

WHAT HAVE THEY DONE WITH THE MONEY?

THE FOLLOWING ARE SOME OF THE COMMENTS AND CRITICISMS MADE UPON THE ABOVE ENTITLED ARTICLE WHICH APPEARED IN LAST WEEK'S ISSUE OF THIS PAPER, AND THE ANSWERS TO SAME:

First. "The article was not an official report and was not sworn to."

It did not purport to be an official statement but nevertheless the statements therein contained are true as shown by the books regardless of what any expert accountant may say or any one else upon his authority.

Second. "The article did not contain a statement of the accounts for the year 1913."

The article did not show the accounts for the year 1913 because the fiscal year 1913 will not end until the middle of April and there is no means at hand by which the accounts can be correctly ascertained, and the correct expenses of and for the year 1913 obtained.

Third. "The article did not show the pauper claims for the year 1913 which were paid for the Township of Dwight during the year 1913, and one certain gentleman in Dwight went so far as to say that the reason the pauper claims paid for the year 1913 were not shown was because the amount paid during that year was the largest ever paid in Dwight Township."

In answer to this the following figures were obtained from the County Clerk of Livingston County and they show for themselves the amount that was paid out:

*The County Clerk says that the County paid out for pauper claims for Dwight Township during the year 1913 the sum of.....\$590.13
The last year of dry (1908) they paid out....\$806.89
The last year of wet (1913) they paid out.... 590.13*

\$216.76

A pupil in the fourth grade could tell you that there was two hundred and sixteen dollars and seventy-six cents less paid out for pauper claims in the last year of wet than was paid out in the last dry year. THERE IS NO TELLING WHAT AN EXPERT ACCOUNTANT MIGHT MAKE OUT OF THESE FIGURES.

Fourth. "The article was erroneous and a mistake was made about the amount that the Dry Board was short in six years."

*This criticism was well founded. The facts are that in addition to the bills of McIlhuff and Baker and A. C. Norton for attorney fees which the Dry Board contracted but could not pay there was outstanding at the end of the year 1904 orders which had been drawn on the Village Treasurer but had not been cashed when the Wet Board took charge of the affairs of the Village and these orders amounted to the sum of.....\$736.78
This should be added to the amount that the Dry Board was short in six years. As shown by the article in last week's issue they were short in six years the sum of.....\$5617.96
Add to this the orders outstanding and not paid..... 736.78*

\$6354.74

They were in fact short Six Thousand Three Hundred Fifty-four Dollars and Seventy-four Cents.

That being the case the Wet Board was ahead just \$736.78 more than shown by the article (\$6040.77) or in fact the sum of.....\$6777.55

Fifth. "The article showing the amount of fines paid under wet and dry included the amounts paid for the illegal sale of liquor."

Read the article and see what it says—The statements about this matter are true—An expert accountant may say differently but he can't prove his assertions by the Treasurer's books.

Sixth. "The article did not show conclusively (because it was not sworn to) that the amount paid to Klitz & Korsgaard for improvements was correct."

The members of this firm have made examination of the books kept by them and it is with their consent and permission that any one (expert accountants are not barred) are challenged to dispute the statement made in the article that the sum of \$22,813 was paid to them for cement work on streets and alleys during the six wet years.

Seventh. "The article did not show the amounts that were collected and paid out under the six years of dry and the six years of wet for the water works account."

Here are the figures as shown by the Treasurer's book:

DRY YEARS

COLLECTED	PAID OUT
1901.....\$ 3502.08	1901.....\$ 4060.33
1902..... 2733.47	1902..... 2973.69
1903..... 3143.27	1903..... 2700.89
1904..... 3521.39	1904..... 3937.70
1907..... 2427.15	1907..... 2280.70
1908..... 3290.07	1908..... 3130.38
Total.....\$18617.43	Total.....\$19083.69

Actually paid out \$466.26 more than was collected in six dry years.

WET YEARS

COLLECTED	PAID OUT
1905.....\$ 3003.13	1905.....\$ 3609.46
1906..... 3180.43	1906..... 3424.87
1909..... 3497.53	1909..... 3562.35
1910..... 4567.87	1910..... 3642.96
1911..... 4173.17	1911..... 4245.49
1912..... 4300.00	1912..... 4926.44
Total.....\$22721.73	Total.....\$23411.57

Actually paid out \$689.84 more than was collected in six wet years.

In addition to the above there were numerous bills paid by the wet board for improvements at the water works out of the miscellaneous fund as stated in the article of last week.

If you doubt these figures ask Clyde Thompson to prove them to you by showing you the Treasurer's books. He is ready to show them to any one or meet any expert accountant who disputes them.

Eighth. "The article did not show the paving accounts."

The article stated plainly that the paving accounts were omitted because they had nothing to do with the regular Village accounts. This statement is true for this reason—The amounts paid into and out of the Village Treasury for pavement is not and cannot be used for any other purpose than paying the bonds and the interest accruing thereon which have been issued for pavement. The amounts paid are paid by the property owners along the street where the pavement is laid and does not cost the other property owners anything in the way of taxes. The money when paid into the treasury by the property owners whose property is assessed is at once paid out to take up a paving bond. Hence as far as the expenses of running the Village are concerned these accounts have absolutely nothing to do with it and do not affect them one way or the other. That is the reason why the paving accounts are not stated. There is enough in the way of figures and statistics for the people to study over without enumerating amounts which will perhaps run up to \$100,000.00 which has been paid out for paving, and which do not in any way affect the tax payer in general.

Ninth. "The article gave the amount of taxes levied but did not show the amount that was collected."

That is a fair criticism. As stated the dry board in six years levied \$56,033.05 and the wet board in six years levied \$54,247.72 or \$1,785.33 less. Now in order to raise taxes with which to pay the expense of the Village the Village Board must by ordinance levy the amount they wish to raise. Then this ordinance is certified to the County Clerk and from it he spreads the assessment for corporation purposes. If the property valuation as assessed is not large enough to raise the amount levied, then of course the Village only gets what can be raised according to the assessed valuation and it may fall short of the amount that was levied by the Village Board. Almost every year the amount actually collected falls short. As stated in the article last week, property in Dwight has advanced at least 25 per cent under wet administration, consequently the assessed valuation has been higher, and if the property has increased in value under wet, there ought to be more money collected in proportion to the amount levied than under dry, when valuations were lower. And this has perhaps been the case, but, the following figures are taken from the Treasurer's books of the Village of Dwight and they show which Board, the Dry or Wet, actually received the most taxes during the six years. That is taxes actually paid into the Treasury during those years. Here are the figures:

DRY YEARS	WET YEARS
1901.....\$ 8347.77	1905.....\$ 7342.54
1902..... 8759.05	1906..... 10448.78
1903..... 9074.73	1909..... 7251.24
1904..... 9591.25	1910..... 8038.21
1907..... 10127.99	1911..... 8886.63
1908..... 10526.32	1912..... 7884.95
Total.....\$56426.51	Total.....\$49842.35

Thus from the above it appears that the Dry Board actually received the sum of \$6584.16 more in taxes than did the Wet Board during six years. This is of course from Village taxes and from the Road and Bridge Taxes levied by the Township and which the Village gets a part of. The difference is partly accounted for by the Dry Board getting more paid into the treasury as delinquent taxes, which should have been paid into the treasury while the Wet Board still had charge. The amounts as given above are the amounts shown by the Treasurer's books, notwithstanding the fact that through juggling of figures it may be attempted by some to make them appear otherwise.

Tenth. "It was an awful thing for the DWIGHT STAR AND HERALD to publish and they ought to be prosecuted for it."

This criticism is too foolish to even answer.

IF YOU HAVE ENOUGH INTEREST IN THE MATTER TO INVESTIGATE FOR YOURSELF THE CORRECTNESS OF THE ARTICLE AS A WHOLE LOOK AT THE TREASURER'S BOOKS, AND THE VILLAGE RECORDS AND FIND OUT.

YOU WILL FIND THERE ARE NO MIS-STATEMENTS CONTAINED IN THE ARTICLE.

THE STREATOR INDEPENDENT-TIMES IN ITS ISSUE OF MARCH 21st LAST, HAS IN ITS EDITORIAL COLUMN THE FOLLOWING:

WHAT THE CAMERA SAW.

The other day Rev. T. B. Wadleigh, while in Rockford, photographed in 45 minutes eight wagon loads of booze being hauled away from the interurban depot to be stored in the homes of this "model dry city," and some of it went into the basement of homes whose owners talk dry but live wet. He would have photographed more but the agent interfered. He took a snap shot of 100 beer kegs in one pile, and got a flash light picture of the main floor and basement of Behr. Bros.' junk shop containing six car loads of beer and whisky bottles gathered from the streets and alleys of this "model dry city" in the last six months. There are several other junk dealers who do a big business in empty bottles. The camera, like George Washington, cannot tell a lie.

As I write there is before me a sheet containing photographs of 47 empty store rooms, now inhabited only by owls, rats and bats. Blot out all other evidence and these would be sufficient to prove Rockford to be a "model dry city."

The local brewery is doing a banner business. Rockford also has in her midst fourteen brewery agencies and none of them are in business for their health. They do a wholesale business in wet goods. When the city had a license a working man could buy a drink. Now he buys a drunk.

A queer way to promote temperance.

Here is what the noted Cardinal Gibbons thinks about prohibition—that is the same as anti-saloon only its under a different name:

CARDINAL PROHIBITION'S FOE

GIBBONS SAYS IT COULD NOT BE ENFORCED IN UNITED STATES.

(By the Associated Press)

NEW ORLEANS, March 7.—"Prohibition never will be enforced in a Christian country," said Cardinal Gibbons today while paying his annual visit to his brother, John T. Gibbons.

"While I am an ardent advocate of temperance I am intuitively persuaded that prohibition cannot be enforced in this country," continued the cardinal. "It is calculated to make hypocrites and lead to the manufacture of illicit whisky, replacing the good material with the bad and at the same time robbing the government of the legitimate tax."

Don't let a lot of foolish prohibition literature and a lot of expert prepared figures keep you from voting to keep Dwight advancing.

ON APRIL SEVENTH BE SURE AND MARK YOUR BALLOT ON THE WET AND DRY PROPOSITION. (Advertisement)

VOTE NO