ascertain where and how these funds are expended and for what immediate and ultimate purpose; and shall go into a general inquiry to learn the methods by which any lobby seeks to influence legislation in Congress.

If members of Congress were to allow themselves to be guided by the views of the lobbyists, they would conclude that the people back home were not in good faith when they voted for tariff revision downward. Or, if they were in good faith at the time, that they have since changed their minds, deciding they do not desire the monopolies of the tariff trusts interfered with.

But President Wilson is not being fooled. Nor is the average member of Congress. They know that for every man who beseeches them in Washington to retain the tariff on sugar, there are nine hundred and ninety-nine of their constituents who are not writing letters, but who demand that promises made to them before election be kept after election, and especially the downward revision of the tariff on the vital necessities of life, such as sugar.

President Wilson and the members of Congress also know that every penny of the extra dividends that the lobby interests will make by virtue of legislation granting them special privileges must come from the pockets of the men, women, and children in the districts back home.

It will be recalled that President Taft once faced the same crisis that members of Congress face now. He listened to the voice at his ear in Washington, whom the late Senator Doolittle described as "men who knew exactly what they wanted." President Taft forgot the folks at home who do not write letters, but who desired tariff revision downward, and on the very first election day following they got revenge. The lobbyists in Washington whose counsel he had accepted were powerless to save him from the wrath of the home folks who vote, but who maintain no lobbies in Washington.

"The trusts and combinations—the communism of self—whose machinations have prevented us from reaching the success we deserved, should not be forgotten nor forgiven." These are the words of Grover Cleveland. He was referring to the tariff lobbies which prevented the democratic party from living up to its campaign promises of 1892.

President Wilson no doubt has in mind what the lobbyists did to the Wilson democratic tariff bill in the senate in 1894 when he denounces the lobbies operating in Washington.

A review of what happened to the last democratic tariff bill as a result of the work of the lobbyists while the measure was in the senate is especially interesting at this time when special privilege is trying to perform the same old trick of robbing the consumers of the fruits of their victory at the polls.

On Dec. 19, 1893, Chairman Wilson, of the democratic ways and means committee, reported his tariff revision downward bill to the house of representatives. It was a fulfillment in nearly every particular of the promises made by the democrats in the campaign of 1892, which brought about their election. Although denounced by the more partisan republicans as a free-trade measure, it was in reality but a conservative step in the direction of freer trade, and was well received by the democratic party throughout the country. It made rather moderate reductions in the duties on woolen goods, cottons, linens, silks, pig iron, steel billets, steel rails, china, glassware, and earthenware. It removed entirely the taxes on wool, coal, iron ore, lumber, and on sugar both raw and refined.

The bill passed the house Feb. 1, 1894, by a vote of 152 to 105, 61 members not voting.

But in the senate special privilege attacked the bill ferociously, powerful lobbies being conducted day and night. Certain democratic senators, foremost among them Gorman of Maryland and Trice of Ohio, forgot the solemn pledges of the democratic convention of 1892 and rendered most efficient services to the protected interests.

The work of the lobbies had their effect. The special-interest service in the senate obtained one amendment after another, each one restoring a part of the omitted duties. In all, the senate made 634 changes in the house measure, destroying entirely its original character. The people were cheated out of their victory at the polls. Special privilege had stepped in and, via the lobby route, had defeated the interests of the people. The bill was passed, but President Cleveland refused to sign it, allowing it to become a law without his signature.

President Grover Cleveland deserved credit for having endeavored in every good faith to see that pre-election promises should be carried out. His whole soul was in the fight. His defeat at the hands of the lobbies carried the bitterest humiliation and disappointment. He was a changed man all the remaining years of his life. In a letter to Mr. Catchings, a Mississippi congressman, he used the quotation alluded to. It should be easy for everyone to realize that President Wilson, in the courageous fight he is making against the lobbies in Washington, is simply trying to prevent special privilege from again depriving the American people of a well-earned victory.

If the sugar lobbyists should succeed in having the tariff restored to sugar, the sugar trust and the men back of the sugar lobbies would each year draw down dividends amounting to millions of dollars.

But where would this money come from? The answer to this question is the milk in the lobby-controversy cocoanut. The millions that would go annually to the sugar magnates would not drop from the blue sky, but would come from the consumers—the men, women and children of the United States who use sugar.

The lobby issue is plain. If the lobbyists win out in their fight to persuade members of Congress to forget their promises to the people and slap the tax back on sugar, the consumers must go on contributing to the coffers of the sugar trust by paying artificially high prices for sugar. And if the sugar lobbyists do not succeed, these millions will be saved to American consumers.

Thus it will be seen that the consumers have something at stake in the framing of a tariff bill as well as the sugar barons.

If the sugar lobbyists should succeed, one of the principal beneficiaries would be the same old sugar trust which not so very long ago stole some \$2,000,000 from the government in customs duties by deliberately placing steel springs in 14 pairs of scales, so that their importation of sugar would be underweighed and the government cheated. Caught red-handed, the trust was forced to disgorge most of the plunder, and a few underlings were sent to jail and released after serving a small portion of their sentence. But none of the millionaire sugar mag-

nates into whose pockets the stolen millions would have gone had the crime been undiscovered were even called to the bar of justice, let alone prosecuted.

Conducting a lobby in Washington by the sugar interests is a business proposition strictly. The multimillionaire sugar magnates, who are every year adding to their colossal fortunes by millions through the kindness of Uncle Sam in giving them a protective tariff which guarantees them a monopoly of American markets with power to charge consumers what they please for sugar, can well afford to spend a few hundreds of thousands in the form of \$1,000 a month salaries to slick-tongued lobbyists, if by doing so they can prevent their monopolies and profits from being interfered with.

To hear the wall now going up from the \$1,000-a-month men one would imagine Congress had not given the sugar people any opportunity whatever to be heard. The fact is a committee of 21 members of the house of representatives—the ways and means committee—sat in session for weeks, listening to the arguments of those desiring protection. The sugar people were permitted to say any and every thing they desired. The members of the ways and means committee sat somewhat as a court. They considered all the testimony, and then brought in their verdict in the form of the Underwood bill. After having had a fair deal in open court the sugar trust is now trying to win, as usual, by the underhand method of approaching members of Congress in private or working in the dark.

The people are at a disadvantage in the face of this kind of warfare, because they have no knowledge of the pressure and kind of arguments brought to bear on congressmen by special privilege. There are no lobbyists to present the viewpoint of the consumers or to disprove the false statements which may be poured into the congressmen's ears by the able and resourceful representatives of the sugar trust.

If a man living in California had a lawsuit before a judge in far-away New York, and knew that his rival in the litigation was in the habit of dining with the court and spending an hour or two daily in private conversation with him "in chambers," he would, if he was an average human being, be inclined to be a little nervous over the situation. And that is about the way it is with the consumers of the United States. They are just a little bit nervous over the fact that special privilege is paying men \$1,000 a month to persuade their representatives to vote for the interests of the tariff trusts instead of the interests of the consumers.

By his recent speech in the senate exposing the methods used by the beet sugar trust to manufacture false and artificial public sentiment against the tariff bill, Senator Thomas of Colorado, has performed a public service second only to that of the president in calling attention to the insidious tariff lobby, the most powerful which ever operated in Washington.

Senator Thomas's speech gives the public some idea of the pressure national legislators must withstand when they attempt to pass laws which the special interests oppose but which the people want.

Senator Thomas and his colleague, Senator Shafroth, as well as two representatives at large, Edward Keating and E. T. Taylor, were elected in Colorado last fall on the democratic ticket by pluralities ranging from 45,000 to 50,000 votes. While the platform did not specifically indorse the removal of the duty on sugar, it indorsed all the actions of the last democratic house, one of which was to pass a free sugar bill, and Representative Keating ran on a straight free sugar platform. It appears evident that Colorado, with its extensive sugar industry, voted for free sugar by a plurality of 45,000.

The special session of Congress met. The tariff bill, providing for free sugar, was introduced. And then what happened? From all parts of Colorado letters began pouring in on that state's senators and representatives protesting against free sugar. So numerous and vehement were these letters and telegrams that they apparently indicated a tremendous revulsion of feeling in the state toward the sugar tariff. Any honest legislator might well hesitate before he voted against such an overwhelming expression of public opinion.

Senator Thomas, however, went behind the returns. He got in communication with Thomas S. Price, an intelligent man formerly employed by the Great Western Sugar company at Longmont, Colo., who told the senator how the fictitious public sentiment was manufactured. He wrote:

You will no doubt receive letters from employees of the factory here, as they are compelled in an underhanded way either to write them or take chances of losing their jobs by refusing.

Price inclosed a form letter which the sugar companies ordered their employees to copy, sign, and mail to Washington. This letter does not speak for the sugar company but is all for the poor farmer and the poor wage earner. After instructing the employees how to direct the letters, the instructions were:

A letter to Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States, Washington, D. C., will do a lot of good. If you are a democrat, tell them so; it will carry more weight.

In this way thousands of employees of Colorado sugar mills have been "influenced" to write to their senators and congressmen, urging them to vote against free sugar. Senator Thomas charged that a similar campaign was carried on among the sugar beet growers and among the sugar beet associations, all of whom have been adding their letters to the flood

now pouring in upon the Colorado legislators.

These companies have made an enormous amount of money, not only upon their capitalization, but upon their overcapitalization.

Declared Senator Thomas—Two of them operating in Colorado represent collectively a capital of \$50,000,000, \$50,000,000 of which is water pure and simple. Yet they have paid dividends constantly upon their preferred stock, and for a large part of the time on their watered stock, and one of them has a surplus in the treasury in excess of \$10,000,000.

This fight merely means that these hugely overcapitalized industries want to retain their franchise to rob the people by taxing the necessities of life, to the end that they may pay profits upon the capital that they have manufactured with printing presses and fountain pens.

Senator Thomas' ringing challenge to the sort of public opinion these bloated corporations have manufactured deserves to be read in the public schools as an example of the new, rugged patriotism which now has control of Congress. He said:

Mr. President, while I have the most profound respect for petitions sent to myself while I am a member of the senate, I want to say here and now, and I think I speak for my colleague (Mr. Shafroth) as well as myself, that I was sent here by the people of my state, by the producers and by the consumers, by men and women who are not organized, who have no lobby, who are possessed with no great fund to go out through the highways and byways of the state seeking and obtaining favorable action in their behalf by the great banks and associations.

They are the toilers and the taxpayers, "the common people," as Mr. Lincoln called them. It is their interests and their welfare, their wants and their desires that I propose to represent and promote in the senate of the United States to the best of my ability. They look to us for relief, and we shall not disappoint them.

A land of oppression, misery, and sorrow, that is the picture drawn by the Hawaiian sugar plantations by testimony brought out by the senate lobby investigation.

The very crowd of men whose legislative activities in Washington brought forth the recent lobby accusation from President Wilson are the representatives of rich planters whose cruel exploitation of their wage slaves has no counterpart under the stars and stripes.

These sugar growers, earning profits of 50 to 90 per cent, and asking for the continuance of a tax of over \$100,000,000 annually on the American people, that they may continue to reap their golden rewards, are coming before Congress in the name of labor of Europe, all the while they maintain a labor standard that is a blot on American civilization.

So terrible are working conditions in Hawaii that European and Asiatic laborers, deceived into coming to the island, literally starve themselves in order to save up passage money for San Francisco, and escape the trap into which they have been inveigled. A horde of these pauper laborers are beginning to arrive in California, in their extremely willing to work for any price, thus depressing wages of Americans on the Pacific coast.

Incidentally, Senator Reed of Missouri, a member of the lobby committee, showed that a report exposing this condition was written by Daniel F. Keefe, commissioner of immigration, who went to Hawaii at the request of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, to study the industrial conditions. The report, however, was never published. It was suppressed by the Taft administration. The bureau of labor sent a man to Hawaii to get out another report on labor conditions. This report flattered the planters and was published.

The government investigator who wrote the whitewashing report was shortly thereafter given a good job by the Hawaiian territorial government, while Secretary Nagel later busied himself preparing charges looking to the removal of Keefe.

Senator Reed, however, resurrected the suppressed report and brought it before the lobby committee. The planters have been loudly proclaiming the fact that no poison exists in Hawaii. After reading the report, I am convinced it would be better for the wretched plantation and sugar mill laborers if they were peons or actual slaves. They would be better treated by their owners.

Wages run from \$8 per month for children up to \$26 for white adult men. Hours are 10 and 12 a day. The employees live in miserable shacks provided by the companies. The men buy food from company stores, where prices range from 10 to 70 per cent higher than average food prices in New York, Washington, Chicago and San Francisco. The food is sold to the plantation stores by Honolulu wholesale houses, owned for the most part by the plantation owners.

Doctors employed by the companies have gone to visit sick laborers 24 to 48 hours after being called, sometimes only to find corpses instead of patients. Laborers are called insulting names and treated like dogs by field bosses. "In a desperate effort to keep down the wage rate of all employees" the planters are spending huge sums importing Filipinos for laborers. These workmen are the dregs of the Philippine population, gathered from jails and almshouses, the very young and the very old, weak, and racked with disease.

The imported laborer, arriving penniless, is held in actual subjugation, unable to escape from the island, which is possible only to the harder individuals, who can endure starvation while saving passage money. But the rich owners have devised a crafty "homestead" system, whereby in exchange for an acre of land received

after six years' occupancy the homesteader virtually binds himself to labor for life on the plantation.

Why free sugar? Why has all of the bitterness of the tariff battle settled upon this single commodity, which is one of the cheapest of all foods and which at casual glance does not seem to rank high among the important food products?

The Louisiana cane sugar producers claim that free sugar will wipe out their industry. The beet sugar producers of the United States have an investment of about \$61,000,000, according to the report of the Hardwick committee, which investigated the American sugar industry last year.

The beet interests are claiming irreparable damage to be caused by free sugar. The Hawaiians, the Porto Ricans, the domestic beet sugar producers and the Louisiana interests are maintaining in Washington the tariff lobby against whose insidious activities President Woodrow Wilson so justly complains. These lobbyists contend that free sugar means ruin for the American sugar industry. And yet the administration is not halted. Why?

There is a basic principle underlying the democratic determination to remove the tax from sugar. The ordinary man does not understand the question at all clearly. The sugar question has seldom been plainly stated to the average citizen. Yet when the conditions under which sugar is now produced are clearly understood, the free sugar principle becomes as simple as it is just. It then becomes astonishing that this country ever taxed sugar. To protect this product is the very opposite of common business judgment.

I shall therefore endeavor to explain the free sugar argument as I see it and the effect free sugar may be expected to have on the different phases of the industry in this country. In the first place, what of the importance of sugar as food?

In a recent bulletin issued by the department of agriculture sugar is given a place among the three or four most important foodstuffs, following after meat and bread. In the human diet it is the great energy producer. And so it is the great food of the workingman. Experiments have shown that while large quantities of sugar give dyspepsia to idlers and indoor workers it is readily digested by men who do manual work, supplying them with stores of physical energy.

Sugar as we know it, however, is a commodity of the last century. It was formerly produced only in India, and Europeans supposed it to be a gum which exuded from trees. Cultivation of sugar cane began in this country in 1751, but only in the last 75 years has it come into general use. The world production is now over 16,000,000 tons, of which over 4,000,000 tons, or 81 pounds per capita, are consumed annually in the United States.

In the latter part of the eighteenth century a German chemist discovered that sugar could be made from beets. This was merely a scientific curiosity until Napoleon, realizing the absurdity of fighting England's army while France was paying great annual sums to British sugar producers, which money England was using to equip new armies and navies, by imperial edict established a large number of sugar mills in France and ordered the French peasants to produce all the sugar consumed in the country.

This was the beginning of the beet-sugar industry, which has thrived until now the beet-sugar production of the world nearly equals that from cane. Sugar-beet growing began in the United States in the late nineties.

Compare the total investment in the American sugar industry with the amount the duty on sugar costs the American people annually and we pick up the clue explaining why, despite the presence of sugar lobbies in Washington, the 2-cent tariff tax was removed from sugar.

Exclusive of land and farm animals, which can be used in other farming operations, the total investment in sugar in the United States is about \$100,000,000. For the benefit of the few men owning this industry the American people are taxed annually in the increased price of sugar \$140,000,000, or \$40,000,000 more than the total sugar investment. It is also \$40,000,000 more than the total annual value of the American sugar crop, including its by-products.

To the individual this tax amounts to \$1.50, or an annual charge of \$7.50 on a family of average size.

Since 1897 the protection to the sugar industry has cost American consumers \$2,000,000,000. But if the public got value received for this sum—in revenue to defray the cost of government—there would not be so much complaint. But the actual duty collected in 16 years has been only \$800,000,000. The balance, \$1,200,000,000, has been a bonus, pure and simple, wrung from the poor to create a new group of American millionaires.

Leaving aside the principle that sugar as a prime food necessity should come untaxed to the American public, the production of cane sugar in this country is an artificial, unnatural industry.

There are two types of sugar production—from sugar beets, grown in many sections of the country, and from sugar cane, grown along the Gulf coast of Louisiana and Texas. It is possible, indeed probable, that beet-sugar production has now progressed to a point where it can be called a natural industry. If so, it does not need protection in order to survive. But there is no natural justification for cane-sugar production in the United States.

It is possible to grow bananas and tea in New England in hothouses. Yet not even the most rabid protectionist would advocate a prohibitive duty on bananas or tea, raising the prices of these foods ten times above what they are now, in order that tea and bananas might be produced with profit in hothouses in New England.



Make Trucks Pay—Use

Polarine

Keep them busy, and properly LUBRICATED. Polarine is made in ONE GRADE that lubricates every type of motor in every kind of car or truck. It maintains the correct lubricating body at any motor speed or heat, and flows perfectly in zero weather.

It keeps every friction point protected with a durable slippery film. Millions of parts have run for years on Polarine practically without wear.

The World's Oil Specialists make it after 50 years' experience with every kind of lubricating problem and a study of all makes and types of cars.

Polarine is worth to you many times its cost, because it stops the largest part of motor truck depreciation. Try it for three months and note the saving in repairs.

STANDARD OIL COMPANY
(AN INDIANA CORPORATION)
Makers of Special Lubricating Oils for Leading Engineering and Industrial Works of the World

The sugar in cane is called sucrose by chemists. Louisiana cane is only 6 to 7 per cent sucrose, while Cuban cane is 11 to 14 per cent and Hawaiian from 14 to 15 per cent sucrose, or over twice as much sugar in the same amount of cane.

In Cuba sugar cane grows naturally and is planted once every 10 years. In Louisiana the cane must be replanted every year. There is never frost in Cuba; in Louisiana the cane must be cut in October before frost, thus accounting for the lower sucrose content. Louisiana sugar mills are antiquated, while some of the Cuban factories are the latest and most efficient in the world.

And so, though Louisiana wages are lower than those paid in Cuba, it costs nearly 4 cents to produce a pound of raw sugar in Louisiana against a Cuban cost of 2 cents. Said Representative T. W. Hardwick, of Georgia, the great sugar expert of the house.

In order to produce a cane-sugar crop valued at \$25,000,000, our Louisiana friends insist that we ought to continue a system of taxation that costs the American people \$140,000,000 in the increased price of sugar. It is undemocratic, it is unfair, it is unrighteous, and so far as I am concerned, I will never stand for a continuance of this policy to keep a duty on this great necessity of life which cannot possibly be produced in Louisiana one-half as cheaply as it can in the balance of the world.

Why not continue the tariff tax on sugar in order to protect the sugar-beet industry?

This is the query raised by the sugar lobbies. Here is the answer: It is unfair to require 90,000,000 sugar consumers to pay 2 cents a pound more for sugar than it is worth in order to protect the sugar-beet industry, because, although the sugar-beet factories are overcapitalized approximately \$50,000,000, or 57 per cent, they are paying large dividends and making millions in profits.

The greatest lobby ever known in Washington is now being financed by the beet-sugar manufacturers. Money is being spent like water, and the senate investigation has shown a scandalous misuse of publicity and the postal franks of certain special privilege senators. If money can do it, this lobby will defeat free sugar, not because the industry faces ruin, but because the sugar barons wish to continue to pay enormous dividends in the worst watered industry in the United States. The high sugar duties of the successive Dingley and Payne tariffs have made possible an overcapitalization in this industry without parallel in American financial history.

The total capitalization of all the beet-sugar companies is \$141,000,000. The industry is peculiar in that it is possible to estimate very closely the actual cost of building factories. It has been worked out that it costs to build a factory \$1,000 for each ton of beets to be consumed by the factory per day. Thus a mill with 100 tons of beet capacity per day costs \$100,000.

Now the total daily capacity of all the beet-sugar factories in America is 63,550 tons, showing that the total actual investment is not over \$63,550,000. Indeed, the Hardwick sugar committee estimated the actual investment at \$60,712,000.

Thus, of the beet-sugar capitalization, from 75 to 80 millions of dollars is pure water, or 57 per cent. J. Pierpont Morgan in his prime never poured water into stocks at this rate. Even the Steel trust achievement could not equal it.

Some of the individual companies exceed even this figure. The Great Western Sugar Co., capitalized at \$30,000,000, is worth \$10,600,000. The American Beet Sugar Co., with \$20,000,000 capitalization, represents an investment of \$5,300,000. The plants of the Michigan Sugar Co., which is valued over \$11,000,000 capital stock, can be duplicated for \$500,000.

But in spite of these fictitious valuations, the sugar companies have been able to pay high dividends on all their capital stock. The sugar investigation showed that the Great Western Sugar Co., besides paying 7 per cent dividends on its preferred stock and 5 per cent on common, amassed a surplus of \$9,000,000 in five years, making an annual net profit on actual investment of 36 per cent, or 182 per cent in five years. This company actually had to juggle its figures to keep down dividends on stock over half of which was water.

The American Beet Sugar Co. made \$9,600,000 on an actual investment of \$5,300,000 in seven years. The Michigan Sugar Co. paid back in four years every dollar of real money invested in it.

The great crime of modern finance is overcapitalization. A charter granted to a watered concern is simply a charter to rob the poor and the helpless, for obviously either prices must be raised to an unnatural level or wages must be reduced in order that dividends may be paid on money that is not invested. The beet-sugar industry is one of the worst offenders, yet its great lobby is demanding that the working people of this country shall be taxed \$1.50 per year in order that they may continue to pay dividends on watered stock.

JUDGE FOR YOURSELF.
Which is Better—Try an Experiment or Profit by a Rock Island Citizen's Experience.

Something new is an experiment. Must be proved to be as representative.

The statement of a manufacturer is not convincing proof of merit. But the endorsement of friends is. Now supposing you had a bad back, a lame, weak or aching one? Would you experiment on it? You will read of many so-called cures.

Endorsed by strangers from far-away places. It's different when the endorsement comes from home.

Easy to prove local testimony. Read this case: J. L. Williams, engineer, 321 Forty-third street, Rock Island, Ill., says: "Doan's Kidney Pills were beneficial to me and I gladly recommend them. I had backache and my kidneys were irregular in action. Doan's Kidney Pills made me entirely well."

For sale by all dealers. Price 50 cents. Foster-Milburn company, Buffalo, New York, sole agents for the United States.

Remember the name—Doan's—and take no other.—(Advertisement.)

Northern Steamboat Co

Between Rock Island and St. Paul

Plan for your vacation now on the Tri-Cities Favorite Steamer Morning Star. Commencing May 31. Leaves Rock Island for St. Paul every Saturday at 3 p. m.

WHITE COLLAR LINE STEAMERS BETWEEN ROCK ISLAND, BURLINGTON, KEOKUK AND QUINCY.

Take a trip to the Big Dam at Keokuk. Steamer Helen Blair leaves every Monday, Wednesday and Friday at 4 p. m. Call or write for illustrated folder.

Office feet of 19th St. R. W. LAMONT, Agent, Phone 188.

"Forget It"

NO MORE INDIGESTION
NO MORE CONSTIPATION
NO MORE BILIOUSNESS
If you will only keep the digestive system working properly by the regular use of

HOTSETTER'S STOMACH BITTERS
You should try it today