

The Manning Times.
LOUIS APPELT, Editor.
 MANNING, S. C., OCT. 13, 1909.
 PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY
 SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
 One year, in advance, \$1.00; six months, \$0.75; three months, \$0.50.
 ADVERTISING RATES:
 One square, one time, \$1.00; each subsequent insertion, 50 cents. Obituaries and Tributes of Respect charged for as regular advertisements. Liberal contracts made for three, six and twelve months.
 Communications must be accompanied by the real name and address of the writer in order to receive attention.
 No communication of a personal character will be published except as an advertisement.
 Entered as Second-Class Matter, Second Class Matter.

found no evidence the prosecution has produced that a jury of his Peers will convict upon; therefore there is no just reason; because the defendant did not avail himself of the privilege to go on the stand, to count it against him, and say he is guilty.
 We are not so sure that no one has suggested that Wylie perjured himself in order to give damaging evidence against Farnum. Surely the State would not vouch for the truth of Wylie's testimony, who admitted to counsel for the defense that he lied when not under oath. We may differ frequently with our contemporary in many things, but we have never doubted its honesty, and we would not believe that it would stand sponsor for a man who sells himself to give testimony, even the price being immunity from prosecution, and this is just what Wylie did, and the corroborative evidence he furnishes is another bought witness. The State cannot stand defender of such men, and the testimony of Mr. Gage we contend, does not convince the public that Farnum gave his draft to bribe an officer of the State.
 The Columbia State fails "to understand how any law respecting person can question the completeness of the proofs offered the State." Its editor should crawl out of his shell of prejudice, go among the masses, rub up against the unprejudiced, and perhaps he will discover that the weight of sentiment will be in line with the position this newspaper has taken. Not however as a defender of Mr. Farnum, as The State would have it appear by reproducing parts of THE MANNING TIMES editorials, but from conclusions reached after reading the stenographic reports of the testimony as published in The State.

We did not give our readers the benefit of all the evidence against Farnum, because of inability to do so, but we deny that we have orareshielding Farnum, and answering the State's question, "Did THE MANNING TIMES wish the evidence against Farnum to convince the jury?" We answer, that with the evidence presented that jury, were we on it, we would not have consented to a verdict of guilty, because, notwithstanding the State's view to the contrary, there was no evidence to convict Mr. Farnum of crime. Now if the State's question had read "would we have Mr. Farnum convicted," we should say, most assuredly yes, if the testimony, beyond a reasonable doubt, justified such a verdict. Whenever any man whether it be Mr. Farnum or the editor of The State is charged with crime, and is held before the court he is to be tried by the law, and he is entitled to all the protection the fundamental law of the land gives him. Where this note true, liberty and property, would not be safe from the prejudices and whims of partizan newspapers, and instead of the courts being pure, and free from bias, they would soon become like clay in the potter's hand to be for or against, as the newspapers may will to mould the sentiment.

Juries sometimes make mistakes, but not any oftener than do the newspapers, and it is better for a jury to err in acquitting an accused, than to yield to popular wrath that has been made, and fanned into flame by a partizan press, and convict wrongfully. Why, The State is right now making a strong effort to build a sentiment against those yet to be tried on the graft charges; it is so intense in its prejudice that we believe it will destroy all chance of getting a conviction at all, matters not what the evidence, and well may the State of South Carolina cry out, "God save us from our friends."

"THE ETHICS OF BANKING."

It seems to be the habit of the Columbia newspapers when criticizing the editorial utterances of another newspaper to give its readers only a part of what the paper being criticized by them said, thus frequently misleading their own readers, and doing the criticized paper an injustice. In its issue of the 5th, The Daily Record of Columbia, makes the following comment, but it did not give to its readers the whole of the editorial in THE MANNING TIMES: "An editorial article, recently reprinted in full, THE MANNING TIMES says: 'The supposition is that business in a bank is a confidential relation, and when one of the officers voluntarily assumes the role of detective and exposes the bank's confidential relations to a patron, that officer is not fit to have the confidence of business men.'"
 The TIMES here holds up to young bank employees a standard of banking ethics that will hardly bear analysis. It is dangerous and full of potentialities for mischief.
 "Suppose circumstances that come to his knowledge in the course of business lead a bank official to suspect that his bank is being used by a customer to forward certain highly criminal operations. And suppose, further, that the official in question should quite take steps to ascertain whether his suspicions were justified, and when he keeps the bank's confidential relations to the public, he is not fit to have the confidence of business men." Does the citizen become any the less a citizen when he happens to take employment in a bank? In no country has it been held at any time that bank employees are to be held to a standard of priest and parishioner or lawyer and client. Is it no part of a banker's duty

to safeguard the integrity and protect the good name of his bank? Does he owe nothing to the public? Is a criminal to be shielded and protected, even afforded every convenience for his wrongdoing, by a bank's officials, merely because he happens to be a depositor of that bank?
 It is a strange gospel THE MANNING TIMES brings to young men starting their business careers as bank clerks. THE MANNING TIMES would not find its ideas popular, if it is to be hoped among the members of the South Carolina Banker's Association.
 The suppositions, The Record indulges in, will not do in argument, but granting that it does, then we say whenever a bank official has reasons to believe that a patron of his bank is doing a dishonest business, and he does not propose to have his bank converted into "a fence" to receive ill-gotten gains, the moment he makes the discovery, he should tell the patron of his suspicions, and require him to withdraw his business from the bank. It will not do for the bank official to continue, and perhaps solicit the business of a dishonest man, and then when occasion arises, as we understand from the Chester bank—the cashier, whose suspicions were aroused, continued business with the suspected parties, and said nothing until the president of his bank became an opponent of one of the suspected criminals for the office of mayor of the city of Chester; it was not until then did this cashier make known the transaction and gratifying an idle curiosity, and then only, to drive votes away from the man who was opposing his employer.
 We do not pretend to say that a bank should be a screen for criminal operations, but we do say that the relations between patron and bank are strictly confidential, and that when an officer of a bank plays the role of detective and becomes a "spotter" on one whose business, and patronage he is receiving and continues to receive, he is not carrying out in good faith that confidence the patron has a right to expect, and which is promised by every bank.
 There are times when a bank official must expose the transactions of his bank, but that when a court of competent jurisdiction issues the proper authority for him to come into court and testify from the bank's records, of course, in that case he must tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, but we contend, that until then, he has no right to tell anybody of what is done in that bank, and when he does, it is a breach of confidence.
 The Record says, and we agree with it, "It is admittedly immoral for any citizen to shield by his silence those whom he discovers to be criminals." Yes, and if the cashier of the Chester bank upon his discovery of crime among a couple of the bank's patrons, had at once required those patrons to withdraw their funds because of the discovery, in our opinion, he would fare better in general estimation, but "one cannot keep his cake and eat it too." When he accepted the deposits of these men, especially after his suspicions were aroused, he could no longer claim the right to expose them on the ground that their operations were unlawful. No, a criminal is not to be shielded and protected, nor even afforded a convenience for his wrongdoing, by a bank's officials, because he happens to be a depositor. But when it becomes known or suspected that the bank is being used by criminals, then is the time for an honest bank to rid itself of the business of the criminals, not wait for a municipal election. There is ample protection in the law for the public, without a man supposedly occupying a confidential business relation becoming a spy on the movements of those confiding their trust in that bank.
 When the law, in the interest of justice, wants information from a bank there is a proper way to get it, and that is understood by the patron when he opens an account, hence when an official gives up information on the mandate of a court, the officer giving the information has not violated a confidence with his patron, because the confidence is so received. We therefore insist that no bank official has any right in morals or in law to expose the relations existing between bank and patron without the patron's consent, unless required to do so by a competent authority, and we further contend that when a bank receives deposits of a patron that it suspects is doing a business which is criminal, it has accepted such a trust that it has no right to violate, and if it does violate that trust, it is no longer to be trusted by others, on the principal that if a man proves himself unworthy of trust in one case, he is no longer to be trusted in any case. "False in one, false in many."
 Our contemporary regards our views "strange gospel," but it would be surprising if we all viewed matters alike. The "gospel" is not strange or new; we believe it is the common belief that this relation is strictly confidential, and in a well regulated bank, a cashier exposing the business of the institution voluntarily, would lose his job, more especially would his services be dispensed with if he made that exposure to gain some advantage over a man he was opposing in a municipal campaign. Now when the cashier of the Chester bank was on the stand he could do nothing else than tell the truth, and while we do not see where his testimony proved that the accused bribed Mr. Wylie, yet Mr. Gage had to

testify that he paid a certain marked bill out to Samuel, and that same bill was deposited by Wylie, that's alright. It is not what Mr. Gage testified on the stand that we object to, it is the manner of the transaction being made known, which we regard an act of bad faith on the part of a bank official receiving a trust, banking for his bank what the deposit profits, and then without being required by lawful authority to do so, violate the trust reposed.
 AND NOW FOR THE LAW.
 Under the caption "speak a word for the law, please" The State would have THE MANNING TIMES answer the question "When, for example, did even one self-confessed 'liar' testify?" Unfortunately we do not keep a newspaper after we have finished reading it, but it is our recollection that we read in the Columbia State which professes to give a full and complete report of the trials, where the prosecution's star witness, Mr. Wylie, in answer to a question from counsel for the defense, admitted that he lied, and undertook to excuse himself by saying, that when he told the lie he was not sworn.
 Now, as to the other question, "And what about the Farnum draft for \$1,125?" Well, if there was any testimony which proved that the draft was given as a bribe, we have been unable to find it in the State's full and complete report of the trial. It was proven that Samuel cashed a draft signed by Farnum, or rather purporting to have been signed by Farnum, but that did not prove Farnum signed the draft, nor did it prove, if he did sign it, it was in payment of a bribe. Oh, "The State" will probably say, that Wylie says, it was given to him as a bribe. But Wylie was promised immunity from prosecution, if he would give testimony, and being a shrewd man, who loves the dollar more than his soul, would rather say, this money was given to him as a bribe, because he was promised his freedom, rather than to say, the draft was for a bribe, for if it was a bribe and he put the bribe in his pocket, it would have been a confession that he robbed the State, and while he would have been relieved of a jail sentence, he would not have been relieved of being forced by a civil action from disgorging this bribe to the State. Wylie was shrewd enough to know that there is a difference between a bribe and a bribe. A bribe, according to the law as given to the jury from the bench, a seller had a right to give, an officer had a right to accept, but if the officer failed to turn that bribe received into the treasury, he would be guilty of crime, but the man who gave the bribe, would have committed no offense, not only would the officer be guilty of crime, but the State could recover if he has any property to recover out of. Therefore it is easy to understand why Wylie would prefer the ignominy of acknowledging himself a bribe-taker, than to confess his ill-gotten money belongs to the State, and subject to be forced from him.
 We have tried to comply with the State's request to "speak a word for the law" as it applies to the issue. It is true that our contemporary did not single out "none as accomplices," but it referred to those newspapers that were not echoing the views given out by the State, and as this newspaper was one of the four or five, we had a right to assume that we were included in the number, and willing to put ourself in the attitude of the "hit dog." THE MANNING TIMES is not good at guessing conundrums, and must confess it does not understand what the State means by the suggestion that "the State of South Carolina, as represented by the prosecution, may hold views upon this point. THE MANNING TIMES get them for personal use." "Inasmuch as THE MANNING TIMES is not in the confidence of those who represent the prosecution, the mystifying words are lost upon us."
 Further, we have information that not only are the views as expressed in THE MANNING TIMES the views of thousands of citizens of South Carolina, but they are the views of a large portion of the citizens of the city of Columbia, for we are reliably informed that the sentiment in the city is largely divided as to the conclusion of the jury which had the verdict to render.
 We clip this amusing little paragraph to show the "ugly humor" of our contemporary, that is always so fair, and reports the proceedings of a trial the whole country is deeply interested in, full, complete and without fear, favor, or prejudice the entire proceedings, even mentioning all of the questions and answers, by whom the questions are asked, and by whom answered, yes our contemporary is absolutely fair?
 Speaking of the Farnum jurors, Editor Appelt asserts, "They are daily readers of THE STATE." We emphatically deny the charge and repel with indignation the covert insinuation. There are only six or seven daily readers of THE STATE, including Senator Appelt, who think just like that thoughtless wretch.
 The indignant denial, and scornful repudiation of several of the citizens of Richland county who are "good and lawful men" were members of the Farnum jury, is indeed a revelation to us, because we cannot conceive, how any citizen of Richland county can possibly do without reading THE STATE, and of course, while we did assert the members of that jury were readers of THE STATE, the mistake was a natural one, and if they are not regular

subscribers, nor daily purchasers, then they should be borrowers, so that they might know who is who, and what is demanded of them by the exacting editor of that always fair and unprejudiced (?) newspaper.
 It is settled that Cook did not get to the North Pole. "I—took—a—shoo," and "Ah—pe—lah" say so, and who is it to dispute either I—took—shoo, or his fellow eskimo? As long as the controversy lasts Dr. Cook will give to the public a lot of hot air that he brought home with him from the frozen regions, at so much per blast.
 We shall have to ask Columbia's morning daily to excuse us from its fake Newberry correspondent, we have troubles of our own and do not care to be burdened with any more. However, the Newberry man is evidently a student of our contemporary, which accounts for his failure to spell correctly, but all the same he has a clear idea of what the general sentiment is.
 The citizens of Chester have demanded the resignation of their Mayor Henry Samuel, who has recently broke into notoriety by becoming an immured witness for the State in the graft cases. The testimony given by Samuel was sufficient, if he had any shame left, to have caused him not only to resign the mayorality of Chester, but to go somewhere and hang himself. He gave to the world a sworn statement which forever damns him in the estimation of decent people.
 THE MANNING TIMES is honored with an invitation to lunch with President Taft on the occasion of his visit to Columbia Saturday, November 6th, but accompanying the invitation is a letter from the chairman of the invitation committee which says if the Editor accepts the invitation he is requested to accompany his acceptance with a check for \$10. My, how groceries have advanced. It is extremely doubtful if the invitation can be accepted, as a ten dollar bill is a scarce article with him just at this time. However, he appreciates the kind remembrance, and will drink a silent toast to the distinguished visitor, at home.
 Deafness Cannot be Cured
 by local applications, as they cannot reach the diseased portion of the ear. There is only one way to cure deafness, and that is by constitutional remedies. Deafness is caused by an inflammation of the mucous lining of the Eustachian Tube. When this tube gets inflamed you have a rumbling sound or imperfect hearing, and when it is entirely closed deafness is the result, and unless the inflammation can be taken out of this tube restored to its normal condition hearing will be destroyed forever. Nine cases out of ten are caused by catarrh, which is not a permanent condition of the mucous surfaces.
 We will give One Hundred Dollars for any case of Deafness (caused by catarrh) that can not be cured by Hall's Catarrh Cure, Send for circulars, free.
 F. J. CHENEY & CO., Toledo, O.
 Sold by druggists. The Hall's Family Pills are the best.

COLLINS' Wireless Telephone Co. OF NEWARK, N. J.

Demonstrating Wireless Telephones are now being shown and tested at the new Court House by our traveling representative, Mr. W. E. REARDON. Stock now selling at

\$4.00.

M. L. ROSENWALD,
 Manager for South Carolina.

DANGER IN DELAY.

Kidney Diseases Are Too Dangerous for Manning People to Neglect.
 The great danger of kidney troubles is that they get a firm hold before the sufferer recognizes them. Health is gradually undermined. Backache, headache, nervousness, lameness, soreness, lumbago, urinary troubles, dropsy, diabetes and Bright's disease follow in merciless succession. Don't neglect your kidneys. Care the kidneys with the certain and safe remedy, Doan's Kidney Pills, which has cured people right here in this locality.
 Elias Bounds, 15 W. Pine St., Florence, S. C., says: "Doan's Kidney Pills gave me great relief and I do not hesitate to give them my endorsement. The kidney secretions were highly colored, often described a dark sediment and were too frequent and painful in passage. My back ached nearly all the time through my hips. I finally read about Doan's Kidney Pills and began taking them according to directions. They lived up to representations, soon stopping the backaches and pains and restoring my kidneys to their normal condition. I am more than pleased with the results I obtained from Doan's Kidney Pills."
 For sale by all dealers. Price 50 cents. Foster-McMurrin Co., Buffalo, New York, sole agents for the United States.
 Remember the name—Doan's—and take no other.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

County of Clarendon.
 COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.
 T. W. Lee and R. D. Lee as Executors and Trustees under the Will of Mrs. S. A. Lee for Miss Sarah Howell Lee, Plaintiffs
 vs
 Marcha V. Beard, William D. Beard, Forrest L. Beard and S. D. Powell, Administrators of the Estate of J. E. Beard, Defendants.
 Decees.
 UNDER AND BY VIRTUE OF A Judgment Order of the Court of Common Pleas, in the above stated action, to me directed, bearing date of June 12, 1909, I will sell at public auction, to the highest bidder for cash, at Clarendon Court House, at Manning, in said county, within the legal hours for judicial sales, on Monday, the 1st day of November, 1909, being salesday, the following described real estate:
 All that tract of land on which J. E. Beard resided, containing forty-seven and one-half acres, situate in Clarendon county, in said State, on the North side of the North by land of J. E. Beard, and West by land of Estate of J. E. Beard, being the tract of land conveyed to J. E. Beard by Sarah Adkinson, by deed recorded in office of C. C. C. P. for said county, in Book H. H., at page 428.
 ALSO,
 That tract of land containing forty acres, in said county and State, bounded on the North by land of J. H. Gibbons, formerly of Beard; South by lands of W. Coker, and of H. P. Gibbons; East by land of Estate of Julia Beard, and West by land of Estate of W. A. Welch, being the tract of land conveyed to J. E. Beard by Sarah Adkinson, by deed recorded in office of C. C. C. P. for said county, in Book H. H., at page 428.
 Purchaser to pay for papers.
 E. B. GAMBLE,
 Sheriff Clarendon County.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

County of Clarendon.
 COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.
 T. W. Lee and R. D. Lee as Executors and Trustees under the Will of Mrs. S. A. Lee for Miss Sarah Howell Lee, Plaintiffs
 vs
 Marcha V. Beard, William D. Beard, Forrest L. Beard and S. D. Powell, Administrators of the Estate of J. E. Beard, Defendants.
 Decees.
 UNDER AND BY VIRTUE OF A Judgment Order of the Court of Common Pleas, in the above stated action, to me directed, bearing date of June 12, 1909, I will sell at public auction, to the highest bidder for cash, at Clarendon Court House, at Manning, in said county, within the legal hours for judicial sales, on Monday, the 1st day of November, 1909, being salesday, the following described real estate:
 All that tract of land on which J. E. Beard resided, containing forty-seven and one-half acres, situate in Clarendon county, in said State, on the North side of the North by land of J. E. Beard, and West by land of Estate of J. E. Beard, being the tract of land conveyed to J. E. Beard by Sarah Adkinson, by deed recorded in office of C. C. C. P. for said county, in Book H. H., at page 428.
 ALSO,
 That tract of land containing forty acres, in said county and State, bounded on the North by land of J. H. Gibbons, formerly of Beard; South by lands of W. Coker, and of H. P. Gibbons; East by land of Estate of Julia Beard, and West by land of Estate of W. A. Welch, being the tract of land conveyed to J. E. Beard by Sarah Adkinson, by deed recorded in office of C. C. C. P. for said county, in Book H. H., at page 428.
 Purchaser to pay for papers.
 E. B. GAMBLE,
 Sheriff Clarendon County.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

County of Clarendon.
 COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.
 T. W. Lee and R. D. Lee as Executors and Trustees under the Will of Mrs. S. A. Lee for Miss Sarah Howell Lee, Plaintiffs
 vs
 Marcha V. Beard, William D. Beard, Forrest L. Beard and S. D. Powell, Administrators of the Estate of J. E. Beard, Defendants.
 Decees.
 UNDER AND BY VIRTUE OF A Judgment Order of the Court of Common Pleas, in the above stated action, to me directed, bearing date of June 12, 1909, I will sell at public auction, to the highest bidder for cash, at Clarendon Court House, at Manning, in said county, within the legal hours for judicial sales, on Monday, the 1st day of November, 1909, being salesday, the following described real estate:
 All that tract of land on which J. E. Beard resided, containing forty-seven and one-half acres, situate in Clarendon county, in said State, on the North side of the North by land of J. E. Beard, and West by land of Estate of J. E. Beard, being the tract of land conveyed to J. E. Beard by Sarah Adkinson, by deed recorded in office of C. C. C. P. for said county, in Book H. H., at page 428.
 ALSO,
 That tract of land containing forty acres, in said county and State, bounded on the North by land of J. H. Gibbons, formerly of Beard; South by lands of W. Coker, and of H. P. Gibbons; East by land of Estate of Julia Beard, and West by land of Estate of W. A. Welch, being the tract of land conveyed to J. E. Beard by Sarah Adkinson, by deed recorded in office of C. C. C. P. for said county, in Book H. H., at page 428.
 Purchaser to pay for papers.
 E. B. GAMBLE,
 Sheriff Clarendon County.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

Clarendon County.
 COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.
 The Citizen's Bank of Timmonsville, Plaintiff
 against
 Jehu Smith and Leila L. Smith, Defendants.
 Decees.
 UNDER AND BY VIRTUE OF A Decreeal Order of the Court of Common Pleas for Clarendon County, dated the 2nd day of October, 1906, I will sell to the highest bidder for cash, on Monday, the 1st day of November, A. D., 1909, the same being salesday, in front of the Court House at Manning, in said County, within legal hours of sale, the following real estate:
 All the right, title and interest of the said Jehu Smith in and to that piece, parcel or tract of land lying, being and situate in Clarendon and State aforesaid, containing one hundred and twenty five (125) acres, more or less, and bounded and butting as follows: North by lands now or formerly of Mrs. F. A. Logan; East and South-east by lands now or formerly of the estate of M. Levi, and on the South and West by lands now or formerly of the estate of T. J. Cole. For a more particular description of said eleven acres reference may be had to plat of the same recorded in the office of Clerk of Court for said County, in Book B. 3, pages 295 and 296.
 Purchaser to pay for papers.
 E. B. GAMBLE,
 Sheriff Clarendon County.

SOLE AGENTS FOR

FOLEY'S HONEY AND TAR
 For children, safe, sure. No opiates.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,

County of Clarendon.
 COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.
 T. W. Lee and R. D. Lee as Executors and Trustees under the Will of Mrs. S. A. Lee for Miss Sarah Howell Lee, Plaintiffs
 vs
 Marcha V. Beard, William D. Beard, Forrest L. Beard and S. D. Powell, Administrators of the Estate of J. E. Beard, Defendants.
 Decees.
 UNDER AND BY VIRTUE OF A Judgment Order of the Court of Common Pleas, in the above stated action, to me directed, bearing date of June 12, 1909, I will sell at public auction, to the highest bidder for cash, at Clarendon Court House, at Manning, in said county, within the legal hours for judicial sales, on Monday, the 1st day of November, 1909, being salesday, the following described real estate:
 All that tract of land on which J. E. Beard resided, containing forty-seven and one-half acres, situate in Clarendon county, in said State, on the North side of the North by land of J. E. Beard, and West by land of Estate of J. E. Beard, being the tract of land conveyed to J. E. Beard by Sarah Adkinson, by deed recorded in office of C. C. C. P. for said county, in Book H. H., at page 428.
 ALSO,
 That tract of land containing forty acres, in said county and State, bounded on the North by land of J. H. Gibbons, formerly of Beard; South by lands of W. Coker, and of H. P. Gibbons; East by land of Estate of Julia Beard, and West by land of Estate of W. A. Welch, being the tract of land conveyed to J. E. Beard by Sarah Adkinson, by deed recorded in office of C. C. C. P. for said county, in Book H. H., at page 428.
 Purchaser to pay for papers.
 E. B. GAMBLE,
 Sheriff Clarendon County.

To Our Friends and Customers :

THE MANNING OIL MILL has been recently bought from the South Atlantic Oil Co., and at the beginning of our career under the present ownership we extend our thanks to all of our friends for their support and patronage.
 We have tried in the past to deserve your support by being absolutely fair and honest with all of our customers, and we ask for a continuance of your support for the following additional reasons:
 FIRST: Ours is a local company—not a dollar of its stock is owned outside of South Carolina.
 SECOND: We pay annually to the Town and County Treasurers over \$600 taxes which helps that much towards paying the expenses of our local government.
 THIRD: It costs us about \$30,000 per year to manufacture the seed we purchase, and of this amount, \$20,000 is spent right here at Manning. In other words, when you sell us a ton of seed (66 2/3 bushels) you get market price for the seed and the community gets \$4 of the amount it costs to manufacture them. When you sell a ton of seed to the other fellow, you get the a. k. p. price for the seed, and SOME OTHER COMMUNITY gets the benefit of the money paid out to manufacture them.
 We could mention a number of other reasons, but we think the above is sufficient to convince you that it pays to patronize home industries.
 Yours very truly,
Manning Oil Mill,
 C. R. SPROTT, President and Treasurer