

## Mayor Bryan's Candidacy

The campaign for the democratic gubernatorial nomination is fairly under way. The announcement by Mayor Bryan of a number of progressive measures that he believes should be adopted in Nebraska in the interest of the people, coupled with the announcement that it was almost impossible to secure the passage of the reform measures through the legislature on account of interference of special interests under the leadership of organized booze, has brought all the corporation-controlled press of the state upon their hind legs in holy horror. In the last session of the Nebraska legislature the fire insurance combine, under the leadership of a prominent democratic lobbyist, endeavored to pass what was known as a uniform rate bill. If this bill had gotten through, it would probably have cost the fire insurance policyholders of this state a million dollars extra annually in premiums. The Omaha World-Herald was kind enough to credit the defeat of that iniquitous measure to the influence of Charles W. Bryan.

The people of Omaha asked the legislature to pass a bill giving to the people of Omaha the right to vote bonds to establish a municipal electric light plant. If the permission had been given, the people of Omaha would now be saving annually in their bills for electric current a quarter of a million dollars that is now going to a private corporation that has no competition. The opposition to giving the people of Omaha the right to engage in municipal ownership was led by another prominent democratic lobbyist representing the private Omaha electric light plant. The bill passed both houses of the legislature by a public vote, and following its passage a number of members of the legislature identified with the wet corporation element, who voted publicly for the passage of the bill, privately petitioned that the bill be vetoed, making a majority of the legislature opposed to the bill after its passage. The Omaha News, a large, independent daily, was generous enough to attribute the passage of that bill through the legislature to the influence of Charles W. Bryan, who has been advocating municipal ownership of public utilities for a number of years.

Mayor Bryan, in his candidacy for the democratic nomination for governor, is warning the people against permitting the fire insurance combine to get control of the legislature. He is favoring giving to Omaha a municipal electric light plant to protect the people of Omaha against the extortions of a private corporation. He favors the re-nomination and election of Woodrow Wilson. He is an advocate of the good roads movement, and favors rural credit legislation in the interest of the farmers. He is advocating the development of the water power of the state by municipal, county, district and state development so as to give to the people of the farms and in the cities electric current which will light their homes and operate their machinery, furnish heat to take the place of high priced coal, operate interurban railways, and will break the strangle hold of the private light and power companies which is preventing the growth and development of our state and which is preventing the people of Nebraska from utilizing their natural resources for the benefit of the people who are entitled to them.

Mayor Bryan has declared in favor of helping to secure federal aid to enable the people of Phelps, Gosper and Kearney counties to secure the flood waters of the Platte river to supplement the rainfall, which will double the crop production in all of those counties.

He favors the reduction of telephone rates in Nebraska to a reasonable basis, and believes that the power of the railway commission should be used to protect the public rather than to restrain the public while the public service corporations collect an amount in excess of a reasonable rate on the investment after the moisture is squeezed out of the stock.

He believes that it might be well for the state to provide hail insurance to protect the farmers against impositions and loss.

The issue that Mayor Bryan is submitting to the voters is whether they want progressive development for the state, or do they prefer to drift for another two years while the wet, cor-

porate interests of the state dominate the state senate and block all legislation affecting the public service corporations in return for protection of the organized booze interests of the state.

Mayor Bryan has made an enviable record as chief executive of the capital city, and also has devoted much time to protecting the people's interest on bills that have been before the legislature. He has devoted the past twenty years of his life in an effort to protect the weaker members of society against the strong, and he entered the gubernatorial contest for the purpose of being in a better position to carry out a constructive program under the leadership of the chief executive of the state. If the voters of Nebraska believe in the progressive measures that Mayor Bryan is advocating, if they want a man to head the state ticket who has a program and a record that will appeal not only to democrats but to independent republicans as well, they should not only support Mayor Bryan's candidacy at the primaries April 18, but they should also endeavor to interest their neighbors in supporting his candidacy on account of the benefits they will receive by the fulfillment of the program which he advocates. W. J. BRYAN.

### TILLMAN DEFENDS DANIELS

The following letter is self explanatory: United States Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. February 28, 1916. Henry Reuter Dahl, Esq., New York City.

Dear Sir: I am mailing you a single copy of a speech I made in the senate some time ago in which I paid my respects to von L. Meyer, former secretary of the navy. I haven't read all of your article, but I have read far enough in it to find out its purpose and intent is to praise von L. Meyer and abuse Daniels; and I can not help but wonder who is inspiring you to do this. Your idea of the secretary of the navy is summed up in the first paragraph: "Allowing the professional men to run the show, they simply supplied the official signature which made the wheels work." That was the type of secretary von L. Meyer was. I know, because I visited his office a few times while he was in it. Daniels is running the navy now, and that is the reason you are abusing him. He is a thorough democrat; perhaps too much of a democrat for a cabinet officer, for he was a poor boy who has fought his way up from the ground and doesn't feel because of his official position that he is superior to a Jackie; therefore, he did not hesitate to have his photograph taken between two of them. Imagine von L. Meyer doing such a thing as that?

Admiral Dewey is well satisfied with the efficiency of the navy at this time and its progress under Daniels, as he testified in the letter which I published. Admiral Benson is also well contented with the conditions, although he wishes to make them better. All of the deficiencies which Admiral Fletcher's report showed were due, as I proved by the record, to republican inefficiency, and to von L. Meyer's own lack of loyalty to the navy itself as a fighting machine. The surprising thing is that a sensible man like you should attempt to charge Daniels with being guilty of this crime against the navy, for it is a crime that the fleet is not in better condition than it is. The more evidence you pile up, and you submit a great deal of it about the navy, the heavier grows the indictment against von L. Meyer and the republican congress, and I am surprised that your own sense of fairness did not make you realize this. But I waste time in writing to you. Read my speech and then I will be glad to hear from you if you have the nerve to write.

I will be glad to have you send 25 more copies of your screed if you have it printed in pamphlet form, to send out, together with a copy of this letter, and a copy of the speech I delivered in the senate.

Have you the nerve to do this? I will see. Very truly,  
(Signed) B. R. TILLMAN.

### THE DEMAND FOR WAR

A group of New York gentlemen have announced a meeting at which speeches will be made demanding that this country lay aside neutrality and enter the war on the side of the allies.

By what name shall we characterize this effort to involve us in the horrors of this awful war? If it is almost treason to plead for peace, what is it to argue for war? We have reached an unhappy condition when any American will speak for such a cause, or when any considerable number will assemble to listen to such speeches.

## The Real Test

The attempt to distinguish between a merchantman armed for DEFENSE and a merchantman armed for OFFENSE will prove futile if the discussion is intended to affect the question of passengers. If the submarine must comply with the rules governing cruisers and allow time for passengers to escape it would seem logical to compel the merchantmen to obey the rules governing merchantmen and not resist attack. It would be absurd to say that the submarine can not attack the merchantman until the passengers are taken off and then allow the merchantman to sink the submarine while it waits.

And if the merchantman has no right to RESIST, why allow it to carry arms? As long as it is permitted to carry arms—and there is no excuse for carrying them except for use—the submarine can have no assurance that its obedience to international law may not prove fatal to it. And why should an American citizen be permitted to put his life in the hands of the captain of a belligerent ship, to be forfeited if the captain decides to use the ship to resist attack? And why should this government permit the question of peace or war to be decided in a moment of excitement by the captain of a belligerent ship who, by resisting attack, risks the life of an American citizen?

W. J. BRYAN.

### HEARING FROM HOME

The discussions in congress show that the republicans also have been hearing from home. Nine-tenths of the voters of the United States believe that AMERICANS SHOULD BE KEPT OFF OF BELLIGERENT SHIPS, and the republicans in the senate and house are speaking out. It is interesting to read the arguments made by democrats and republicans in favor of giving warning—they are seeking to keep their constituents out of an unnecessary war. And the other side? Well, it was not an argument, it was abuse. They say it is "unpatriotic." We are now asked to allow the jingoists to define patriotism for the nation, and to fasten upon us the duellist's standard of honor. It would be a reflection upon the intelligence of the people to assume that the country would set up this sham standard of honor and turn itself over to the disciples of wholesale butchery.

The people along tidewater who are crying loudly for protection from unnamed and unknown probable invaders of the country, assert that the lack of enthusiasm in the middle west for the program is due to its distance from the supposed danger zone. In other words, they are patriots and the people of the interior are not. If that is the case, then it is not asking too much of the tidewater folks that they pay their own life and fire insurance.

From the moment that the campaign to arm the nation against imaginary enemies was begun, every form of graft that has been discredited in the last ten years of national progress stuck its head above the horizon and began to look hopeful again. An era of exploitation of the public tax money is a period when corruption flourishes and every cramp-fingered grafter in the country gets busy.



CAN'T EMBARRASS THE COLONEL  
—From the Louisville Times.