

Nebraska Independent

Consolidation of THE WEALTH MAKERS and LINCOLN INDEPENDENT.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY

Independent Publishing Co.

At 1190 H Street, LINCOLN, NEBRASKA. TELEPHONE 538.

\$1.00 PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

Address all communications to, and make all bills, money orders, etc., payable to THE INDEPENDENT PUB. CO., LINCOLN, NEB.

THE LEADERS HEARD FROM.

THE INDEPENDENT presents this week quite a large number of letters on the proposed abandonment by the populists of the silver issue.

We beg the pardon of our readers for having devoted so much space to this matter; but it is really important—more important, perhaps, than most of us realize.

THE OPPOSITE IS TRUE.

Those who advocate abandoning the silver issue contend that a further advocacy of that issue will cause the disintegration of the peoples party and destroy the reform press.

Exactly the opposite is true. If we abandon silver as an issue, or make any show of so doing, we will not only cease to gain converts from the silver republicans, where we are now rapidly gaining them, but we will lose thousands and thousands of those who have been with us in the past.

Mr. J. Burrows in a letter which appears in another column expresses a fear that there will be a middle-of-the-road party in this state.

Fusion with the democrats seems to be the bugaboo that has caused some of our middle-of-the-road brethren to scare at silver.

Chairman Butler of the national committee, advises going to Memphis, going into Van der Voort's press association and fighting it out.

The cotton mills involving nearly 4,000,000 cotton spindles have entered into an agreement to shut down two days of each week.

There seems to be some misunderstanding somewhere. There will be no conference at Kansas City; and no authorized conference anywhere.

In his last letter to the editor of this paper (at least the last when we went to press) Mr. Washburn says that we are the only populist in the United States who oppose his plan of dropping silver as a fighting issue.

The corn crop of the United States according to the report of the department of agriculture for 1896 aggregates 2,283,000,000 bushels.

Ex-Auditor Moore, is short in his accounts nearly thirty thousand dollars. There is a growing suspicion that every thing is not right with ex-Treasurer Bartley.

BY HIS OWN WORDS.

Mr. Washburn, in his last letter to the editor of this paper says: "I do not advocate the abandonment of silver, or any change in the platform, and my appeal must not be construed to mean that. You do not discriminate between planks and issues."

Really, this is kind. He don't advocate any changes in the platform. We never supposed he did. Only national conventions can change platforms.

"The democratic party proposes to continue the silver fight. Two parties cannot exist on the same issue."

Does that not imply that the people's party should abandon the silver fight? He refers constantly to paper money as our main plank and silver as a subordinate one.

"The substitution of our main plank for a subordinate one, as the fighting issue for the next four years, is in line with the best sentiment of our party."

If you substitute one thing for another, don't you abandon the latter? If you substitute paper money for free silver as the fighting issue, don't you abandon free silver as a fighting issue?

Then again he speaks about greenbacks and the railroad question as "the two strongest measures of our platform." Then free silver must be a weaker measure of our platform.

Again he says: "We are now free to act separately on advanced lines and to emphasize the real issue our party was born to advance."

Well, if greenbacks and government ownership are the "real issues," then silver must be a sham issue.

Then, speaking still of greenbacks and government ownership, he says: "We are issues free from the charge of mercenary motives to enrich a portion of our constituency."

Then silver must not be free from this charge. All these are deliberate attempts to discredit the silver issue.

Does that not imply that the gentleman from Boston in the habit of belittling issues he expects to advocate?

First he says that the silver plank is a "subordinate plank." Then he implies that it is a weaker measure. Then he implies that it is a sham issue.

In Mr. Washburn's letter of January 21st to the editor of this paper he speaks of "changing the fighting issue to scientific money and the government ownership of railroads."

Well, if you change to something, you must change from something. That something is, of course, free silver, as that has been the "fighting issue" in the past.

Mr. Washburn favors changing the fighting issue from silver to something else, don't he advocate abandoning free silver? But there is still more.

Mr. Washburn gathered his symposium of letters for the Boston Herald. In publishing these letters the Herald uses this language:

"Two weeks ago this morning the Herald published the first intimation of the dissolution of the alliance between the populists and democrats, and of the practical abandonment by the populists of Bryan and free silver."

"The public announcement was made in the form of an appeal to the populists of the United States signed by George F. Washburn."

Where did the Herald get its intimation that this meant "the practical abandonment by the populists of free silver?" It was acting as the organ of Mr. Washburn in publishing his letters.

"The public announcement was made in the form of an appeal to the populists of the United States signed by George F. Washburn."

Really, when Mr. Washburn says he does not advocate the abandonment of silver, and charges us with not discriminating between planks and issues, he merely quibbles with words.

He evidently means to say that he does not advocate abandoning the silver plank by taking it out of the platform. Of course not. But he practically admits that he does advocate abandoning silver as an issue. That is all we ever charged. That is enough.

British wheat imports—The London Times says: "The subjoined table, which gives the value of our imports of wheat from various countries for the eight months ended Aug. 31, shows that the United States has profited appreciably by the partial failure of the supplies usually put on the market by its competitors."

Table with 3 columns: Country, 1896, 1895. Rows include Russia, United States, Argentina, India, Australasia, British North America, and Other Countries.

The Profits of the Sugar Trust on Its Refining Business Alone Was \$236,240,000 IN 10 YEARS.

This Calculation is Based on the Sworn Testimony Given by Henry O. Havemeyer, Its President, and John E. Searles, Its Secretary and Treasurer, Before the Legislative Committee That is Now Investigating Trusts.

Both Mr. Havemeyer and Mr. Searles have testified that about 1,500,000 tons of refined sugar are annually consumed in the United States, and that the Sugar Trust controls about 1,200,000 tons of that output and the price.

Mr. Henry O. Havemeyer was called upon to and did give the committee a table showing the margin of profit to the refiner of sugar since 1886. The trust did not monopolize the business of refining sugar until 1887.

The figures given by Mr. H. O. Havemeyer under oath show that in 1886, the year before the Sugar Trust came into existence, the margin of profit to the sugar refiner was .58 of a cent a pound. His figures showed that since the formation of the trust the margin of profit to the refiner has ranged as follows:

Table showing profit per pound for years 1887-1896. Values range from .673 cents per lb. in 1887 to .908 cents per lb. in 1896.

Taking these figures as the margin of profit on refined sugar in connection with the statement of Mr. H. O. Havemeyer and Mr. John E. Searles that the Sugar Trust controls the output and the price of 1,200,000 tons of the 1,500,000 tons of refined sugar used in the United States each year, it is easy to make calculations which will show the unnatural profits made by the trust simply on its refining business.

The Sugar Trust refines and puts on the market 1,200,000 tons of sugar a year, according to the statements of Mr. H. O. Havemeyer and Mr. John E. Searles. 1,200,000 tons are 2,400,000,000 pounds.

Table showing total profit for years 1887-1896. Values range from \$16,152,000 in 1887 to \$21,792,000 in 1896. Total for 10 years is \$236,240,000.

LET THE PEOPLE KNOW.

Six weeks have now elapsed since the new state treasurer was inducted into office, and beyond the fact that several questions relating to depository banks have been submitted to the supreme court, the public knows very little more about the condition of the treasury than before.

The INDEPENDENT respectfully suggests that it is about time to let the people know what has become of their money. Has it been turned over or has it not?

We have been reliably informed that it has not. Outside of the depository banks, there seems to be yet a sum of half a million or more that has not been turned over.

The law provides that this money shall be turned over at once. But in this case six weeks have elapsed and still it is not in sight.

The bad feature about this is that if Mr. Bartley should be short three or four hundred thousand dollars in his accounts, this delay might furnish a loophole of escape for his bondsmen and the state be left to hold the sack, as it was in the Capital National bank failure.

The people would like to know the truth about the state treasury. Turn on the light.

WILL BE HELD IN NEVADA.

The legislature of Nevada has repealed the law forbidding prize fighting in that state, and as a result the great Corbett-Fitzsimmons battle will be held at Carson City.

TURN ON THE LIGHT.

In last week's INDEPENDENT we referred to a certain "middle of the road" populist who aided in the election of the goldbug Pritchard to the United States senate from North Carolina, when a populist might have been elected.

We have now investigated far enough that we are absolutely satisfied as to the truth of the statement. The prominent populist is Thomas E. Watson.

We have it from three sources. 1. It is openly charged and denounced by the Caucasian, of Raleigh, the populist state paper. 2. We have it in a private letter from Hon. John M. Devine, formerly of this state, now of Washington, D. C.

3. We have it in an interview from Senator Butler. Mr. Devine's letter charges that Mr. Watson wrote a number of letters to

members of the legislature in Pritchard's interest. The Caucasian article is similar to the statement of Senator Butler, which is given below:

"What," the Vice-President asked, "do you think of ex-Presidential candidate Watson's course in the contest?"

"Mr. Watson's course," he replied, "does not surprise me in the least. It is perfectly natural for a man who preferred the election of McKinley to that of Bryan, and so proved his preference by failing to vote for Bryan, to favor the election of Mark Hanna's man, Pritchard, to the United States senate in preference to the election of a straight populist senator, especially when the vote of that senator determines whether the gold men shall have a majority of the senate or the peoples party shall have the balance of power in that party to protect the interests and welfare of the people. It is very noticeable that nearly every fellow who posed as a middle of the road populist in the last campaign—every fellow that was such a straight and conscientious populist that he could not afford to vote the joint electoral tickets, when enough such votes would have meant the election of Bryan instead of McKinley—has been howling and working for the election of Pritchard and against the election of a straight populist for senator from North Carolina. This is true of nearly every one of the few middle of the road populists in North Carolina; and even of certain prominent so-called middle of the road populists in other states, who were so anxious for the election of Pritchard that they wrote letters and sent telegrams to Raleigh in Pritchard's interest, and advising the action of the bolters, and advising them to vote for Hanna's candidate instead of for a straight populist for United States senator. And chief among these was one Thomas E. Watson. Developments in the near future may throw some light on this meddling and strange procedure on Mr. Watson's part. But suffice it to say, that these facts throw some light on Mr. Watson's character and the motives that prompted him to pursue the strange and foolish course that he did in the last campaign.

"What," the Vice-President asked, "do you think of ex-Presidential candidate Watson's course in the contest?"

"Mr. Watson's course," he replied, "does not surprise me in the least. It is perfectly natural for a man who preferred the election of McKinley to that of Bryan, and so proved his preference by failing to vote for Bryan, to favor the election of Mark Hanna's man, Pritchard, to the United States senate in preference to the election of a straight populist senator, especially when the vote of that senator determines whether the gold men shall have a majority of the senate or the peoples party shall have the balance of power in that party to protect the interests and welfare of the people. It is very noticeable that nearly every fellow who posed as a middle of the road populist in the last campaign—every fellow that was such a straight and conscientious populist that he could not afford to vote the joint electoral tickets, when enough such votes would have meant the election of Bryan instead of McKinley—has been howling and working for the election of Pritchard and against the election of a straight populist for senator from North Carolina. This is true of nearly every one of the few middle of the road populists in North Carolina; and even of certain prominent so-called middle of the road populists in other states, who were so anxious for the election of Pritchard that they wrote letters and sent telegrams to Raleigh in Pritchard's interest, and advising the action of the bolters, and advising them to vote for Hanna's candidate instead of for a straight populist for United States senator. And chief among these was one Thomas E. Watson. Developments in the near future may throw some light on this meddling and strange procedure on Mr. Watson's part. But suffice it to say, that these facts throw some light on Mr. Watson's character and the motives that prompted him to pursue the strange and foolish course that he did in the last campaign.

"What," the Vice-President asked, "do you think of ex-Presidential candidate Watson's course in the contest?"

"Mr. Watson's course," he replied, "does not surprise me in the least. It is perfectly natural for a man who preferred the election of McKinley to that of Bryan, and so proved his preference by failing to vote for Bryan, to favor the election of Mark Hanna's man, Pritchard, to the United States senate in preference to the election of a straight populist senator, especially when the vote of that senator determines whether the gold men shall have a majority of the senate or the peoples party shall have the balance of power in that party to protect the interests and welfare of the people. It is very noticeable that nearly every fellow who posed as a middle of the road populist in the last campaign—every fellow that was such a straight and conscientious populist that he could not afford to vote the joint electoral tickets, when enough such votes would have meant the election of Bryan instead of McKinley—has been howling and working for the election of Pritchard and against the election of a straight populist for senator from North Carolina. This is true of nearly every one of the few middle of the road populists in North Carolina; and even of certain prominent so-called middle of the road populists in other states, who were so anxious for the election of Pritchard that they wrote letters and sent telegrams to Raleigh in Pritchard's interest, and advising the action of the bolters, and advising them to vote for Hanna's candidate instead of for a straight populist for United States senator. And chief among these was one Thomas E. Watson. Developments in the near future may throw some light on this meddling and strange procedure on Mr. Watson's part. But suffice it to say, that these facts throw some light on Mr. Watson's character and the motives that prompted him to pursue the strange and foolish course that he did in the last campaign.

"What," the Vice-President asked, "do you think of ex-Presidential candidate Watson's course in the contest?"

"Mr. Watson's course," he replied, "does not surprise me in the least. It is perfectly natural for a man who preferred the election of McKinley to that of Bryan, and so proved his preference by failing to vote for Bryan, to favor the election of Mark Hanna's man, Pritchard, to the United States senate in preference to the election of a straight populist senator, especially when the vote of that senator determines whether the gold men shall have a majority of the senate or the peoples party shall have the balance of power in that party to protect the interests and welfare of the people. It is very noticeable that nearly every fellow who posed as a middle of the road populist in the last campaign—every fellow that was such a straight and conscientious populist that he could not afford to vote the joint electoral tickets, when enough such votes would have meant the election of Bryan instead of McKinley—has been howling and working for the election of Pritchard and against the election of a straight populist for senator from North Carolina. This is true of nearly every one of the few middle of the road populists in North Carolina; and even of certain prominent so-called middle of the road populists in other states, who were so anxious for the election of Pritchard that they wrote letters and sent telegrams to Raleigh in Pritchard's interest, and advising the action of the bolters, and advising them to vote for Hanna's candidate instead of for a straight populist for United States senator. And chief among these was one Thomas E. Watson. Developments in the near future may throw some light on this meddling and strange procedure on Mr. Watson's part. But suffice it to say, that these facts throw some light on Mr. Watson's character and the motives that prompted him to pursue the strange and foolish course that he did in the last campaign.

"What," the Vice-President asked, "do you think of ex-Presidential candidate Watson's course in the contest?"

"Mr. Watson's course," he replied, "does not surprise me in the least. It is perfectly natural for a man who preferred the election of McKinley to that of Bryan, and so proved his preference by failing to vote for Bryan, to favor the election of Mark Hanna's man, Pritchard, to the United States senate in preference to the election of a straight populist senator, especially when the vote of that senator determines whether the gold men shall have a majority of the senate or the peoples party shall have the balance of power in that party to protect the interests and welfare of the people. It is very noticeable that nearly every fellow who posed as a middle of the road populist in the last campaign—every fellow that was such a straight and conscientious populist that he could not afford to vote the joint electoral tickets, when enough such votes would have meant the election of Bryan instead of McKinley—has been howling and working for the election of Pritchard and against the election of a straight populist for senator from North Carolina. This is true of nearly every one of the few middle of the road populists in North Carolina; and even of certain prominent so-called middle of the road populists in other states, who were so anxious for the election of Pritchard that they wrote letters and sent telegrams to Raleigh in Pritchard's interest, and advising the action of the bolters, and advising them to vote for Hanna's candidate instead of for a straight populist for United States senator. And chief among these was one Thomas E. Watson. Developments in the near future may throw some light on this meddling and strange procedure on Mr. Watson's part. But suffice it to say, that these facts throw some light on Mr. Watson's character and the motives that prompted him to pursue the strange and foolish course that he did in the last campaign.

"What," the Vice-President asked, "do you think of ex-Presidential candidate Watson's course in the contest?"

"Mr. Watson's course," he replied, "does not surprise me in the least. It is perfectly natural for a man who preferred the election of McKinley to that of Bryan, and so proved his preference by failing to vote for Bryan, to favor the election of Mark Hanna's man, Pritchard, to the United States senate in preference to the election of a straight populist senator, especially when the vote of that senator determines whether the gold men shall have a majority of the senate or the peoples party shall have the balance of power in that party to protect the interests and welfare of the people. It is very noticeable that nearly every fellow who posed as a middle of the road populist in the last campaign—every fellow that was such a straight and conscientious populist that he could not afford to vote the joint electoral tickets, when enough such votes would have meant the election of Bryan instead of McKinley—has been howling and working for the election of Pritchard and against the election of a straight populist for senator from North Carolina. This is true of nearly every one of the few middle of the road populists in North Carolina; and even of certain prominent so-called middle of the road populists in other states, who were so anxious for the election of Pritchard that they wrote letters and sent telegrams to Raleigh in Pritchard's interest, and advising the action of the bolters, and advising them to vote for Hanna's candidate instead of for a straight populist for United States senator. And chief among these was one Thomas E. Watson. Developments in the near future may throw some light on this meddling and strange procedure on Mr. Watson's part. But suffice it to say, that these facts throw some light on Mr. Watson's character and the motives that prompted him to pursue the strange and foolish course that he did in the last campaign.

TO RAISE REVENUE.

The plan of the incoming administration to raise additional revenue is beginning to take form. It will fall principally upon the necessities of life—upon coal, lumber, wool, and sugar. Coal is produced in this country in larger quantities than any where else in the world. It will be taxed, and men will contribute to the support of the government according to the amount of coal it takes to keep them warm. If they try to keep warm with woolen clothing, there is no escape, for they are to be treated in the same manner. The poor man eats as much sugar as the rich man, and therefore a tax upon sugar compels him to contribute as much as the latter to the support of the government. Do you think the trust will pay the tax? Yes. How? By raising the price on sugar.

MR. GAGE'S VIEWS.

McKinley's new secretary of the treasury is not only a pronounced gold-bug—he is an opponent of all sorts of government paper money. He favors only one kind of paper money, viz., national bank notes. It might be incidentally mentioned in this connection that Mr. Gage himself has been a national banker all of his life. He therefore voices the sentiments of the national bankers in demanding that they have an absolute monopoly of the paper currency of the country.

Here are Mr. Gage's views on the different kinds of paper currency as given out by himself:

"The greenback controverts the principle of paper money, viz.: That every note injected into the commercial system should represent an existing commercial value.

"The treasury note is a standing evidence of a foolish operation—the creation of a debt for the purchase on a falling market of a commodity for which the purchaser has no use; it lies open to the just charge of being both idiotic and immoral.

"The national bank note nearly conforms to the true principles of paper money, but the unreasonable requirements of security paralyze its efficiency and operate to destroy its elasticity.

"The silver certificate encourages the use of silver to a larger extent than is consistent with the safe preservation of that metal on a parity with gold."

Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. Not satisfied with having destroyed silver, the gold-bugs now propose to go a step further. They now propose to destroy the government paper money.

REAL HARMONY.

One or two of the letters published in this week's INDEPENDENT urge harmony. We agree with them. We always favor harmony, but never at the expense of principle. The "re-organizers" have forced this issue. By their calling of conferences over the protest of the chairman and secretary of the national committee; by their attempts to retire the silver issue; by their furnishing necessary votes to elect a gold-bug republican senator from North Carolina, when a populist might have been elected; by their persistent attacks upon Butler, Allen, Weaver and others; by their constant talks of "reorganizing" the party—these people have brought on the fight. Now is the time to settle it, before this fall's conventions. Let us turn on the light and get at the truth. Let us have the matter over while we are about it. Then, when it is over, we will have real harmony.

IN THE AUDITOR'S OFFICE.

When the Hon. Eugene Moore turned over his office as auditor to his populist successor, Hon. John F. Cornell, it was supposed by every one that the books of this office would prove that there had been at least one honest state official. But such was not the case. Mr. Cornell and his deputies Mr. Lichty and Mr. Pool proceeded at once to make an investigation and determine the exact condition of the affairs of the office. Their work is not yet completed. At this time there is due the state of Nebraska according to his own books, the sum of \$27,482 of which amount Mr. Moore has paid into the treasury the sum of \$1,500 leaving a balance due the state of \$25,982. Mr. Moore's friends insist that he will make this good, but if he does he will be the first state official short in his accounts that ever did. Nine weeks have passed since he turned over the office to Mr. Cornell and \$1500 is all he could raise in that time.

THE SUGAR TRUST.

The examination now going on before the Lexow committee is bearing great fruit. In another place we give a statement of the profits of the great concern. The Havemeyer's by their own testimony are guilty under the laws of the state of New York, where they live, of "conspiring to monopolize a necessary of life and to control its supply and price." The punishment prescribed by the laws of New York for the crime is "a fine not exceeding \$5,000 or by imprisonment not longer than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment." Do you think the Havemeyers, who have confessed their guilt, can or will be punished by either fine or imprisonment? What a spectacle it would make, a sugar trust magnate in jail. Our jails and prisons are well filled, but not with this class of thieves and robbers.

Windmill Cheap.

We have on hand a good new windmill steel tower, with anchor posts complete, which we will sell at a bargain for cash or will take a cow for part payment.

1000 ash \$1

APPLE, 3 to 4 ft. 25; Cherry, 3 to 4 ft. 25; Concord grape vines \$2; WE PAY THE freight; Complete Price List Free. J. Y. M. SWIGART, Lincoln, Neb.