NUMBER 116.

Have a Larger Stock -OF-

Ladies'

Misses' and Children's

Than any House in America. WHY? BECAUSE

They have just received from a New York manufacturer who is going out of business

One Thousand Ladies' Cloaks.

Five Hundred Misses' Cloaks.

Two Hundred Ladies' Dresses, Two Hundred

Misses' Dresses, With the instruction to sell them

# Of Manufacture.

Sale Gommences Monday Morning, October 13th.

1518-1520 Farnam Street.

# 1518 and 1520 Farnam Street.

In all probability

Every One

---of these---

LADIES

be able to realize YOUR

MOST SANGUINE HOPES of

Goods are almost given

purchasing BARGAINS.

away.

--and--

Will be sold within

# One Week

This time or NEVER you will And no more such bargains will be offered.

Here are a few instances:

LADIES' --Cashmere Dresses--Already Made.

\$3, \$4 and \$5.

LADIES' ALL WOOL

---Flannel Dresses---Tailor Made.

\$5.00 to \$7.50.

LADIES' EXTRA FINE

--Broadcloth Dresses--

\$10, \$12.50 and \$18

A FEW COLORED SILK DRESSES

These dresses will not be fitted by us, but we will pin them if requested.

\$10.00.

Heyman & Deiches









# HEYMAN & DEICHES, 1518-1520 Farnam St

Ladies' heavy winter Ulsters, well made, serviceable garments, no misfits, all sound and good, in beaver, Berlin twill, stripes and plaids, Scotch cheviots, plain and trimmed,

\$5 \$6 \$10

From 12 to 18

years,

85 83

ALL

# IT IS NO MYTH Among the cloaks are gar-

ments the cloth of which cannot be procured for less than \$8 or \$9, yet they sell at

\$6 and \$7

# LADIES

We wish to remind you that we keep a large and well assorted stock of furs and fur trimmings. We keep

Capes and Muffs,

Boas and Collars

of any kind or any description. We only keep the best qualities, that is, do not keep any inferior goods. Our prices are away below any others. If you want to buy furs and you do not price ours before deciding, you will never know the bottom prices.

We carry other goods besides furs and can afford to sell them cheap, as we don't need to make enough money on them in 3 months to last for a whole

vear.

HEYMAN & DEICHES, 1518-1520 Farnam St.

can be sold for

## ATCHISON & NEBRASKA DEAL

The Argument of C. G. Dawes in the Quo Warranto Proceedings.

WHY THE FRANCHISE WAS LOST.

The Combine One Designed to Remove Competition and in Direct Violalation of the Letter and Intent of the Constitution.

Following is the argument by C. G. Dawes for the plaintiff in the quo warranto proceedings instituted by the state in the supreme court against the Atchison & Nebraska rail-

The undisputed evidence introduced in this case and now forming part of the record which is before you for consideration, shows that from the year 1872 to 1880 the Atchison & Nebraska raitway company, formed by the consolidation of the Atchison & Nebraska railway of Kansas with the Atchison, Lincoln & Columbus railway of Nebraska, operated an independent line of railroad from Lincoln, Neb., to the south line of the state of Nebraska. During this time the B. & M. operated a line of road passing through the middle part of the state and running through Lincoln to Plattsmouth, at which latter point it made direct connections to Chicago. It also operated during this period of time, a line of road on the west of the line of the Atchison & Nebraska railroad running through Lincoln, via Crete to Beatrice, and from the year 1877 (when it leased the Nebraska railway) to the (when it leased the Nebraska railway) to the year ISSO, it operated a line on the east of the Atchison & Nebraska railway, running through Lincoln via Nebraska City to Nemaha City. This sett in quo warranto is brought to obtain a forfoiture of such of the franchises of the Atchison & Nebraska railway, was a warm formally greated by way company as were formerly granted by the state of Neuraska to the Atchison, Lin-

the state of Neuraska to the Atchison, Lin-coln & Columbus railway company—in other words, the franchise for operating that part of the Atchison & Nebraska railway lying within the state of Nebraska. It is charged by the state in this case that the Atchison & Nebraska railway company, which, as the controller and owner of the Atchison, Lincoln & Columbus franchises and the property acquired under them has and the property acquired under them, has assumed its liabilities to the state, has made a lease for 999 years to the B. & M.-a parallel and competing line—thereby render-ing itself liable to lose its corporate exist-ence. On the part of the defendant it is claimed that the Atchison & Nebraska railroad was not a competing railroad with the lines of the B. & M. railroad, and that its lease to the B. & M. railroad was legal and its franchises are therefore not subject for forfeiture. The defendant also asserts that the lease of this road did not result in a legal non-user of franchise after the date of leas-

The testimony of the plaintiff in regard to the competition existing between this Atchison & Nebraska railroad and the B. & M. railway on the west, and the Nebraska railway (leased by the B. & M. railway) on the east, and the B. & M. line to Chicago on the north, and that all this corrections. and that all this competition was destroyed by the lease of the Atchison & Nebraska to the B. & M. raiway is very explicit and defi-

The chief witnesses for the plaintiff are R. P. R. Millar, at present the general agent of the Missouri Pacific rali-way at Lincoln (answer 1st, plain-tiffs testimony); Thomas Lowery, W. B. Morrison and Robert Mitchell, Mr. Millar's

may beinferred from his present position as a railroad employe. He testified that prior to 1880 he was in the employ of the Atchison & Nebraska railway at Troy Junction, at Humboldt, and that he finally became contracting agent at Lincoln (answer 185)—the time of his employment with this road covering a period of nine years. While it is evident from the reading of this testimony of Millar, that his sympathies are with the defendant railroad company, yet his answers fendant railroad company, yet his answers are marked by a candor and evident incerity of purpose that commend them to special consideration. He testifies that in the year 1879—the year prior to the consolidation— more than half the shipments over the Atchison & Nebraska railway, routed to Chicago, went over the Rock Island, or over the Hannibal & St. Joseph railways, well known as competitors of the Barlington system; and he further states that the shipments of the Atchison & Nebraska railway were given to the connections of the road at Atchison which "could do the best with it." (answer 1960) It is true the witness testifies that for the period of a year, some time before the consolidation, when Mr. Bartime before the consolidation, when Mr. Bar-nard was superintendent of the Atchison & Nebraska, all the shipments of the road to Chicago went over the Burlington from Atchison; (answer 197) but he also testifies in answer 215, that for a time all the grain shipments of the Atchison & Nebraska went over the Chicago, East Island & Panilla vall. over the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific rail-road to Chicago. And his testimony in answer 139 is to the effect that during the nine years of the independence of the Atchi-son & Nebraska railway the traffic to Chihe also says that the road which "would bid the best for as would get our business." He affirms that the Atchison & Nebraska rail-road worked with any road that would give it the best rate, (answer 201) and says that he regarded the Kansas City, St. Joseph & Council Blaffs railway, the Hannibal & St. Joseph, the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railroad and the Missouri Pacific railroad as all in competition for the business of his road at Atchison. (answer 205.) His testimony shows that he traveled e also says that the read which "would bid testimony shows that he traveled along the B. & M. soliciting freight for the Atchison & Nebraska railroad. (answers 200 and 210.) He admits that it was sometimes necessary to figure against the Nebraska railway on rates (answer 224.) In answer to question 234 "was there an advance in rates," he says: "I knew so far as the public were oncerned that the private rates were shut iff, the rebates were shut off." In answer to question 337, inquiring on what propertion of freight passing over the line of the Atch-ison & Nebraska railway rebates were paid. ison & Nobraska ratiway rebates were paid, he says: "I would say that on the bulk of the grain shipments and isoek shipments and coal shipments and imber shipments, there were rebats paid." This damaging evidence showing that there was an increase of rates after the consolidation owing to the abating of rebates on the bulk of the shipments of the road, caused opposing counsel immediately to seek to lossen its effect! by eliciting from witness in question 239 the further statement that rebates were paid to only a few individuals. What difference to only a few undividuals. What diffe does it make to whom rebates were paid pro-vided they were paid as the witness testilies on the bulk of the shipments over the road. The community received the benefit of higher prices for their commodities, whether the lower rates on the bulk of shipments came from rebates or through an open rate. Competition among buyers, to which Mr. Ut in his testimony so often refers, and the law of supply and demand caused the community to gain the benefits of the rebates for the reason

tion, which then had a monopoly, A weak attempt is made in answers 315, 316 and 317 of Mr. Utt's examination to impeach way at Lincoln (answer ist, plaintiff's testimony); Thomas Lowery, W.B.
Morrison and Robert Mitchell. Mr. Miller's
has no bias or learning towards the plaintiff

and strong, clear, testimony of Mr. Miller's
and Mr. Cit says in answer 317, "He (Millar)
had no personal knowledge at all except the
that the testimony is especially valuable. That he
that the testimony is mainly irrelevant, it
being confined largely to the condition of the
state in this well known prince
in the strong, clear, testimony of Mr. Miller's
and Mr. Cit says in answer 317, "He (Millar)
it is the contention of the state in this case
that the testimony introduced by the defendant railway company is mainly irrelevant, it
being confined largely to the condition of the
state in this well known prince
in the strong, clear, testimony of Mr. Miller,
and strong, clear, testimony of Mr. Millar,
and strong clear, testimony of Mr. Millar,
and strong clear, testimony of Mr. Millar,
and strong clear, testimony of M

that they were paid on substantially all ship-ments of any bulk. The law of supply and

demand formerly regulated railroad rates, or what is the same thing in this instance, rail-

way rebates; but this unlawful lease ended that by putting the commodity of eastern transportation in the hands of one corpora-

know about the business of the Atchison & Nebraska." He may not, perhaps, have sought permission to know about the busi-ness of the line for which he was agent both at Lincoln and at Humboldt, and of which he was also general contracting agent; but his testimony shows that he did know this business, and knew it well. He probably would have lost his position if he had not

Mr. Lowery testifies directly that he purhased along the lines of the Atchison & Ne braska road at various stations, prior to the consolidation, and that his shipments went east from Atchison via the Missouri Pacific railway, the Wabash, St. Louis & Pacific railway, the Chicago & Alton railway and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railway (answer 1i) that all of these roads and in addition the Chicago, Burlington & Quine and the central branch of the Umon Pacific railway, were in competition for this business at Atchison (question 14)—that he shipped grain to Telede via the Wabash, St. Louis & Pacific railway from the Atchison & Nebraska line, because he could get better rates (answer 20) and that none of this grain went ever the Chicago, Burilagton & Quincy railway unless by accident, for the reason that the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railway and the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific were competitors, and the Burlington road controlled the B. M. (answer 25). He testilies that he bought grain at Crete and as far west as Fairment, on the line of the B. M. railway (answer 31) and diverted it south over the Atchison & Nebraska because rates were better that way than over the B. & M. to Chicago, (answers 31, 32, 33 and 34) In answer to question fifty-six as to what effect the consolidation of these two roads had on rates Mr. Lowery testilies that were raised after the consolidation (answe 1)-that prior to the consolidation he used o have a rate of 6 to 7 cents per 100 pound to Atchison on corn, and that lafter the con-solidation the rate was 10 cents (answers 75 and 77). He says that he used Fort Scott coal up to the time of consolidation, but afterwards could not get any on account of the rate charged. (An swer 87).

The testimony of W. B. Morrison shows that he was engaged in the grain, stock and coal business, and was agent of the Atchison & Nebraska railroad at Hickman for seven & Nebraska railroad at Hickman for seven years prior to the consolidation (answer 286)—that the Atchison & Nebraska railroad a Hickman competed with the B. & M. at Crete and also at Wilbur (answer 290), and at Bemett and Palmyra on the Nebraska railway (answer 291) that he hauled hogs and corn from points on these latter two lines to the line of the Atchison & Nebraska railroad the line of the Atchison & Nebraska railroad where he shipped them (answer 200), and that he was not able to do so after the con solidation, because there was no competitio in rates (answers 295 and 295) and it was im possible to draw grain away from thos roads at equal rates. He testified that he handled Fort Scott coal before the consolida tion, but not afterwards on account of the increased rates. (Questions 200 and 303) is cross examination materially trengthened his testimony.
Mr. A. G. Beeson testifies that prior to the

consolidation, Lowery bought hogs and grain near Crete which he shipped south via the Atchison & Nebraska to Chicago. Robert Mitchell testifies that prior to the consolidation he bought stock from Kansas City (answer 53), but that after the consolidation he shipped nothing from that point as the rates on stock were ruised (answers 53) and 537). He testifies that the rate on cattle from Kansas City to Lincoln prior to the con-solidation was \$30 per car (answer 538) and that after consolidation, it was \$27 per car answerkey). In the determination of the fact as to whether rail way lines are competing or not their traffic arrangements and connections with other lines, must be taken into consider-

cases which establish this well known prin-

ation by the court; and in the brief of the state in this case some of the more important

roadbed and service of the Atchison & Nebraska railroad prior to its consolidation with the Burlington & Missouri Riverrailway and to efforts to belittle the testimony of the

We will discuss this evidence of the defendant collaterally as two consider the gen-eral situation of the railways in this part of the state as regarded eastern business at the time the Atchison & Nebraska railway was operated as an independent line. The testi-mony shows that from Lincoln the Burling ton & Missouri River ratiroad in Nebraska passed east to Chicago via the Chicago, Bur-lington & Quiney railroad. From Atchison, Kansas, there can to Chicago and St. Louis the following great lines or their immediate connections—the Chicago, Rock Island & Paconnections—the Chicago, Rock Island & Pa-cific railroad, the Missouri Pacific railway, the Chicago & Alton railway, the Wabash, St. Louis & Pacific railway, and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railway. Freignt from Lincoln might go to Chicago over the Atchison & Nebraska to Atchison and to Chicago from these areas of the consequence. Atchison & Nebraska to Atchison and to Chicago from there over any one of several great trunk lines. Was it a matter of indifference to the Chicago, Burlington & Qunney railroad at Lincoln whether freight went south over the Atchison & Nebraska railroad! Even Mr. Utt had not the audacity to testify to this, but in answer 453 of his cross-examination, admits the competition at Lincoln between the Atchison & Nebraska and its Chicago connections at Atchison, with the Burlington road. That this admitted compe-Burlington road. That this admitted competition for Chicago freight and other business at Lincoln, and along the lines of said roads within ten miles of Lincoln (see answer of defendant), should not extend to all points in that section of the state equally accessible to both lines, is not to be supposed, and the evasive testimony of Mr. Utt, the one witevasive testimony of Mr. Utt, the one witness by whom it is attempted to prove the absence of competition, cannot stand alone
against the testimony of Millar, the contracting agent of the old Atchison &
Nebraska railway, corroborated by the
clear and explicit testimony of Lowery,
Morrison and Mitchell, the latter three men
heims shippers over the line of the Atchison

being shippers over the line of the Atchison & Nebraska road. To such an extent was there competition between these roads that grain and hogs were hauled across the country from the very line of the Nebraska railway and shipped via the Atchison & Nebraska as testified to by Mr. Morrison, the agent of the Atchison & Nebraska at Hickman. There is a disposition on the part of Mr. Uit to demonstrate that whatever competi-tion there was at Atchison among the numerous roads from that point to Chicago, it did not extend to the line of the Atchison & Ne braska railroad. This is simply prepenterous.

The old through rate from Lincoln to Chicago via the Atchison & Nebraska railroad was the Atchison & Nebraska rate to Atchison plus the rate of the connecting road to Chicago. The sum of these two rates would depend on the water to Chicago. pend on the rate to Chicago made by the competing line at Atchison as much as upon the rate over the Atchison & Nebraska road. Unless the sum of these two rates was the same or less than the rate from Lincoln via the Burlington & Missouri River rallroad to Chicago, the Burlington & Missouri river rallroad would get the business and the Atchison & Nebraska get nothing. Any at-tempt to prove that the Atchison & Nebraska rallroad was not interested in getting through business away from the Burlington & Missourl river rallway by making the lowes possible rate to Chicago, is like attempting to prove that the Atchison & Nebraska railroad was run for amusement and not for pusiness As Mr. Millar of the Atchison & Nobraska testifies, of the different roads that ran from

which would make the lowest rate from Atchison to Chicago, and thereby enable the Atchison & Nebraska to make such a low rate along its line as to get business away from the Burlington & Missouri river railway, its natural competitor.

The testimony of Mr. Philbrick and of Mr. Berkey, both at present employes of the Burlington road, witnesses for the defendant, seems to be introduced mainly to show that the condition of

Atchison to Chicago, the road that "would bid the best for us would get our business," and the road that would do the best for the

Atchison & Nebraska was the one, of course which would make the lowest rate from

tion, was not what it should have been, nor as good as that now furnished by the Burlington corporation The testimony of Michael Derum now agent of the B. & M. at Nebraska City, is as to the open rates on the Nebraska railway prior to the consolidation, and has only collateral and Inferential bearing, if any, upon the case. In answer 23 he directly testines that "he does not know anything about the Atchison & Nebraska road." The testimony of Mr. A. B. Smith is mainly an attempt to belittle Mr. Lowery's testimony by an endeavor to show that he did but a small amount of business

over the road.
Mr. J. E. Utt is the one witness summoned by the defendant in this case who testifies at length and with any positiveness as to rates and the competition on the Atchison & Ne-braska road. His testimony is to be weighed in the balance as against that of Mr. Millar (his fellow emptoye), Mr. Lowery, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Morrison and Mr. Beeson. We think the testimony introduced by the state proves conclusively that the Atchison & Ne-braska railway competed with the Burlington & Missouri river railway not only for the local business of Lincoln and the country between their respective lines, but by means of its connections, on through business to or from this whole southeastern portion of the

What has the testimony of Mr. Philbrick and Mr. Berkey to the effect that the Atchison & Nebraska was not in as good condition before the consolidation as after to do with the case! Has there been any testimony introduced showing that the business now done over the Atchison & Nebraska is at present insufficient to enable its owners to keep it in proper condition? Is not the section through which it runs one of the most prosperous and thickly settled of our state! How otherwise could these counties carry an immense load of bonded indebtedness which they have in-curred for the benefit of these roads? The

curred for the benefit of these roads! The facts are that the Atchison & Nebraska is self-supporting, and always will be as shown by the table of carnings introduced by defendant, and if we are to go outside of true issues in this case, we must look at its present condition and not at its past condition.

An attempt is made by the defendan in the introduction of testimony, to show that a decree of forfeture will not result in good to the people of this state. While contending that this method of argument is entirely irrelevant and immaterial, and that the question which his court is to decide is upon our laws and their enforcement, we will yet conlaws and their enforcement, we will yet consider the matter briefly. Supposing that under this decree of forfeiture the Atchison & Nebraska railroad within the state of Ne-braska is offered for sale by the state. So strict are our laws against the destruction of competition, that the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroad, or its stockholders as individuals, can be prevented by injunction from purchasing it. If sold it must pass into the hands of those who will sperate it independently of the Burlington corporation, or it must be operated by the state. Even granting the improbability that an independent company in possession of this road would not immediately build the forty miles of road from the south line of the state to Atchison, we contend that the Atchison & Nebraska we contend that the Atchison & Nebraska railroad to Falls City, in the hands of an independent company, is better than the Atchison & Nebraska to Atchison in the hands of the Burlington company. That part of the Atchison & Nebraska railroad lying within this state, if it were an independent line, would have not only two alternative routes into Atchison, one via the Missouri Pacific railway at Falls City and one via the Atchison & Nebraska in Kansas; but it would have the power of making through rates by means of traffic arrangements with the Missouri Pacific railway to all points south and east, and on the north end it would have the power of making traffic arrangements not east, and on the north end it would have the power of making traffic arrangements not only with the Burlington, but with the Chicago & Northwestern, the Union Pacific and the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific railways. This is upon the assumption that the line would be cut off from Atchison by forty miles. Common sense indicates that this

ful consolidation. Let no sophistry blind our eyes to this fact. The enforcement of laws designed to protect the people from the destruction of competition between railways, cannot result in harm to the people. For eight years the evidence shows these two roads were in active competition. This com-petition has been obtained at a cost to the people of the southeast portion of the state of \$.97,000, as shown in this testimony, but although their taxes were made heavier on ac count of the subsidies voted to the Atchison & Nebraska railway, their rates of freight were supposed to be lighter. Suddenly rates were raised, and by the formation of this lease the competition for which they had paid so beavily was destroyed. This is the ease: This section of country was led into the payment of \$397,000 of subsidies to secure competition, but after the subsidies had been seenred competition was taken away con secured, competition was taken away con-trary to the express words of our statutes and of our state constitution.

A plea that no action has been taken for this length of time is not an answer sufficient

It seems almost impossible

that a dress already made

\$5 or \$6

If the goods will cost more

to stop action in the face of such facts as se, now that action is asked. It is dication that the people were contented with the lease of the road. We all know the weak-ness of such an argument for the reason that we all know the strength of the great corpor ation which is attacked in this case. That there was wide-spread protest and dissatisfaction at the time this lease was made is shown by the evidence of these shippers. Why action was not taken before this time, I care not. Perhaps it was because the shippers lacked organization, or because they lacked leadership; perhaps it was because the power of this corporation was such that they recognized the use-lessness of effort. If the fact that no action has been taken before this time, plays a part in this case, then every unpunished criminal is an argument in favor of crime and the abo ition of punishment, and every unenforced law is an argument against all law. An argument that no beneficial results will be reached, and that rates will not be lowered reached, and that rates will not be lowered by the forfeiture of this roas has nothing to do with this case. This is a question of law upon which you are to pass, not of probabili-ties; and the argument that no action should be taken because it cannot wholly restore the old competition, even if it were sound, would be against the defendant who makes it. It is based upon the principle that there should be an immunity from punishment for an offense. an immunity from punishment for an offense, if it can be shown that the offense has been committed so effectually and so completely. that its evil effects cannot be eradicated From a legal standpoint, the more clearly is is shown that by taking the action asked, th ourt can only partially restore the loss of competition, the greater is it the duty of the duty of this court to hold this corporation to its strict hability for this violation of law Never since there has existed a supreme court in this state has such a case been placed placed upon its docket. With but one determination should you approach it—the determination to enforce the law and to up hold the great constitution of our state. If we have reacted such a point that considerations other than the law and its en-forcement are to determine your action in this case, as is asked by counsel of the oppofavored place than the individual. What de favored place than the individual. What de-flance of law have the men in control of this lime exhibited! What a contempt for every interest save their own! What recklessness of conduct! Have the people who have paid so heavily in bonus for this Atchison & No-braska railway no right to consideration! Mr. Woolworth tells us of his innocent bondholders. Are the people who are receiving the interest on the bonds to be considered and not the people who are paying it? Her stands this railway corporation, pleadin for mercy before this court, and flaunt-ing in its very face, to show innocence of the charge of non-user, an issue of ove \$1,000,000 of bends put on the market and soil in the teeth of our constitution prohibiting such an action. Better to have been a deed corporation than one merely dead to honor, and alive to lawlessness. To what have we come in this state when before this, its high-

to plead a misuser of franchise in defense of the charge of non-user! the charge of non-user!

In these times of commercial turmoil and strife when men are in business conflicts, when the power of accumulated and corporate wealth seems to fetter and cumber the rights of the individual, when all over the country we see combination after combina-tion designed to curb the free course of busi-ness and to destroy competition, in such times as these a case like this becomes doubly important. In your hands there rests the mighty power of the people, who have valued to such an extent the preservation of compe-tion that in its destruction this corporation has struck at the constitution itself, et and expressed will of the people, and the bulwark of their liberty.

Before you we leave this case. Dr. Birney cures catarra, Bee bldg. PUBLIC PARKS.

## How They Have Increased During the Last Twenty-five Years.

With the great economic civic improvements that have been made in the cities of Europe and America during the past twenty-five years there has been a corresponding development of the means of popular recreation; and this progress has been strikingly sho wn in planning and construction of public parks, says a writer in Harper's Weekly. A quarter of a century ago there were but two well advanced rural parks in the United States, now there are more than forty, most of which are fulfilling in a large degree the beneficial purposes for which they were intended. Philadelphia, with its Fairmount park of nearly 2,800 acres in area, Chicago, with six parks completed or well advanced in construction; Brooks-lyn, Baltimore, St. Louis, San Francisco, and even smaller cities, as New Haven, Bridgeport, Albany and Buffalo, have provided themselves with rural parks, New York has nearly 5,000 acres of land devoted to park purposes, and spends nearly \$1,250,000 annually of the mainte, nance and development of her parks. Among European cities, London, Berlin, Rome, Brussels and Liverpool have within a generation twice doubled the area of their rural recreation grounds. All the cities of the British Islands thirty-five years ago possessed but four parks adapted to rurns recreation; now they contain thirty parks, averaging each 500 acres in extent. So essential have public parks come to

be ranked in a satisfactory city life, that a city destitute of one stands at a commercial and financial disadvantage. Beyoud their great utility in affording a means of preserving the health and business capacity of the urban population, public parks in another aspect directly pay for themselves. There is, for exampic, no doubt that the millions of dollars which Central park has cost New York have been returned through the profit that has accrued from the attractiveness of the city as a place of residence for men of means, and simply through the increased sale of real estate which has thus occurred taxes are actually lighter than they would have been but for the

Dr. Birney, nose and throat, Bee bldg,

Harvard students have taken up the quest tion of greater library and reading room ac-commodation and have succeeded in rousing the interest of the alumni to such an extenditional its most prominent graduates have consuch an action. Better to have been a deed corporation than one merely dead to honor, and alive to lawlessness. To what have we come in this state when before this, its highest tribunal, a corporation has the audacity Gore hall.