

THE TREASURY LOOTERS.

The Appalling Figures That Show How It Costs More Than Ten and a Half Millions of Dollars in Excess of the Cost in 1883-86 to Run the State. The Machine Figuring on New Tax Bills to Get Money to make Good the Treasury Deficiency.

A Harrisburg correspondent writes: There are two problems of serious importance facing the treasury officials of Pennsylvania to-day. The first is how, for the sake of the Republican machine, by whose favor they hold office, the fact that there is a practical deficit of nearly \$3,000,000 in the state treasury can be disguised or explained satisfactorily to the voters. The second is, how they can get the additional money which will be absolutely needed for the coming year's expenses if machine rule is to be continued, or unless an anti-Republican Legislature shall be chosen this fall and they shall proceed, immediately after convening, to stop all the steals and cut off all the extravagances.

As to preventing the people from learning that there is a deficit, that it is an ugly one, and that it will sooner or later produce no end of embarrassment, both for the state and its creditors, that is simply impossible. The facts are too plain. The ordinarily intelligent man has but to take up the reports of the state treasurer and auditor general and glance for a moment at the figures to satisfy himself as to the melancholy and disgraceful truth. Each year, for the four years last past, the appropriations have exceeded the estimated expenditures, and the actual expenditures have been greater than the estimated income by from two to four millions of dollars. For the year 1898 the treasurer's estimate of income, leaving the sinking fund out of consideration, was \$11,191,628, while he found that, in going over the 1897 appropriation bills and adding to their totals the overdue payments on previous appropriations, there would be needed during 1898, again omitting the sinking fund items, the enormous sum of \$17,346,823. That sort of financing, continued for a few years, would bankrupt even a Standard Oil trust.

Corruption and waste have been conspicuous in Pennsylvania state government matters for very many years, but it was not until Beaver's administration began, in 1887, that the looting got things down fine and began stealing and squandering by wholesale. Undoubtedly there were moneys unnecessarily expended from 1883 to 1886 inclusive under Pattison, but the total expenditures were nevertheless comparatively modest. The following, taken from the reports of the auditor general, show the total expenditures during that period on current account—that is, less interest, loans redeemed and United States bonds purchased:

Table with 2 columns: Year, Expenditures. Rows for 1883, 1884, 1885, 1886, and Total.

During the same period there were state loans redeemed, including lotteries premiums paid thereon, aggregating \$3,290,427, and United States bonds purchased under the Humes' act amounting to \$5,305,814. These items are not included in the above total.

As an exhibit of how the machine has learned to get away with the taxpayers' money since then, the following exhibit of the yearly expenditures under Hastings, added to the actual balance left over from 1894 in the general fund, and the deficit that will show at the close of 1898 will be found edifying:

Table with 2 columns: Year, Expenditures. Rows for 1894 surplus, 1895 actual expenditures, 1896 actual expenditures, 1897 actual expenditures, 1898 estimated expenditures, and The probable deficit.

Total \$60,820,027. Average per year 1895-98 \$15,205,006. Average per year 1893-96 4,539,256.

So that the Hastings administration has cost the state more than ten and one-half millions of dollars each year over and above the yearly cost of the first Pattison administration.

Again, I say, financing of that sort would quickly bankrupt even a Standard Oil trust. What are they going to do about it? They don't know themselves. And, except for the disastrous effect it is apt to have upon the prospects of Republican success in November, when the facts become generally known, as they certainly will be, they don't care much. They are just now most concerned regarding the threat of certain school districts to test the state's right to hold moneys that have been appropriated for their use and that are due under the terms of the law. If that test should be made and the decision be against the state, it would not be surprising to see the treasury issuing orders at no distant day in payment of salaries and other current expenses. Of course, if that result can be avoided, it will be, and in the hope of avoiding it the treasury officials are busily engaged in devising schemes to get more money out of the corporations as tax on their capital stock, etc. This will be done by raising the assessments as made in the auditor general's department, and if that plan will not work, then they will be prepared with a bill to accomplish it, which they will urge upon the legislature next winter. If that legislature is an anti-machine body, as is now hoped, it will address itself rather to lopping off expenditures than to devising new tax schemes.

It is really amusing that "Boss" Martin should be lauded as a reformer.

What Wanamaker says and what Swallow says all goes to prove that Jenks should be elected.

All the "Pluck me store" proprietors in the field are candidates on the Republican ticket. There are Thropp in the Bedford and Woodin in the Columbia district running for congress as Republicans.

The Philadelphia Times says that two influential Democratic papers are out for Swallow. One of them is a Populist paper and the other a side organ in a county where there were but 1,105 Democratic voters in 1896. A larger, brainier and in every way better Democratic paper in the same county is straight for the ticket. The voters are in the same boat.

Treasury Balances.

Their Manipulation in Debauchery of our Politics—How a Beneficent Democratic Law Operated to the Profit of the People and Was Surprisingly Set Aside by the Machine—The Proof That Democrats, When They Are In, Do Real Reform Work.

The state treasury balances, whether real or fictitious, have never since 1883 fallen below \$3,687,035 and have gone as high as \$6,679,854. According to the reports of the auditor general and state treasurer they have been, for the last five years, as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Year, Balance. Rows for 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897.

Average \$4,923,767.66

These are the balances at the end of each fiscal year. The monthly balances are approximately the same. No money is kept in the treasury. It is all in the banks. Here we have, therefore, an average of about \$5,000,000 constantly in the favored fiscal institutions. This is so large a proportion of the total resources of many of them that financiers have a sudden withdrawal of the whole line would create something like a panic. Indeed, that reason has more than once been put forward to stay reforms intended to prevent the carrying of such balances, by cutting down taxes when the balances have been real, or requiring that the money be paid out when they are manufactured. When banks are without adequate money resources of their own, depositing with them ceases to be safe.

It is notorious that the machine has been in large part maintained from interest privately paid on the deposits to its leaders. Smedley Darlington, of the collapsed West Chester bank, openly admits that he paid such interest, and glories in it.

Responding most reluctantly to popular protests against the outrage and demand that it cease, the Legislature of 1897 passed the act requiring the payment of 1 1/2 and 2 per cent interest to the state.

The state treasurer selects the depositories with the approval of the board of revenue commissioners. The members of this board are the auditor general (Quay machineite) the state treasurer (Quay machineite) and the secretary of the commonwealth (the head of the Martin machine). And since most of the depositories are with the Quay machine, it will be seen that that machine has everything in connection with this business nicely within its own control.

The best possible proof that this matter of the state balances has been a source of unusual profit to the favored banks, and that they have been willing contributors to the support of the machine, in return for the favor of the deposits, abides in the fact that no word of open protest has been made against the new law (which went into operation on the first Monday in May of this year, 1898) and that there is almost as urgent a call on their part, to be permitted to continue as depositories as ever. Possibly the law will curtail to some extent the machine gain therefrom, and that of the individual beneficiaries. But the money is worth to the banks that carry it more than the 1 1/2 and 2 per cent they are required to pay for its use, and it may be safely assumed that the machine leaders are not unaware thereof. There are stories current in Harrisburg and elsewhere that banks have paid, as bonus to those acting as intermediaries to secure deposits, sums in excess of 1 1/2 and 2 per cent. And, while it might be somewhat difficult to legally prove these allegations, no one familiar with the doings "on the Hill" of recent years can be found to doubt their accuracy.

It is the boast of the machine leaders that the state has never been in as serious extent a loser through the failure of banks carrying state deposits. Where such failures have occurred the loss is alleged to have fallen upon the treasurers and their bondsmen, or upon the wealthy machine politicians who have afterwards felt it incumbent upon them, or been in effect compelled, to make the treasurers and bondsmen good. The act of 1897 inaugurates a new order of things in this connection. Section 4 of the act provides that the state treasurer "shall not be held personally liable for any moneys that may be lost by reason of the failure or insolvency of any bank, banking institution or trust company, selected as aforesaid." Hereafter, therefore, bursted banks, if there be insufficiency in the bank's bonds or default in their bondsmen, will mulct the treasury and the people instead of the treasurers.

The act referred to is a concession to popular opinion created largely by Democratic platforms. Democratic newspapers and Democratic stump orators, but it is far from being as safe for and profitable to the state as was an act originating with the Democrats in 1883, and passed by the legislature of that year and approved by the then governor, Robert E. Pattison. That act was known as the Humes' sinking fund act, and provided that when state bonds were not to be had the surplus moneys in the sinking fund should be invested in United States bonds. It was the custom in those days to carry the big end of the balances in the sinking fund, presumably because, when moneys go into that fund, there is no legal way of getting them out again, except to pay the state's bonded debt, and having large sums there insured large sums for distribution among the banks. There were about \$2,500,000 then in the sinking fund, and not quite as much in the general fund. Senator Humes (Democrat) the father of the act, pointed out that \$2,000,000 of the sinking fund balance, which was not needed to take up bonds, could be utilized to save the state during the term the bonds then outstanding had to run from one to three and a half millions. The bill was fiercely fought by the retainers of the Republican machine in both houses, and did not pass the lower body until the night before the adjournment, when it did not have a single vote to spare. However, as already stated, it was signed by Governor Pattison and became a law. For eight years it remained in operation, and it is the testimony, both of those who had to do with the execution of the act and of the books, that it operated largely to the advantage of the treasury. It brought the

state considerably more than 1 1/2 or 2 per cent on its moneys that would otherwise have been farmed out to the banks gratis, and it involved absolutely no possibility of loss.

Its repeal was not actual, but virtual. It was not manly, but tricky, after the manner of all the doings of the machine. In 1891 legislation was had largely lessening the flow of money into the sinking fund, so that there remained in that fund practically nothing to be invested under the Humes act. This was not because the balances carried were any less. In fact, they were larger in that year and the year following than ever before or since. But they were kept mainly in the general fund, and the banks got them again, and the machine treasury and the machineites revelled correspondingly.

Here we have the convincing proofs that, when the Democrats are in, they do real reform work, and that the great ad recently made in so-called independent reform circles touching the debauchery of our politics through manipulation of the state deposits is a very old story to the workers of the Democratic party.

The Padded Pay Roll.

Mr. Wanamaker, in Reply to Chairman Elkin, Gives the Names and Record of Some of the Men Who Were on the Roll.

In his Media speech Mr. Wanamaker said:

"Chairman Elkin, for shame. Dare you stand up and assert that all the politicians who were on the padded pay roll performed any service to the state? Dare you assert that Phillip Gori, of Shechequo, Bradford county, who was appointed to pay a political debt the machine owed to the now discarded Louis Piollet, and who drew from the padded pay roll \$1,080, ever performed any service to the state?"

"Dare you assert that James R. Greiner, of Luzerne county, now serving sentence in the Eastern penitentiary for murder, who, as a political reward from the machine, received nearly \$1,000 from the padded pay roll, and who visited Harrisburg but three days during the session, performed any service to the state?"

"Dare you assert that Jonathan Jones, of Schuylkill county, who testified under oath in a libel case at Pottsville in November, 1897, that his name was placed on the padded pay roll by Senator Coyle, a Quay senator, who drew for him \$900, though he, Jones, was not once in Harrisburg during the session, performed any service to the state?"

"I have in my possession other names that were on the padded pay roll, and the amounts of salary they received, and stand ready to furnish before a court of record indisputable proof that these men performed no labor for the state, and that the money was paid as political rewards."

"I am discussing Mr. Elkin as a public official, and not as a private individual, and all interrogatories are addressed to him as the official head of an organization. "Chairman Elkin, though you have been declared an unfaithful state official and have been dismissed for cause from public office, and though your attempted defense is a complete confession of your guilt, and your explanations, in the light of historical facts, have convicted you of the grossest misrepresentations, still, under the principle of law that grants immunity to a copilot who turns the state's evidence, and stand ready to furnish before a court of record indisputable proof that these men performed no labor for the state, and that the money was paid as political rewards."

What It Costs.

To Run the State Department Under Quayism, as Compared With the Costs Under Democratic Management.

Here are some figures showing the cost of certain branches of the state government under the appropriation acts of 1883 and 1897 respectively, former having been the nearest approach to a Democratic year the state has had since the war:

Table with 2 columns: Category, 1883, 1897. Rows for Executive offices, Legislative expense, Judicial expenses, Printing and binding.

These figures need little explanation. They show the unbroken direction of Republican lawmakers, executive departments have been multiplied, salaries increased, new and useless deputies and clerks employed and contingent funds padded, until from a half a million, our executive expenses have swelled to a million and a half for each two years.

They show that while the number of senators and members of the legislature has remained the same as in 1883, by increasing the already large enough force of clerks and other employes, by adding enormously to contingent expense to pay party favorites, by awarding pay for regular committee services, by creating whitewashing and fraudulent investigating committees and by padding the cost of contested elections, etc., they have swelled the charge upon the people for holding a legislative session about \$200,000, or over 35 per cent.

They show that the expenditure for printing and binding the often worse than useless state publications has almost doubled since 1883, although the actual cost of doing that kind of work has been very materially reduced in the interval.

They show that even the bench has been made to contribute to the imposition largely by laws that multiply the number of judges beyond all reason and then making statutes that enable some of them to add almost 50 per cent to their legal salaries by holding court in other districts in years when, in order to keep up with the trial lists, they must have other judges come and hold court in their own districts.

They show, in brief, that under Republican rule, the system is rotten from core to rind, and that there is but one chance for real reform, which lies in electing a Democratic executive administration and a Democratic legislature.

The king said "I rule all." The preacher said "I pray for all." The lawyer said "I plead for all." The soldier said "I fight for all." The workman said "I pay for all."

Legislative Employes.

How Their Number and Cost Have Grown Since the Democrats Had a Voice in the Matter—A Dead Swindle in the Thing—Extra Clerks and Employes Paid for Twice—The Chief Clerks Defy the Law's Limitations as to Contingent Expenses, Etc.

The number and cost of the officers and employes of the two houses of the legislature are justly objects of much criticism. If the public business were expedited by the constant increase of the number of this class of hangers on, with the attendant large expense involved, there would be no complaint. But it is plain that so large a force is not needed. Many of them do nothing at all, practically, to earn the money they draw from the treasury. Some of them spend but little more than as much time in Harrisburg as will suffice to sign the requisite vouches and draw their pay. Those that are at hand are so numerous that they crowd each other and are in each other's way. There are certain periods of the session at which some of the clerks, notably those in the transcribing rooms, are required to work hard, and even excessively, but this is compensated for by the far more numerous other times, when they have little or nothing to do. Outside of two or three in each house, none of them put in as much time, or render as much service, as would be exacted from them in private or corporate employ for much less remuneration.

Up to and including 1883 the force was large enough in all conscience. It is not easy to dig out of the records—they are generally in so unsatisfactory a state as to frequently from year to year—with absolute accuracy, just the information of which one is in search. But, in so far as can be gathered from the reports of the auditor general and the general appropriation acts, the senate in that year had 41 officers and employes and the house, which was Democratic, 37. The very next legislative year (1885), however, the number in the house was increased to 53 regulars and two extras, making 60 in all. There was no need or reasonable excuse for the jump. The 7 clerks of 1883 did as much work as the 10 of 1885, the 6 pastors and folders of 1883 put up and sent out the documents as promptly as the 11 of 1885, and the 10 pages of 1883 served the personal needs of the members as faithfully and fully as the 15 of 1885. But there was demand for more sinecures to compensate the "workers," who had repaired in 1885 the damage the machine had suffered at the hands of the Democrats and Independents in 1882, and they had to be provided.

There were no apparent increases of the force in either body for the ensuing 12 years, the 41 existing in the senate and the 53 in the house. But in 1895 came an enormous jump, the number in the senate being increased to 47 and that in the house to 69. In fact, excepting the "extra employes," which gave rise to the indemnity bond scandal, there were no more in 1897 than in 1895. It was the legislature of the last named year that was the primary offender in this regard, notwithstanding the fact that it was scarcely noticed by the gentlemen who were so indignant and outraged by the performances of 1897. And in connection with the 1895 employes in the senate, there is something singular. An act of March 5 of that year authorizes the chief clerk to appoint an executive clerk at \$1,500, two additional transcribing clerks at \$7 per day and two additional janitors at the compensation usually allowed that class of employes. These appointments were made, and the auditor general's report shows that the salaries stipulated were paid to the appointees direct from the state treasury. But it shows also that \$3,700 was paid to the chief clerk for the "salaries of additional officers and employes under the act of 1895." Who did the \$3,700 go to? Not to the executive clerk and the others lawfully, though needlessly authorized, for they got their money from the treasury on the regular pay rolls. Who, then, got it? Are we not right in saying that it is difficult to determine from the records how many officers and employes there are?

There is a very loose and entirely unconstitutional process resorted to in both houses to provide for extra employes and for their compensation. Section 16 of Article III of the constitution, which article covers the subject of legislation, says:

"The general assembly shall provide by law the number, duties and compensation of the officers and employes of each house, and no payment shall be made from the state treasury or be in any way authorized, to any person, except to an acting officer or employe elected or appointed in pursuance of law."

Section 16 of the same article is to the following effect: "No money shall be paid out of the treasury except upon appropriations made by law and on warrant drawn by the proper officers in pursuance thereof." Yet, on the last day of the session of the house of 1897, Mr. Keyser offered and the house passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the payment for extra labor in the house of representatives for session of 1897, including committee and transcribing clerks, not provided for by special items in the appropriation act, be paid by the chief clerk, on vouchers approved by the speaker and attested by the chief clerk, warrant to be issued by the auditor general to the chief clerk or the state treasurer therefor."

The house has no constitutional right to vote money in that way. The state treasurer has no right to issue his warrant upon any such authorization. The auditor general has no right to pass such an account. The question of law or right or constitutionality will never, however, amount to a deterrent when the machine has a purpose to fulfill, so long as the machine remains dominant in the legislature. There is but one cure. The Democrats must capture the body named. The Democratic house of 1883 was as well, if not better, served by the 37 lawfully authorized clerks and employes as was the Republican house of 1897 by 69, nearly, if not twice, the number. The \$27,886 paid during the regular session of 1883 for the service was sufficiently extravagant. The \$74,197 paid in 1897 for no better service, if as good, was more than half of it thrown away. And yet, if Hastings had permitted it, the appropriation would have been \$12,500 more, that being, in round figures, the

amount of the governor's vetoes in this line. The increase in the cost of the senate clerks, etc., has been just about as great. The appropriation for 1883 was \$23,700. The appropriation for 1887-88 was \$47,710, and was \$54,976 before being trimmed by the vetoes. And if William A. Stone should be elected governor and a majority of machine legislators returned, every item vetoed by Hastings will be reinstated in the general appropriation bill to cover "a deficiencies in salaries, etc.," passed and approved.

The contingent funds of the senate and house indicate a like degree of fraud and extravagance, even if we admit that the money is actually expended as professed. In 1883 an appropriation of \$4,000 for the senate and \$5,000 for the house, to be paid out by the chief clerks, was considered adequate to cover all contingencies. In addition, the librarian of the senate got \$1,200 for recess postage, etc., and the resident clerk of the house got \$1,050 for the same purpose. In 1897 the appropriation for the senate for contingencies was limited to \$8,925, and for the house to \$13,580. In 1895 the limitations were \$7,700 for the senate and \$10,800 for the house. Notwithstanding this, however, the actual expenditures by the chief clerks for contingencies in that year were \$8,500 in the senate and \$14,741 in the house. In the senate the limitation was exceeded by \$800 and in the house by nearly \$3,900. It is not so much the amounts thus expended that is to be deplored as the impudent and daring disregard of constitution and statute law that characterized them, and the evidence it affords that under Republican sway, all the departments of the state government are in constant collusion to loot the treasury and swindle the people.

Colonel Stone's Ten Thousand.

His Fee Three Times Larger Than the Amount Recovered—The Accusation, the Admission, and All the Details.

In the Philadelphia Press of April 18, 1897, was an address delivered by Major George W. Merrick, of Tioga county, who was a schoolmate of Colonel W. A. Stone, the Republican candidate for governor, in which he said:

"I have undertaken to state from the stump that Colonel William A. Stone, now of Allegheny, late of Tioga county, is the slated candidate for governor; that his candidacy was agreed upon by the powers that be some two years ago; that he had served the machine faithfully, during the whole of his political life; that he said to me frequently during the past eight years that his great ambition in politics was to be governor, but that he could not be a candidate for office until the 'Old Man' said so; that two years ago in the senatorial campaign, he made the declaration that his relations to Mr. Quay were such that his political fortunes would rise or fall with those of Mr. Quay. I asserted also that I did not deem him a safe man for governor to stem the tide of corrupt approach upon the state treasury, since in private life he had charged the state \$10,000 for collecting \$2,400."

Mr. Stone has undertaken to deny the last statement. Addressing a meeting at Royersford, April 13, he said: "It has been said that I charged the state \$10,000 for a case which returned \$2,400. I never made a charge against the state." By this statement I understand Colonel Stone to deny the allegation that he received a fee of \$10,000 for collecting \$2,400. Does he mean to charge me with accusing him falsely? I will submit the record, and you may judge, gentlemen, who is guilty of duplicity.

"In Colonel Stone's speech last week in Williamsport he said, alluding to this charge: 'I was pained when my old comrade, Mr. Merrick, stated here in the city of Williamsport, not for the purpose of helping me but to injure me, that I had charged the state of Pennsylvania \$10,000 for collecting \$2,400. This is an old story and one which I never lost a vote. I never denied the facts, and I do not deny them now, but I never presented a bill or made any charge. That is 12 years ago, and is known to everybody in Allegheny county, and now Major Merrick is reviving that old tale.'"

"Well, gentlemen, that is a pretty broad admission of the truth of my charge against Brother Stone, but Mr. Stone is mistaken when he charges me with reviving this old tale. On Dec. 14, 1897, a clergyman of Wellsboro wrote him as to the truth of this allegation, asking for information, saying: 'In reference to the past record to which you refer, I would say that for some years there has been a report current here that once in a case in which you collected a claim for the commonwealth in the amount of about \$3,000 you charged and received a fee of \$10,000; the story seems to be well supported. If it is true it would suggest some doubt as to the propriety of placing you in the high and responsible control in the office you seek in the affairs of our commonwealth. I shall be pleased to receive an answer to this question.'"

"In reply to this letter Candidate Stone, in a letter dated Washington, Dec. 20, 1897, from which I now read, said: 'The matter of the fee which you speak of occurred nearly 12 years ago. My fee was not fixed by me, but it was fixed at the request of the auditor general by attorneys in Pittsburg at \$10,000, which the state paid me. Of course I am aware that my enemies will raise many objections to my candidacy, which will appear from time to time in the newspapers, but it is not my purpose, nor has it been my practice, to pay attention to them.'"

Major Merrick is a prominent attorney. He is a Republican and a native of the county where Candidate Stone was born, and lived many years. He was Stone's schoolmate and his friend in later years. He was everything that would have inclined him to be Stone's friend. Charges so grave a character, coming from such a source, would be a serious business, even without Stone's admission of their truth, as above avowed.

"The governess was giving little Tommy a grammar lesson the other day. 'An abstract noun,' she said, 'is the name of something which you can think of but not touch. Can you give me an example?'" Tommy—"A red-hot poker!"

—Subscribe for the WATCHMAN.

Quayism in Figures.

How Four Years of Machine Rule Converted a Real Surplus of Nearly Four Millions Into a Real Deficiency of Nearly Three Millions—The Figures From the Records That Support Mr. Jenks' Charge That the State Treasury Is Bankrupt.

Mr. Jenks has charged, upon the stump, that the state treasury is bankrupt and the astounding fact has not been and cannot be denied. Here are the figures, from the official records of the machine state treasurers, that prove it:

Table with 2 columns: Year, Amount. Rows for 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898.

Total \$47,678,895

GENERAL FUND PAYMENT.

Table with 2 columns: Year, Amount. Rows for 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898.

Total \$54,249,446

The figures for 1898 are the official estimates of the state treasurer. He calculates the probable receipts, and he puts down the actual obligations. By the end of the year, therefore, if all the obligations are in the meanwhile met, the state will have expended, during the four years of Governor Hastings' administration, \$6,570,581 more than its income.

But there was a real balance left over from Governor Pattison's last year, 1884.

Auditor General Gregg (Republican) spoke of that balance in his annual report for that year as follows: After noting that the nominal balance was \$5,014,942, he said: "Of the amount paid into the state treasury (as personal property tax) there remains to be paid back to the counties \$1,273,578.09. This should properly be deducted from the reported balance, in order to ascertain the real, which deduction being made, would show a real balance of \$3,807,747.62."

"While we may point with pride to the existence of this large balance, it must not be too readily assumed that it will prove an unmix'd blessing. Its very existence will invite applications for its appropriation to purposes neither necessary nor deserving. The revenues of the state are at present ample to meet its expenses if economically applied."

And then this Republican auditor went on to recommend the appropriation of the surplus "to some needed public use, whose benefits should be enjoyed by the entire people, without placing upon the commonwealth an annual charge therefor."

Inheriting this "real surplus" of \$3,807,747 from its predecessor, and expending in four years \$6,570,581 in excess of its income, the Hastings administration has exhausted the surplus and left the state \$2,762,834 in the hole. With "money to burn," so to speak, four years ago, the treasury now has, if its debts were paid, nearly \$3,000,000 less than nothing.

This is Quayism fittingly illustrated in figures.

State Reform.

Democrats No Eleventh Hour Converts to the Doctrine—Pertinent Extracts From Their State Platforms.

The Democratic party is no eleventh hour convert to state reform. For years it has been presenting the ugly facts and urging amendment. Whenever it has had opportunity it has loyally redeemed its pledges, to the full limit of its power. The following will be interesting reading in this connection:

In 1874 the Democrats of the state in their platform denounced the Republican for fostering corporations to the detriment and injury of the great agricultural interest; for having introduced frauds and corruption into the departments of the state government and among the state officials generally, and for having failed to dismiss them when exposed and convicted. They demanded a greater economy and the lopping off of every needless expense.

In 1882 the Democrats elected their state ticket and secured a majority in the house on a platform devoted to state issues and condemning Republican theft and reckless expenditure.

In 1885 the party thus said: "The long continued abuses and spoliations of the state treasury and the defiance of laws by its management make essential a radical reform so that large sums shall not be accumulated by taxation of the people to be distributed among the favored depositories of the state."

The convention of 1880 again urged reform. The Republican legislature of "its failure to pass the state revenue bill, which was urged by nearly all the people in the commonwealth, and which, by its failure, made the people pay a million of dollars annually that should and would have been paid by corporations." It denounced, also, "the failure of the administration to attempt any correction of the wrong doing or exposure of the fraud or criminal neglect, as confessing the supremacy of ring rule in Pennsylvania."

The convention of 1890 again urged reform, condemned the Bardsley steal, and, following the election of the Democratic governor, Robert E. Pattison, the monies stolen by the said Bardsley and others were restored to the state treasury.

A Rallying Cry Everywhere.

All along the northern tier of counties, throughout the oil regions and in the iron manufacturing districts the name of the Democratic candidate for governor is a talisman to conjure with, a rallying cry for multitudes of honest men who stand stoutly together for honest politics. The western Pennsylvania Democrats and independents are flocking to the standard of George A. Jenks because they see in his candidacy an assurance of deliverance of the state from the clutches of unclean hands that have grasped power only for plunder and personal advantage.

Wherever intelligent public opinion finds expression throughout the state there is ready and ample concession of Mr. Jenks' fitness for the office of governor, and especially at this juncture, when there is need for a stern executive hand at Harrisburg to restore old landmarks of honest state administration.—Philadelphia Record.

—If you want fine work done of every description the WATCHMAN office is the place to come.