

More Home Print  
Than Any Other  
A Peoples Party  
Paper in the U.S.

# The Nebraska Independent

A Club of Five  
Subscribers from  
Now Until Jan.  
1st, 1901, \$2.50

VOL. XI.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA, FEBRUARY 22, 1900.

NO. 41.

## MEETING OF THE POPULIST NATIONAL COMMITTEE

### The Populists Stood by their Organization and Kept it in the Hands of Tried and True Reformers.

## AN ATTEMPT TO PACK THE HALL WITH REPUBLICANS FRUSTRATED

### Wharton Barker's Delegates and Republicans Holding Proxies Withdraw and Name D. "Glam" Deaver as Chairman.

## A UNION OF FORCES AGAINST PLUTOCRACY MADE CERTAIN.

The meeting of the populist national committee was set for the 19th. That was on Monday, but as early as Saturday the committee began to arrive. The fusion men came in with a determined look on their faces. They knew the life of the populist party depended upon winning this fight against Mark Hanna's attempt to secure the control of the populist party. They were men who had fought out many a contest against plutocracy, but this time they were resolved to stand by the old ship, and if she was sunk to sink with it and go down beneath the waters with guns firing and the flag waving.

The night before the committee met the fusion forces met in conference at the Lincoln hotel in private rooms on the fourth floor. There were many familiar faces there, many men whose hair had grown gray since they enlisted. It was a good representation of the intellectual force of the populist party. They were not brawlers, they did not impugn the motives of each other, though at the beginning they were not at an agreement. They all listened respectfully to what each one had to say.

The writer of this went into that conference, with, as he thought, his mind made up. He was firmly convinced that that Omaha agreement, as it was called, was of no binding force in ethics or in law. Those men who were at that conference and who had insisted on that arrangement, when they were pledging themselves to stand by it, had in their pockets the type-written plans for the calling of the Cincinnati convention, and within one hour they had gone out and had called that convention, afterwards attended it, organized a new party and put up their presidential candidates. Therefore he held that no attention should be paid to it.

But there were Cyclone Davis and Harry Tracy from Texas who said that they had accepted that agreement in good faith, had gone into the south and declared to the people there that the populists of the northwest were true and honorable men, and were not the scoundrels that Joe Parker and Milton Park declared that they were, and that they pledged their honor to the people of the northwest would stand by that agreement. They said that believing and trusting in them, the populists of Texas had elected a delegation to the populist national convention, 90 per cent of whom come to that convention and cast their vote for W. J. Bryan and Judge Caldwell. They also pledged themselves that Alabama certainly and probably Georgia would follow the example of Texas and send the same kind of delegations.

By the time that Harry Tracy and Davis had concluded their remarks, this pop editor was in about the same neck of woods and was ready to say: "Thus almost persuaded me." But there were many good men who were not persuaded and hour after hour was passed in the most earnest discussion. Tracy and Davis had no better opinion of the Wharton Barker bolters than we of Nebraska had. They claimed that if we followed out their plan that it would leave the Barker crowd without a corporal's guard of following in the south. Finally it was agreed, although no formal vote was taken upon it, that the committees should go ahead and appoint a day and a place to hold the populist national convention.

Then the question came up as to what was to be done with these men who had bolted the party and nominated their own candidate and were wading along in the middle of a road knee deep in Mark Hanna and boodles. There was but one opinion on that subject. They were not members of the populist party and had no right to sit in its conventions or to participate in its councils. A resolution to that effect was passed unanimously. It was very late at night, or perhaps more accurately, very early in the morning when this conference broke up.

Meantime the fellows who came here in the interest of Wharton Barker and Mark Hanna were holding a council of their own under the leadership of D. Clem Deaver and Joe Parker of Kentucky. This writer was not invited. They wouldn't even give him a ticket of admission. But a friend of his was in there taking notes. Joe Parker had his pockets full of proxies and D. Clem was instructing him who were the reliable republicans to whom they could be distributed so that they could report that they had earned their salaries and were not away simply on a picnic.

They did not make many mistakes in this matter and this writer saw sitting on the floor as proxies, five men, citizens of Lincoln, whom he knows have always worked for and with the republican party and two of them sport as vile characters as it is possible for any man to acquire in this western country.

Finally the hour for the meeting of

## SENATOR ALLEN'S SPEECH

### On a Bill to Confiscate the Property of the People and Make the National Debt Perpetual.

The following is part of the speech of Senator Allen delivered in the United States senate, Wednesday, February 7 and Thursday, February 8:

Mr. ALLEN. I have been looking up the discussion of 1893 and I find by examining the Record that the senator from Rhode Island was present, giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the people on that occasion. He was one of the gentlemen who voted to repeal the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act of 1890; and by his vote, by his associations, by his influence, and by what he said, he gave currency to the thought that it was not within the power of Congress to create or affect values by legislation. Now he admits that it is. The progress is somewhat slow and possibly painful, but nevertheless marked.

I was about to say before engaging in this side discussion that that question seems to have been settled by those who formed the Constitution and adopted it, for Congress is by that instrument given power "to coin money and regulate the value thereof." Certainly it must have been in the minds of those who framed the Constitution and in the minds of the people who adopted it that it was within the power of Congress to regulate the value of money.

What does "regulate value" mean? Can not regulation be carried to the extent of creating and destroying? "To regulate" certainly means to affect, to change, to move from one standard to another. If the value of money were a thing fixed by trade, then it was a work of prerogative in the fathers of the constitution to invest that power in congress. The power to control the volume of money, to issue money, and to regulate its value is a sovereign power which no government has a right to alienate or abandon. You might as well say, if you have a right to turn this power over to the national banks or to private institutions, that the power to tax the people, which is also a sovereign power, may be farmed out to private individuals and exercised by the few to the detriment of the many, as it was in Rome at one time in her history.

The power to raise armies and navies, which is a part of the power to make war and essential to national preservation, is a sovereign power; yet congress has as much right to turn over to private individuals and private corporations the power to make war, to conclude peace, to raise armies and to construct navies as it has to turn over the power to coin money and regulate its value.

Whenever we concede that congress has the right to abandon one of these powers to be exercised by private institutions or individuals, we admit that congress has the right to abandon all sovereign power and to turn over the government to its entirety to private interests and the few, and therefore, because this bill is an abandonment of the sovereign power to make money and to regulate its value, I am opposed to it.

In 1893 when we were discussing the money question here, another argument was made by the honorable senator from Rhode Island and I refer to him because he is the general tipstaff and major-domo of his party. That argument was that silver should not be coined on terms of equality with gold because the silver barons would make money out of it. And we all recall the drivel that was sifted out of the hustings about the 50-cent dollar, as though such a thing as a 50-cent dollar were possible.

How stands the argument in respect to this bill? Who is protesting on that side against turning over to the national banks the right to make, by the issuance of their currency and by the retirement of the different forms of paper money and silver, more money than the "silver barons" in their wildest dreams ever expected to make? It was wrong in our nation of silver mines in 1893 to make money out of the people. So said our friends upon that side of the chamber. It was wrong to put them where they were before the crime of 1873, and it was a crime against civilization and against the rights of the men, women and children of this country, let it be sneered at publicly or privately as it may. If it was wrong to coin silver at a ratio of 16 to 1 at that time because it would result in a benefit to a certain class of our citizens to the greater number than the beneficiaries of this bill, is it not for a like reason wrong in 1900 to pass this measure when its only beneficiaries will be about 3,500 banks? I am not the enemy of legitimate banks. I realize as fully as any man the necessity of banks of discount and deposit. In our complex civilization they can not be dispensed with; they are necessary.

But when they perform those offices they perform every function that pertains to legitimate banking, and when they are permitted to issue their notes as money they are invading the sovereign power of the people of this nation. There is where I draw the line, and there is where I believe the people will draw it forever.

Mr. President, this is a bill for confiscation. Our constitution provides that "no state shall... pass any... law impairing the obligation of contracts." So the framers of the constitution said. And yet this bill by its express terms impairs the obligations of all contracts, public and private. Now is there any doubt about that? It may be said that while the constitution prohibits a state from passing laws impairing the obligations of contracts that it does not prohibit the nation; and I ad-

## MAGRUM SPEAKS OUT

### Says the Americans Took the Oath to Oom Paul and Went Off to Fight The British.

Much has been said in the papers about the American consul having deserted his post at Pretoria and the appointment of Secretary Hay's son to take his place. Mr. Macrum now gives his reasons to the public for his action. He says that when he started for America he did not know that there was a secret alliance between this country and the British.

Washington, D. C., Feb. 14.—The following signed statement was given out to night by Charles E. Macrum, former United States consul at Pretoria:

"The situation in Pretoria was such that, first, as an official, I could not remain there, while my government at home was apparently in the dark as to the exact conditions in South Africa. Secondly, as a man and citizen of the United States, I could not remain in Pretoria, sacrificing my own self respect and that of the people of Pretoria, while the government at home continued to leave me in the position of a British consul and not an American consul. I want to say right here that there was not one single request made of me through the department of state looking to the care of British interests in Pretoria which I did not fulfill and report upon according to my orders. On the other hand, American interests in South Africa were in that condition which demanded that the department of state should be cognizant of them.

"I issued the statements received from the state department that Americans must remain neutral. In the face of this the Americans were continually going to the front and taking up arms in the cause of the Boers. I could not help but know that many of these were citizens of the United States. I also knew that many of them in utter despair at the apparent attitude of our own government, were taking the oath of allegiance to the Transvaal republic. When affairs had reached that state that my vice-consul, Mr. Van Ameringen, closed up his business, took the oath of allegiance to the republic, and went to the front as a burgher, I thought the time had come and I should make a report of these conditions.

"It was over four weeks from the time the war opened before I received a single mail dispatch from my government or a personal letter. The mail for the Transvaal had all been stopped at Cape Town in order of the high commissioner. When this mail was finally forwarded to me, after Col. Stowe, the consul-general at Cape Town, had secured its release, I had the humiliation as the representative of the American government of sitting in my office in Pretoria and looking upon envelopes bearing the official seal of the American government opened by an official sealed with a sticker, notifying me that the contents had been read by the censor at Durban. I looked upon international law, but failed to find anywhere that one military power can use its own discretion as to forwarding the official dispatches of a neutral government to its representative in a besieged country.

"The mail service from Delagoa bay to Europe was continually interrupted by the action of British men-of-war at that port. The service was over two weeks longer than by the west coast and there were continual rumors that that port would be closed and communication with the outside world entirely shut off.

"The cable service for the Transvaal was absolutely cut off, I was privately informed by the Belgian and German consuls at Pretoria that their official cables in code to their governments had been refused by the censor. I filed one cable in the interest of an American in Pretoria which was refused absolutely by the censor in Durban. This cable I sent to the fiancée of a Mr. Nelson, an American business man in Pretoria. She was on her way to South Africa from Buffalo, N. Y., when the war broke out. According to a letter which Mr. Nelson received just before the war commenced, she was buying her trousseau in Europe. The cable requested her to come by the east coast. When I informed Mr. Nelson that the cable had not been sent, his brother took the oath of allegiance to the republic and went to the front.

"But these are simply minor details. The misrepresentations which had been going on before the war and after it opened were of such a serious nature, and would require such detailed explanation, that on Nov. 6 I filed a cable to the department in code, stating that I wished leave of absence in order to visit the states. I set forth in this cable that my vice-consul had enlisted in the Boer army; that Mr. Atterbury, an American whom I have known very favorably for more than a year, could take charge of the office until my return. In reply to this dispatch, which was forwarded without any delay, I received from the department a reply advising me that my presence at Pretoria was important to public interests. On November 8 I telegraphed again, acknowledging the receipt of the cable and advising the department that the situation was not critical; that Mr. Atterbury was competent; that my presence in America was important. No reply was received until I wired again on Nov. 11 stating that no reply had been received and again urged a favorable reply. No reply was received to this. On Nov. 14 I again wired the department, stating that I could not leave without permission, that I would forfeit my post if the reasons which I would make to the department did not prove satisfactory. This cable was delayed by the censor under Dec. 2, when I had advised that it had just been forwarded. On Nov. 18 I again filed a cable, stating that three of my cables had been unanswered and stating that a substitute would be

## THE GOLD BILL PASSED

### An Unlimited Issue of United States Bonds and a Perpetual National Debt Established.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Feb. 15.—The senate substitute for the house currency bill was passed by the senate today by the decisive majority of 46 to 29. Prior to the final passage of the bill, amendments were considered under the ten-minute rule. Only two of these amendments were adopted, viz: One offered by the finance committee, keeping the door open to international bimetalism, and one by Mr. Nelson of Minnesota, providing for national banks with \$25,000 capital in towns of not more than 4,000 inhabitants.

The vote taken on the various amendments offered were practically along party lines. Mr. Chandler (rep., N. H.), voted for the bimetallic amendment, but against the bill. Mr. Caffery (dem. La.) and Mr. Lindsay (dem. Ky.), voted against the committee amendment, but for the bill. Mr. Kyle (S. D.) was the only senator who did not vote and was not paired. The free silver substitute offered by Mr. Jones, the leader of the democratic side, was defeated by a majority of 19, the vote being 47 to 28.

The bill as passed consists of ten sections. It provides that the dollar of 25.8-10 grains of gold, nine-tenths fine, shall be the standard unit of value and that all forms of United States money shall be maintained at a parity with it, and that treasury notes and greenbacks shall be redeemable in gold.

The secretary of the treasury is to set apart a fund of \$150,000,000 for the redemption of these notes and to maintain this fund at a figure not below \$100,000,000; he is empowered to sell bonds of the United States, bearing interest at not exceeding 3 per cent. It shall be the duty of the secretary of the treasury, as fast as standard dollars are coined, to redeem an equal amount of the treasury notes and to issue silver certificates against the silver so coined. Under certain provisions, too, gold certificates shall be issued against the gold held in the treasury. No United States notes or treasury notes shall be issued in denominations less than \$10 and silver of a denomination to exceed \$10.

The secretary of the treasury is also authorized to refund the bonded indebtedness of the United States in thirty year bonds bearing 2 per cent interest, the principal and interest on these bonds to be paid in gold. The 2 per cent bonds shall be issued at not less than par. Any national bank, by depositing with the United States, bonds of this country, shall be permitted to issue circulating notes to the face value of the bonds deposited, no bank being allowed to issue circulating notes in excess of the amount of the paid in capital stock of the bank.

The bill as amended, passed, 46 to 29, as follows:

Yeas—Aldrich, Allison, Beveridge, Burrows, Caffery, Carter, Clark (Wyo.), Cullom, Davis, Deboe, Depew, Elkins, Fairbanks, Foraker, Foster, Frye, Gear, Hale, Hanna, Hamont, Clay, Cozwell, Culbertson, Daniel, Harris, Hatfield, Jones (Ark.), Jones (Nev.), Kenney, McEnery, McClaurin, Martin, Money, Morgan, Pettus, Rawlins, Stewart, Sullivan, Tallaferro, Teller, Tillman, Turley, Vest—29.

Ex-Senator Gorman

Mr. Gorman has recently given out an interview for the purpose, as he says, of correcting some misstatements about him which have appeared in the press, and this is what he says:

"I am just as much opposed to the nomination of Mr. Bryan today as I was in 1896," said he this evening. "He is the same man, standing on the same platform, and the same reasons against his nomination apply with even more force today than then. I do not think his nomination would be wise and I have not said that nothing can prevent it. On the contrary, while I realize that he has the support of the people to a remarkable degree, I believe his nomination could be prevented if those who believe it unwise would get together and unite their efforts. Every now and then I hear an influential man in the democratic party say that he does not think we ought to nominate Mr. Bryan but that he does not see how it can be prevented. The united action of people who feel that way can prevent it. Mr. Bryan has a great many unwilling supporters."

"Will you support Mr. Bryan if he is nominated?"

"I am a democrat and I never desert my party."

Taking that as the correct representation of his views, the Independent wishes to say that Mr. Gorman advertises himself as a political scoundrel of a worse character than he has ever been charged with. A man who will say that he is opposed to Bryan and the principles that he represents and yet will support him for president is a dangerous character and should never be allowed to hold office of any kind. Such a man is on a level with an anarchist and a traitor to his country. He should be driven out of decent society. There is no honor or principle in him.

Club of five subscribers from now until January 1, 1901, for \$2.50. Every body rustle.

## ENGLAND IN TREMORS

### It Is Acknowledged That the Empire is in Danger—Russia's Movements Excite Alarm.

The following discussion took place in the English house of lords the other day:

The earl of Rosebery said he fully realized the gravity of the situation and agreed with the previous speaker in thinking that the measures adopted were inadequate in the circumstances. He also doubted whether "the paper force of 400,000 men in Great Britain," to which the secretary of state for war had referred would stand analysis. For the volunteers Lord Rosebery said he had the highest respect, but by no stretch of the imagination could they be called soldiers, as it was admitted that they needed months of training annually to render them efficient.

"The crisis in South Africa is urgent," continued Lord Rosebery. "But we must not keep our eyes on South Africa alone. Last December the government made urgent overtures to great powers, Germany and the United States, for an alliance, but those overtures were not received with such cordiality as to encourage the government to pursue them. It does not appear that the friendship of France would bear any great strain, and as to Russia, events have been recently witnessed in Persia about which England would formerly have had something to say, but which she now passes unnoticed.

"It now becomes the situation to take a large grasp of the situation and to make no sudden proposals. If Great Britain were to lose South Africa she would lose the most important base outside of the United Kingdom, and she would lose colonial support which has been given because the colonies have believed that they were associating themselves with a powerful empire, and thus the empire would break away from us. If this be not a life and death crisis I do not know what is."

The Earl of Kimberley, the liberal leader, said he felt the danger of the situation equally with Lord Rosebery. Although he would not ascribe a direct hostile intention to Russia at the present moment, he said that he could not overlook the fact that there was a movement of troops in progress, which, if not menacing, showed at least possibilities of the future.

(Continued on page 8)

(Continued on page 2)