

hours a week by instructors. A little more than a year ago it was observed that the head of one department had reported a greater number of students than were registered for work in his department for that semester. Five years service on the "Time-card committee" had compelled me to become familiar with the workings of all other departments, with their hours, with their number of students, and, to some extent, with the nature of the work. Without this information the schedule cannot be constructed. My familiarity with the work of other departments enabled me to see at a glance that a mistake had been made in this report. The chancellor was a new man in the university and I supposed he would be glad to have the mistake pointed out. His attention was called to the fact and (presumably at his request) the professor submitted a revised report containing forty-three fewer students than the first report contained. In conference with two members of the board the chancellor stated to them in my presence that the second report contained more students than the first report. He has since made the same statement to others. Along with this second report appeared an explanation of the cause of the mistake and a complaint against the "meddler," the "Paul Fry" in the university. It seemed proper to explain the circumstances attending the "meddling" though, of course, the reports of the professors are public documents and have always been filed in a convenient place for inspection by members of the faculty or by anyone interested in the various departments. I therefore prepared an explanation and asked that it be filed along with that of the professor. Both explanations disappeared from the files and I have not seen the originals since. I have copies of the two reports and also of the two "explanations," all of which may be published later if it seems best.

Since the beginning of the present school year in September this matter has not been discussed, and when incidentally referred to was understood by me to be a case already settled. The investigation of the question seemed to me to be none of my business. The fact of a mistake in the report seemed to me to call for notification to the executive. I am not conscious of having "meddled" in any other affair of any department.

The only other important charge which has been brought to my notice I learned first from the newspaper accounts of the action of the board as communicated to the reporters by the chancellor. It was stated in several of the papers that the executive committee of the board instructed the chancellor to "warn" me not to interfere with other departments. I have no recollection of receiving such warning and I am certain it was never given in such manner as to suggest its official nature. Fatherly advice has often been given me by the chancellor along with many most flattering compliments; as, for example, in our most friendly conference before the regents met, the chancellor earnestly said he wished I "would prefer charges" against the professor whose report was corrected. Of course I did not consider this official advice and took the liberty of ignoring the remark. It is barely possible that the "official warning" referred to came in some such friendly way, but I cannot now recall any such fact.

But even if "warning" had been given there has been no instance during the present school year in which either the spirit or the letter of it has been violated; it is true that in the interest of the university I endeavored to arrange a compromise by which the readjustment between two other departments could be effected with less friction, and as it seemed to me with greater justice to both men. I am not certain, however, that either the board or chancellor knew of this "meddling" at the time of my dismissal.

The third specific charge which has come to me is a case in which I "do not co-operate with the faculty." It is a fact that I do not report students for membership in Phi Beta Kappa. This matter has never seemed to me to be a university affair. As far as I know the regents have never authorized the establishment of a chapter of this society or even recognized its existence. Quietly enough the professor whose report was corrected is said to agree with me on this point and has also neglected to "co-operate."

The preceding instances are the only specific reasons for my removal which have been given to me in an official manner. In a personal interview a little over a week ago the chancellor said to me in almost these words, "You have said I am incompetent, insincere and untruthful, you must first retract those statements as a basis of settlement between us." This was the first direct evidence I had obtained that the chancellor's recommendation to the board was caused by personal feeling. Of course I was unable to say that I now believe to be untrue, and hence our conference was fruitless.

That the real cause is different from those officially assigned is further evident from the anxiety of the chancellor to "recommend me to a better school than this, and for a position with higher salary than I have received here." And "such is his influence with other presidents" that I would be certain to obtain whatever he asked for me. And yet my crime cannot be very serious else this way out of the "series of blunders" would not have suggested itself to a "competent" and honest man. His deep interest in my welfare is seen even to greater advantage in the proposition made to three friends of mine, that if I would agree to it, he would secure me a "leave" of absence for one year on half pay, without expectation of further service to the state. Silence is indeed golden.

The foregoing statements have seemed to me to be due to my friends who have wondered at the action of the board. No one could have been more surprised than myself, for though I felt that the chancellor was not deeply attached to me I had come to think that absolute devotion to duty would atone for shortcomings in the eyes of a few men in the faculty and even for differences of opinion from the chancellor.

H. K. WOFFE.

THE SUGAR TARIFF.

Is Not Levied for Protection but Helps to Build the Great Trust.

The theory of protection has for its foundation argument the building up of new industries or assisting those that need temporary assistance. The tariff tax which it is proposed to levy upon sugar cannot be justified by any such argument. The tax which it is proposed to levy is a varying one that amounts to about one and five-eighths cents per pound.

There may be some who believe that this will benefit the sugar industry, some who do not believe that the trust has complete control of the sugar business in the United States, some who think that it is an infant industry that needs protection. For those we quote the following from the Congressional Record of the proceedings of the Senate. Senator Caffery said:

"The American Sugar Refining Company monopolizes the purchase and sale of cane sugar. It monopolizes the sale of not only the cane sugars of Louisiana and the beet sugars of Nebraska and California, but the cane sugars of the world. The rise or fall of a half cent a pound makes an enormous amount of money. In round numbers the amount of sugar consumed in the United States is 4,000,000,000 pounds annually; with half a cent a pound in favor of the trust, which melts all our sugar, it amounts to \$20,000,000. So it is easily perceived what is the animus, the impelling cause that brings the American Sugar Refining Company to the doors of congress at every session demanding a tariff in its behalf.

There was some very interesting testimony given before the special committee to investigate attempts at bribery in 1894, contained in senate document No. 606, in regard to the monopolistic character of the American sugar-refining interests. Mr. H. O. Havemeyer is the witness whom I propose to quote. He appeared before that committee to testify in regard to the question then under consideration, which was whether United States senators had been speculating in sugar stocks. The senator from Nebraska, (Mr. Allen) asked Mr. Havemeyer the following questions:

Senator Allen. And when you sell in this country you control the price?

Mr. Havemeyer. Yes, sir.

Senator Allen. And it was organized, Mr. Havemeyer, as I understand it, with the view of controlling the price and output to the people of this country?

Mr. Havemeyer. That was one of the objects of the consolidation.

Senator Allen. And you have succeeded in doing it?

Mr. Havemeyer. Yes, sir.

Senator Allen. That was the principal object in organizing the American Sugar Refining Company?

Mr. Havemeyer. It may be said that that was the principal object.

Mr. Havemeyer is exceedingly frank. He does not equivocate a particle. The object of organizing the American Sugar Refining Company was to control the price of sugar in the United States, and he succeeded in his object. He controls the price, or his company does. Here it is, plain, unequivocal, unambiguous:

Senator Allen. And making money instead of that control?

Mr. Havemeyer. Yes, sir.

Senator Allen. At the time of your organization, in 1891, I understand that you were capitalized for \$50,000,000?

Mr. Havemeyer. At the time of the reorganization the capital was \$50,000,000.

I will read again where this monopolist, this confessed monopolist, says that he controls the price in America, and he runs up the price precisely to the importing point.

Senator Allen. The American Sugar Refining Company is able to control the price of the sugar sold in the United States, is it not?

Mr. Havemeyer. Up to the importing point, it is.

I will read further from this witness. He goes on in his testimony and states that after the formation of this trust they bought up nearly all outside companies. After stating that purchase Senator Allen asked him this question: Before that—

That is, before the consolidation—you had not been able to control the price of sugar absolutely? There was competition between the American Sugar Refining Company and these outside factories?

Mr. Havemeyer. Yes, sir.

Senator Allen. That competition you succeeded in destroying by bringing them into the trust, did you?

Mr. Havemeyer. Yes, sir.

Senator Allen. And made the price of sugar to the American Sugar Refining Company much more favorable than it had been before that time?

Mr. Havemeyer. Precisely.

So they do not control the price, they not only hold up the price to the importing point, but they advance the price immediately after the consolidation of the companies.

Mr. Havemeyer testifies again as to what he had been making. The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Allen) asked to know how much was the price additional to what it would have been had there been no consolidation. Mr. Havemeyer answers with great frankness.

Senator Allen. And what difference does it make for the consumers in this country in a year, in your judgment?

That is, the additional price asked over and above the competing price before the consolidation.

Mr. Havemeyer. It has been in three years past three-eighths of a cent more on every pound they are, as against doing business at a loss.

A half cent a pound would be about \$20,000,000; three-eighths would be \$15,000,000 that the American Sugar Refining Company here say that they placed upon the people of the United States in excess of the price that was charged for sugar prior to the formation of this trust. Then Senator Allen asked him the following question: And that would be about how much in round numbers?

Mr. Havemeyer. It is a large sum in the aggregate.

Senator Allen. How many millions?

Mr. Havemeyer. I should say it was close to \$25,000,000 in three years.

It would be a little closer to \$45,000,000 in three years, I suppose he thought as he was dealing in millions, that \$25,000,000 was close enough to get to \$45,000,000.

In his testimony somewhere, which I read a little hurriedly this morning, not expecting to take the floor, Mr. Havemeyer makes the further statement that the profit he makes upon every pound of sugar refined is a quarter of a cent.

That was under the operation of the McKinley law. This was before the Wilson Act took effect. He acknowledged to a profit of a quarter of a cent a pound.

Mr. Caffery continued and by tables showed that the rate in the proposed schedule now before the senate, the benefits to the trust would be greater than under either of the preceding acts.

ALLEN ON LUMBER.

[Continued From First Page.]

was a race of jackals before that committee. Every man who appeared before me was interested in the lumber trade in some form or another.

The men who wanted protection, the men who owned the forests and who wanted to grow rich out of the people who are compelled to use their product, were there in great numbers. The men who were handling the lumber as an occupation, or thought of making an occupation of it, were there. Not a home builder in the United States, not a representative of the humble classes who are building up the cities and the villages of the great west and south was there. These hearings were not open to him. Neither the doors of congress nor the doors of the committee room were open to the representatives of that class of people. They were open only to those who had gotten rich out of tariff taxation.

Mr. President, the adoption of this paragraph will place every farmer in the Missouri and Mississippi basin and the great west and southwest at the absolute mercy of the men who control the pine interests of this country. What does it signify to a farmer today? To pay the tariff tax on a thousand feet of lumber means 20 bushels of corn to the farmer according to current prices. It means between 16 and 17 bushels of oats, it means about 4, or between 4 and 5 bushels of wheat. If he builds a home requiring 10,000 feet of lumber, which will be a humble home indeed, it takes 200 bushels of his corn at current prices to pay the tariff tax. What reason is there in permitting less than a dozen men or a dozen institutions of this country to levy upon every corn field and oat field and every wheat field of the United States a tribute of this kind? Why should not these men be put upon an equality in the market? Why should not the men who are dealing in white pine today be compelled to walk out into a competitive market and take their chances in that market as other people are required to do?

Mr. President, it will not do to say that the American wage earner in the pine woods of the United States is paid more and better wages than the Kanuck is paid. The truth is, the wages across the line as a whole are higher than they are in the United States for like services. There is nothing in that argument. The claptrap so frequently used in these discussions, that the interest of the wage earner is advanced and the poor man's condition in this country is improved over the condition of a like laborer in another country, can not be urged in this case. No, Mr. President, it is simply an attempt, in my judgment, to pay back to this great syndicate or these great syndicates of lumber owners a compensation which possibly they advanced less than a year ago.

Mr. President, larceny is larceny; it makes no difference what name you may give. You may call it a breach of trust, you may call it a breach of good faith, you may call it embezzlement, you may give it any soft-sounding name you see fit, but a law that permits one class of people to take from another without compensation their just and honest earnings is, in the eyes of the law, of the higher law and in the eyes of honest men, nothing short of absolute larceny, legalized larceny.

We have thirteen and a half million of homes in the United States. Many of our people are undergoing the privation of pioneer life. Life at best in the great West and in the undeveloped portion of the country is a constant struggle. Why should not those who are marking out the pathway of civilization and endeavoring to build up homes be encouraged to some extent at least? Why should not the material that enters into the construction of their humble abodes be free from taxation, especially when there is no necessity of levying a tax for the revenue upon lumber?

Mr. President there can be no excuse for this. The people are disorganized; they are not organized like the syndicates controlling almost one half of the white pine of this country. They are too poor to come to congress and hang around these lobbies and galleries to influence the action of congress. They can not do that. Many of them would be unable to get here and return from the profits of their farms. They must depend upon their sense of right and the patriotism of their representatives here to protect them from such an enormous evil as the imposition of a tariff upon lumber would be.

Every prairie in the land, every interior section of the United States, under just legislation upon this and upon other questions, would have a school house and a church and colleges as gorgeous and commodious as the most populous city. Is there any reason why they should not have these accommodations? Are they not American citizens? Do they not bear their burdens of taxation and the other burdens of government when called upon, and do it willingly and uncomplainingly? Why should any man in a populous city have a greater opportunity to enjoy the blessings of life in this country than should be enjoyed by the farmers and the industrial classes under a just and humane system of legislation?

The people whom I represent in part in this chamber are victims of the lumber trusts, and syndicates. I speak for my people, and I say, Mr. President, notwithstanding my friend from Maine, for whom I have great respect personally, that the great bulk of the men engaged in felling trees and sawing lumber in this country, are men of foreign birth. I say that 80 per cent of them from Maine to Minnesota are men of foreign birth, and a great portion of them are not citizens of the United States.

You can not secrete the fact from a person who takes a trip through these great pine forests, who watches the industry, and looks at the men engaged in the labor, that they are men who do not naturally belong to this country. They come here, as any other man comes, for the purpose of making a few dollars, and when those few dollars are made, they return to their foreign homes. They do not get any particular protection or increase of wages in consequence of a protective tariff. Show me an industry in the United States—one of them alone—the wages of whose operatives have been increased by tariff taxation, and I will show you an isolated instance in the history of the country. I say, sir, there is not an industry in all the ramifications of the industrial pursuits of this country where the wages of the men who perform the labor have been materially

increased by the imposition of tariff taxation—not one.

I know senators who will rise in their places and discourse upon the beauties and sing the song of protection, and yet look at our country and see who profits by the imposition of a tariff of that kind. Where is the millionaire who has earned a livelihood or a fortune by his hand or his craft? There is not one. But, Mr. President, the Atlantic seaboard has its thousand and thousands of millionaires who have made their millions within the last thirty years under the pernicious influences of high protection.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the senator kindly tell us how many thousand millionaires there are on the Atlantic coast?

Mr. ALLEN. I think about 4,000. I do not know that the senator from New Hampshire is one of them. I hope not. I think it is generally accorded that there are about 4,000 of them. Mr. President a third of a century ago there was not one. Before the imposition of the tariff of 1861 there was not a millionaire in this country who had made his fortune through tariff taxation. Yet sir, they have increased until they amount to thousands, and where in all the nation can be found a man who is dependent upon his hands or upon his brain as an operative who has been able to do more than to keep soul and body together and care for his little family in a humble way?

I know that this was called to my attention very forcibly a few years ago. I noticed a little factory. The man had grown rich. He had accumulated a fortune and when I came to investigate, I found out that he and his neighbor, a few years before, were alike humble farmers, living upon adjoining farms, each industrious, each possessed of about the same amount of ability, each economical. One had grown to have a tremendous fortune as a manufacturer. The other had barely held his own during those thirty years, being able to hold on to his little homestead. Can any man convince you, sir, that a law which will produce results of that kind is just to those two men? A law, the result of which will make one class rich and the other poor is unjust and inequitable; and when you come to apply a law of that kind to thousands and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands, who are carrying the torch of civilization upon the great prairies and in the mountains and upon the valleys of the west, you are imposing upon civilization a burden which it ought not to be called upon to bear.

Sir, make our homes free—as free as they can be made consistently with the raising of sufficient revenue to conduct the affairs of the government. Make the three great essentials to human life, shelter, clothing and food, as free as the air and sunlight. The American people are entitled to have them free as they can be made, consistent with the raising of revenue to conduct the government."

OUTSIDE OF OMAHA

How Country Patients Are Reached and Cured by the Perfect Mail System of the Shepard Medical Institute—Read the Evidence Below.

One-half of the extensive practice of Dr. Shepard is conducted at the patients' homes by the use of the Home Treatment. By means of a carefully prepared Symptom Blank, which, when filled out, gives a full history of the complaint, the age, the habits and characteristics of the patient, the complications existing and the particular phases of the disease suffered from, Dr. Shepard is enabled to accurately diagnose and prescribe for each patient. Thus every symptom, every fact desired is down before him in black and white and is always on hand to refer to and study. No point is forgotten, as every feature of the disease is fully covered. Those who send for a Symptom Blank receive a letter of information also. When the Symptom Blank is returned the case is diagnosed, the proper treatment for the first month is prescribed and shipped immediately by express, the patient is notified thereof in a letter of instructions and is requested to report his condition within a week. Every week he sends in a report, which is fully replied to. Dr. Shepard keeps in constant touch with the patient, and, whenever necessary, makes such changes or modifications in the treatment as are required. The correspondence is a pleasure and a recreation for the patient and most valuable to the physician.

It matters not how far you may live from Omaha or how near you are to the city, you can get, by mail, a close, careful and scientific treatment of your case.

tack of la grippe left him greatly debilitated. He goes on: "I kept getting thinner and weaker until I could hardly get around. I lost 23 pounds in weight. Besides the affection of the head and bronchial tubes I suffered severely from catarrh of the stomach, obstinate constipation and MENTAL DEPRESSION."

"I sent for Question Blank, and after a short course by mail found myself restored to excellent health. I'm all right now in every way and can't say too much in favor of the Shepard treatment by mail."

CATARRHAL ASTHMA.

Miss Alice L. Woodard, University Place, Neb., was ailing four years as a result of a severe attack of congestion of the lungs. She writes to Dr. Shepard:



Miss Alice Woodard, University Place, Neb. "I cannot say too much in praise of your Home Treatment. You were very patient and kind in handling my case and I am now in fine health. Now I don't have to cough and sneeze until exhausted when I get up mornings. Formerly I had a dry, hacking cough with soreness and tightness through the chest. My tongue was always coated and my breath offensive. In fact, the whole system seemed poisoned by infections that were always present until you took hold of my case. I felt from the first few doses that you would cure me, and as my system became cleansed and strengthened my lungs got well—asthma and all. Many of my friends have written for the Home Treatment since you cured me."

\$5.00 A MONTH.

Distant patients are welcome to our famous Symptom Blank, that covers all chronic diseases. Write for them and get a free and careful opinion from physicians who treat hundreds of cases every month. If you take treatment the fee is \$5.00 a month, medicines included.

A COWBOY.

W. A. Cole, Eckard, S. D., a ranch and cattleman, writes that for five years he had been running down in health without finding the cause. He was cheerful in look, but his nerve power was steadily failing. The Home Treatment cured him.



W. A. COLE, ECKARD, S. D. "I was nervous and irritable, got tired easily and had roaring noises in my head. The sense of smell was impaired. I had catarrh first of the head, then of the stomach and liver. I coughed and gagged much mornings; often in severe coughing I raised blood. Dr. Shepard's medicines, sent me at my home, straightened me out very quickly and I am now as well as any man in South Dakota."

COUNTRY PATIENTS.

H. R. EGGLEMAN, BLISS, NEB. A farmer of wide acquaintance in Holt county, writes that for many years his constitution has been impaired by catarrhal poison. Then, five years ago, a severe at-

HOME DOCTORING.

A Kansas School Teacher Cured Through the Mails.

Mrs. Lottie Scribner, Havenville, Kas., writes with enthusiasm of the Home Treatment. Her letter runs as follows: "Dr. Shepard, Omaha: This testimony was due you something like a year ago, and I now give it with a great sense of thankfulness. After teaching school several years I found I was a victim of catarrh in its most offensive form. I tried several doctors and numerous remedies with little benefit. Then I took a course with you and found it a perfect cure. My general health has been splendid since you discharged me as cured in the summer of '96. Please send a symptom blank to all for my mother. I hope you can cure her also."

Shepard Medical Institute,

C. S. SHEPARD, M. D., Consulting and Physician, ROOMS 211, 212 & 213, NEW YORK LIFE BUILDING, OMAHA, NEB. Office Hours—9 to 12 a. m.; 2 to 5 p. m. Evenings—Wednesdays and Saturdays only—4 to 8. Sunday, 10 to 12.

Chicken Mite Exterminator Lice Killer

No handling of poultry is needed, simply paint roosts, nest boxes, cracks in boards, and Mite Exterminator will do the rest. 1/2 gallon of Mite Exterminator will make 100 gallons of a solution that will destroy all kinds of vine bugs, such as cucumber, squash, pumpkin, cabbage, tomato, celery, etc. Agents wanted. Send for circular that tells all about it.

One-half Gallon.....25 cents
One Gallon.....50 cents
Five gallons.....\$3.00

MANUFACTURED BY JAMES CAMERON, Beaver City, Neb. Will give "Subscription Coupons" good for payment for subscription to the INDEPENDENT to all who purchase. Write for particulars.

Call or write to me for time orders, prices, etc.

The Omaha, Chicago and points in Iowa and Illinois, THE PATENT OFFICE has been notified.

TRADE MARK

BILLMEYER & SADLER

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL

- Carriages
- Phaetons
- Surreys
- Buggies
- Traps, Spring Wagons, Road Wagons and . . .
- Harness.

Just Received from Manufacturers five car loads of vehicles on which we will make Prices that will ASTONISH YOU!

Largest and most complete Stock in the State

1133-35 N Street.

June 15th, 1897.

Subscribe for this paper. Keep posted "up to date."

Loan your paper to your neighbor. Perhaps he will subscribe.

The INDEPENDENT 1 year \$1.00.