

THE BRIBING OF GOMEZ

More Neely Scandals in Cuba—Something New in "Pensions"—The (an) Civil Service—The Brilliant Shallenberger

Washington, D. C., June 16, 1902.—(Special Correspondence.)—Close upon upon the withdrawal of the American troops from Havana and the establishment of the Cuban republic come charges that have such a ring of truth to them that the administration should come forward and give us light. The payment to General Wood of a sum of money from the Cuban treasury to General Maximo Gomez, by the advice and with the approval of the administration at Washington, to keep the followers of Gomez in check, pending the formation of a government in Cuba, is the new subject that is likely to call from the republican speakers some adroit explanations. At first came deliberate denials—denials, denials. But later it was learned that such a grant had been made and that the late President McKinley had authorized it. But there are other charges in connection with the same grants. Gomez, it is charged, was bribed on the authority of McKinley not to make trouble and thus help the republican party in the last election. They felt that a rebellion in Cuba, while another of the same sort was going on in the Philippines, would endanger republican chances and so the small amount that it has been alleged was paid to Gomez, was the best few dollars used in the huge republican campaign fund.

The man who makes the charges and puts his construction on the payment of the large sum, is none other than Charles Dodson, a well-known and respected correspondent of the Associated Press at Havana. He was in New Orleans yesterday and gave an interview to the Statesman in which he declared that there would be revealed in Washington during the course of the present week some of the most startling facts concerning General Wood's management of Cuba and the continued fleecing of her treasury. He declared that he knew where the checks for the amounts could be found and that he could lay his hands on them in a moment. He claimed that there was no secret in the matter among General Wood and his friends. He asserted that President McKinley knew of it and authorized it; that President Roosevelt knows all about it; but that General Wood, although directly connected with it, did no more than carry out the orders of his superior, President McKinley.

Gomez's friends had declared that it would take money to secure his withdrawal from the race for the presidency of Cuba and had declared that if his wishes were not complied with, that he would raise an army to go to the eastern part of the island and start another revolution. So the administration rather than have trouble, just previous to the elections of 1900, when the dreaded question of imperialism was before the people, deliberately bribed General Gomez to keep him and his cohorts quiet. These are the facts that are denied by the administration and by General Wood. It is a question of who's telling the truth. Veracity!

Now the fact remains that Secretary Root, when confronted with the charges, declared that the correspondent must have been mixed. It was a pension that the administration was giving Gomez. And that the amount was small. But the official records show that twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000) was given to Gomez and the administration cannot deny this. Why was Gomez given such a pension, is the question that the administration must answer. And until that question is answered and positively, too, is not the statement of Dodson, backed up by the official record showing the payment of large sums to Gomez at the time asserted, at least a bit of circumstantial evidence and strong enough to convict? It is an excellent opportunity for the republican administration to give us light upon the status of the Cuban treaty. Has Neely made use of it and now and has been freed by the general amnesty act of the Cuban congress. Wood seems to have made use of it by authority of his superior officers, to bribe General Gomez, and Dodson asserts that this is not all. The American people want light. Light! Light! Let us have light!

President Roosevelt has been acting autocratic again. He has violated the civil service regulations to get rid of a petty clerk who has seen fit to give her views to the press concerning the conduct of affairs in the Philippines and who had particularly attacked the president's assertion that "the flag shall stay put." He has changed the existing civil service regulations so that he could get rid of this clerk, whose yearly salary amounted to but seven hundred dollars. Miss Rebecca J. Taylor, a clerk in the war department, was discharged from the war department for the circumstances cited above. She is a brilliant woman, perhaps her superior cannot be found in the whole series of departments here. She had written for over two years for the newspapers declaring her views upon the question of the Philippines and had lately attacked Roosevelt upon his recent speech. The president, the great civil service stickler, decided that he must have her scalp, civil service or no. So he construed a section so that he could get rid of her and after a conference with Secretary Root she was called upon to find out whether or no she had written the letter referred to. She immediately answered affirmatively and so she was ordered out. Yet the civil service states time and time again that no one shall be discharged

chief executive of the nation, came down from his exalted position to get back at this poor woman clerk, who had taken occasion to attack a policy that seven million free thinking American voters had declared was undemocratic, unrepresentative and vicious in all of its tenets.

Immediately her friends sought the two most able men in congress—men who are as fearless as they are honest, and begged that the question be considered in congress, to find out whether or no the president could act so autocratic. In the senate, Senator Carmack introduced a resolution of inquiry into the matter and he proposes to fight the question to a finish. In the house that eloquent young member, Ashton C. Shallenberger, was singled out to make the fight and he is determined that the president shall not be allowed to so flagrantly abuse the provisions of the civil service without the attention of congress being called to it. He also introduced a resolution and will call it up today. There is no probability that he will be allowed to discuss the question, because a tyrannical republican majority, realizing that question is of importance will refuse to listen to him. But however the question has gotten a good airing in the papers throughout the length and breadth of the country, so that one can see how flagrantly the civil service has been abused in this case. Of course no one ever dreamed, even in his idiot moments, that politics ever entered into the civil service. It would have been but a fleeting dream even to the most ardent thinker, but it has been abused and the country has an acute instance of it.

The senate has been considering the interoceanic canal bill all week. Speeches have been made pro and con on the relative merits of the routes under discussion. Since Mount Vesuvius has made such an awful outbreak, the question of earthquakes and volcanoes seems to have been a live topic for discussion. One senator will assert that Nicaragua has a number of volcanoes, his successor in the field will then positively contradict him and give him figures relative to the Panama conditions. We have been given notice that a vote will be taken upon the question on Thursday of this week and that before that time quite a number of senators will address the senate. Today Senator Kittredge of South Dakota will be the principal speaker. On Tuesday, Senator Stewart, on Wednesday, Senator Hanna will close in favor of the Panama route and on Thursday, Senator Morgan will end all argument by a plea for the Nicaraguan canal route, for which he has spent nearly his whole life.

The house has had several measures under consideration and has passed one of great interest to the good people of Nebraska. That is the irrigation bill, and its passage was cheered and cheered by the western members. Debate was started on Wednesday and concluded on Friday when the bill was passed by a great big majority. Old Joe Cannon, a republican from Illinois, blustered and argued about his ability to beat the bill, but he signally failed to align a large part of his party against it. It was doubted by many that it would pass, but I have heard it said that the speech delivered by that young Demosthenes of Nebraska, Mr. Shallenberger, did more to secure it than any other speech. This is the congressman's third speech in any length during the session and when it was learned that he was to speak many members phoned out to their friends to come up and hear him. For already he has gotten the reputation of being a very good speaker and of always giving light when he does speak. So the galleries were filled when he began to speak and before he had half finished his speech his time had expired. The house then at that late hour, a thing almost unprecedented, extended his time once again as long as he had been previously granted and this without a dissenting voice. When he had concluded his speech, many republicans as well as democrats came over to him and personally congratulated him. Representative Dalzell, a republican, rushed over to him and shouted: "It's the best speech on irrigation I ever heard and one of the best speeches delivered during my long service as a member of this house." It (the speech) was printed to the extent of a column—an unusual thing—in the Times on the following morning and many have decided that the young member is the most promising that has come from the western country since the days of Bryan. He has certainly made his mark—that no one can doubt—and in this day when the committee on rules is the ruling fact in the house, it is difficult for a member to get his speech in. It has now come to be the fact that when Mr. Shallenberger wants time he can get it. The house realizes that when he speaks that they are going to get information and he gets the time. Ability is always recognized. Every one who wants information on this subject should write to Mr. Shallenberger for his speech on irrigation. It is a masterpiece, not only of English, but an accumulation of facts that shows an extensive search. It should be for a man who can deliver such a speech in his first term certainly deserves the suffrages of his constituents who must feel proud of themselves.

The Cuban reciprocity bill will be considered in the senate immediately following the passage of the interoceanic canal bill. There are fifteen bolting republican senators who are strongly against the bill. They are even willing to unite with the democrats to secure the passage of the house bill rather than ally themselves with the administration senators on the question. President Roosevelt

LYING AS A FINE ART

Mr. Van Vorhis Exposes the Deception Practiced by the Comptroller of the Currency in Making Reports.

(No man in the United States has given more thought and painstaking study to the national bank question than Hon. Flavius J. Van Vorhis of Indianapolis, Ind. Every abstract sent out by the comptroller of the currency is carefully analyzed by Mr. Van Vorhis and duly commented on in a well prepared article, if the occasion seems to require comment—which it does. In cases out of ten, Independent readers will remember the correspondence between the comptroller and Mr. Van Vorhis regarding the national banks which are violating the national banking law by keeping a reserve below what the law requires. It appears that the only effect of Mr. Van Vorhis' correspondence has been to make the comptroller rearrange his abstract so that the table will not show upon its face which banks are violating the law. A correct statement of fact made with intent to deceive is as truly a lie as though the facts are mis-stated with like intent. In fact, the most dangerous lie is that based upon correct statements of fact so made that the wrong deductions will be made; and it grieves The Independent to confess that many of the government departments at Washington have made this sort of lying a fine art.—Ed. Ind.)

Editor Independent: It has become a real art in the departments at Washington to make reports and escape the charge of falsehood and yet conceal the truth, or make it so obscure that it will be misapprehended or overlooked.

In a former article I mentioned correspondence in which the comptroller of the currency admitted that abstracts of the reports of the condition of the country banks, and one that office for over five years, did not show correctly the condition of the reserves.

Those who have given attention to the subject know that the law provides for a reserve of 25 per cent in all reserve cities and 15 per cent in all other places. They ought to know also that the law provides for a reserve of 4,092 per cent, that it is a legislative fraud contained in the original law creating national banks enacted in the sixties.

No. 28 of these abstracts has just been sent out, and covers the time from February 25 to April 30, 1902. It shows that on that date there were 60 per cent of the 4,092 per cent, 4,092 country banks. It is, I believe generally understood that the law will require 331 of these banks to hold 15 per cent of their deposits, but this is not true. Another provision of the same law permits 271 of the reserve banks to keep a reserve of only 12½ per cent, and all of the 4,092 per cent of 6 per cent. The importance of this legislative juggling justifies some repetition of former articles.

By it the country banks are prohibited from loaning over 85 per cent, and the banks in the reserve cities over 75 per cent, to their own customers. Three-fifths of the amount retained by the country banks, and one-half of that retained by the reserve city banks, is permitted to be deposited with other banks having the deceptive designation of reserve agents, where it is treated like any other deposit, and becomes a part of the deposits of the so-called agents upon which they calculate their legal reserves. It is not difficult to doubt that the original purpose of this arrangement was deceptive and intended to continually draw, as it has done, money from the country banks to the banks of New York city.

Any report of banks, or of the comptroller, that conveys the idea that a bank outside of New York, Chicago or St. Louis is required to maintain a reserve of the 25 per cent on a cash basis is false. The only available reserve of a bank is the cash it has in its vaults. That which is not cash may be called "cash items" or "cash due," etc., and counted as a part of the bank reserves, but no legislative, executive or bank power can make it cash, or make it a reserve in any correct financial sense.

When the comptroller's attention was called to the fact that, even under these absurd provisions of the law, it was impossible for a bank to hold a 25 per cent or 15 per cent reserve, if at the same time it held less than 12½ per cent or 6 per cent in actual cash, and that his abstracts, showing banks to be short in "cash" required, and yet as having a full lawful reserve, were incorrect, he admitted this to be true. He has followed the admission by an entire change of the table of "deposits and reserves," as it appears on page 7 of abstract No. 28, by which this error is eliminated.

But the most important part of this reserve question—"cash reserve required" and "held"—also disappears from the table. It can be ascertained by calculation, but it would seem that, if anything relating to the condition of these banks ought to appear plainly on the face of the abstracts, it ought to be this. There now appears a column headed "cash on hand, due from reserve agents and in the redemption fund." This is the usual method of banks when they wish to conceal from the public the amount of cash they hold. They mix it up with "cash items" or "cash due." This column is an absurd combination. The redemption fund is not available to pay depositors, and the amount due from so-called reserve agents is no more cash than any demand debt due the banks. Neither of these has any rational place among the items that go to make up the reserve, which has no purpose except to furnish a fund

Cash on hand is the only real reserve. It is the only reserve that can be depended upon. This was demonstrated in 1892.

This reconstructed abstract shows that, in the central reserve city of St. Louis and in fifteen of the thirty reserve cities, the aggregate of the bank reserves is below the requirements of the law. The city of Dallas appears in the list as a reserve city for the first time, with four banks showing an aggregate shortage of reserves. It is certain that this report does not disclose the location of all banks that have loaned their deposits beyond the legal limit. This has been the condition for many months, and is well known to the comptroller and the secretary of the treasury, but nothing has been done to prevent it, and nothing will be done by them to make these banks obey the law. They are serving the banks and not the people. The law is bad enough for the public interest if the banks are compelled to obey it.

Too many things are suggested by this abstract to include in one article, but it ought to be noted that, during the 64 days covered by this abstract, the national bank loans have increased at the rate of \$689,224 per day, not excluding Sundays, and that national bank notes are being retired as rapidly as the law will permit.

Another thing ought to be noted, that the increase of loans and discounts (\$44,130,390) was all outside of New York city. During the 77 days covered by abstract No. 27, ending February 25, the increase of loans in New York city was over \$60,000,000, but during these 64 days there was a decrease of \$39,000,000, so that the increase outside of New York city must have been over \$83,000,000.

The outside fools are responding to this abstract by making the charge, which have not the integrity supposed to exist among thieves, but always play their game with false cards and loaded dice. FLAVIUS J. VAN VORHIS, Indianapolis, Ind.

GOOD GOVERNMENT

Sid Fore Believes That Government Can Be No Better Than the Citizenship—Especially in a Republic.

Editor Independent: How long! how long! until the citizen will awake to a sense of his responsibility? How long! until he can be made to realize that it is his own fault that government is wrongly administered? How long! will he persist in regarding officials as kings, and himself as a serf? How long will he allow another to think for him? How long will he elect for himself mental, moral and political masters?

The founders of this government recognized first the supreme authority of God. Then they laid the foundation government on the shoulders of the citizen. The citizen was in no sense a subject except to the will and law of God; he stood in equality with every other citizen in his relation to law and government. But now that is all changed, nine out of ten of the citizens do not know what their rights, privileges and responsibilities are, do not know the definition of citizenship. They seem to be possessed with a spirit of arrogance toward those whom they regard as inferiors, and assume a servile attitude toward those they regard as superiors. They no longer recognize that all are equal in matters of government and that all men have equal rights in life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Now, please understand that I am discussing political equality, civil equality. It is hard to present this idea and be understood. Because nine out of ten will persist in mixing the idea of social and every other sort of equality with it. Politically, civilly, all men are or should be equal. Socially and in a great many other ways, they are not equal, neither is it the business of government to make them so. In a government such as this, where the citizen is the government, as the citizen is, so will the government be. Good citizen, good government. Corrupt, dishonest citizen, corrupt, dishonest government.

The matter with this government is corrupt citizenship. For the sake of a few dirty dollars we, the citizens, have violated the foundation principles of our country, and in favor of the principles of imperialism, in favor of wars of conquest. We have out-heroded Herod, and for what? For the sake of a supposed advance in the price of cattle, grain or hogs, or a fifteen-dollar advance in the price of an old mule.

Now, I do not want to be understood as censuring the administration in this matter; they are doing nothing more or less than carrying out the will and wishes of the majority of the people as expressed at the polls, and by the howling mobs of fools that assemble to do homage to those officials who are connected with this murderous business and to the military smart alecks who dare to insult and threaten the peace-loving citizenry. In view of these things it begins to look like the imperialist is right, and that the citizens are no longer fit to manage government.

Mrs. Astor has engaged the famous woman anarchist, Louise Michel, to deliver a lecture in her parlors. Of course the New York police will not interfere. But if Louise Michel was advertised to deliver a lecture on the east side the whole force would be called out and everybody arrested. All of which goes to show that there is one law for the rich in this country and another law for the poor. Mrs. Astor is to pay the anarchist \$300 for

DAVID BENNETT HILL

Has Something to Think About Now—The Liberal Democratic Platform—Henry George—Socialism

Editor Independent: David B. Hill has something to think about now. The "liberal" democratic party of the state of New York assembled in state convention in New York city, June 7, and made the following declaration: "In the democratic party of the nation lies the only hope of the perpetuation of democratic institutions. Yet under the leadership of such traitors to democracy as David B. Hill, an attempt is being made, under the guise of reorganization, to dominate the party and to degrade it to the position of a mere tool of monopoly."

We see the hand of Henry George in the following plank: "We believe that the land belongs to the people and as a means of reorganizing this right, we demand that land values only be taxed." This exempts from taxation the buildings and other improvements put upon land. It also exempts all personal or movable property. It is grounded upon the idea that, if the value of the land itself were separated from the value of the buildings and other improvements, the former would be enough to support government. This is a mistake, first, because it is impossible to separate the value of the land from the improvements. In the next place, if it were possible to separate the value of the land from the improvements, we would have to consider what land would be worth without improvements. This would take us back to the time of the Indians. Our forefathers found land worth almost nothing, partly because there were no roads to get to it. It is very doubtful whether or not all this land in the United States would now be worth enough to pay for the public highways and the interest on the cost; and if it would, then we would have to take into consideration the cost of the fences. Occasionally, in the city, we see a vacant lot of land sold for a large sum of money and we see it bringing a rent to its owner; but if we take into consideration the cost of the street in front of it, together with the cost of the sewer and other improvements, if we take into consideration the taxes paid for it for many years, it will generally be found that the vacant lot has more than eat itself up. It is very common to sell land for unpaid taxes, under our present system of taxation which taxes the value of the buildings and other improvements as well as the land itself. We should exempt the improvements and put the whole burden of taxation upon the land itself, the burden would be so great that nobody would pay the taxes upon land, and they would let the government take it for unpaid taxes. This was what Mr. George had in view. He thought that as soon as the private owners surrendered their land to the government, then the latter could make use of it for the public good. But this is not the way the thing works. When land is once sold for taxes, nobody will take it and pay the taxes, consequently the government has to hold the land for unpaid taxes and is seldom able to collect the taxes. The scheme of taxing nothing but "land values" for the support of government is to leave the government without support. This is what has prevented Mr. George's idea from being generally adopted.

A socialist plank was adopted as follows: "We favor the initiative and referendum; the former the enactment of laws; the latter to veto legislative measures." We have seldom acted on the initiative and referendum principle, except in the adoption of our state constitutions. These have been suggested by the people in the first instance, and have been called, committee appointed to draft the constitution, and then it has been submitted to the people for ratification. In this way we have adopted our fundamental laws. Seldom have statutes been submitted to the people for ratification. It is unnecessary to submit any law to the people for ratification unless there is a division of opinion between the political parties of the country, and even then the election of representatives ought to determine the character of laws wanted. We are governed by political parties and will have to be so governed, unless we select a king and royal family to govern us. There seems to be no other practical way. Where the people have the right to vote, the remedy for bad government is the election of good representatives, and where there is no right to vote, the remedy is revolution and civil war. A perfect government is impossible. No government can be much better than the people themselves. If we should refer all laws to the people for ratification, they would have all the imperfections they now have. The remedy for bad government is for all the people to take an interest in politics and not leave public affairs to be managed by political bosses exclusively. Not more than one man in a hundred, now taking an active part in politics, is doing so for the public good, but, on the contrary, for private gain. This is a hard thing to say, but nevertheless it is true. The few who are working for reform for the sake of reform merely, find it hard to get the people to take an interest. Ninety-ninths of the people are exhausted in the effort to get a living. Those who pay rent, interest and dividends—and they constitute the masses—have very little time left for politics.

The convention "ratified and confirmed" the platform of the democratic party adopted at its last national convention. This shows that the "liberal" democrats are in the field to contend

well as state issues. Not only that; the Bryanites, Henry George men and socialists—as many of the socialists can be induced to join in the movement—are in the field to prevent Mr. Hill from being elected governor or of having any voice in the government of the state of New York, to the end that he cannot be presented as a candidate for president in the democratic national convention of 1904. The movement has every prospect of success. JNO. S. DE HART, Jersey City, N. J.

POPULIST PROSPERITY

Mr. Warren Continues His Discussion of the Money Question and Urges Democracy to Take a Forward Step.

The following is a continuation of the series of articles from the pen of Hon. Marvin Warren, of Fairbury, Neb., which will probably be completed next week.)

STRAIGHT FOR GREAT PROSPERITY

Let us have that same great prosperity that England had from 1797 to 1819, as shown by the foregoing extract from Archibald Allison's History of Modern Europe. Let us have it and establish it for perpetuity in the United States. If not, then why not? I think that no one should doubt that in this case what has been can be again, especially as Wendell Phillips tells us that "We had similar prosperity during the war and after on the same terms. What were those terms? Irredeemable legal tender paper money circulated in sufficient quantity for it. That was all. It was very simple and is easy to be reproduced if we are only united in sufficient numbers in the United States for it. I know that the simple terms above stated are inadequate to produce that English prosperity, and if adopted will do it. Why not be united in a vast overwhelming number upon those simple terms and turning neither to the right or left go directly forward to the certain, speedy and most thorough establishment of that mighty English prosperity?"

The simple terms, so to speak, are very comprehensive in their meaning, and are all perfectly included in the populist platform adopted at Omaha in 1892, reaffirmed at St. Louis in 1896 and at Sioux Falls in 1900. And they are adequate to the doing away of the financial abominations of the government as now administered, and thereby establishing in this country that great English prosperity above referred to, in all its force and vigor and with all its benefits.

That platform declares that—"We demand a national currency safe, sound and flexible, issued by the general government only, a full legal tender for all debts, public and private, and that without the use of banking corporations." I do not know whether that English paper money was legal tender to pay all debts, public and private, or not. Near the close of the extract the historian calls it "legal tender paper money." If there was any exception to its full legal tender power to pay all debts, it would be somewhat below coin. But it is seen that the populist platform requires that all paper money issued shall be legal tender to pay all debts, public and private. That makes it sure to never depreciate below the parity of coin.

It appears by the historian's account that the English paper money was issued by the Bank of England, and probably floated in circulation burdened somewhat with usury, but our platform is a better arrangement because the issue is to be by the government direct to the people without usury.

The platform further declares that—"We demand that the amount of circulating medium be speedily increased to not less than fifty dollars per capita."

We do not know what the per capita circulation of that English money was. The historian says it was enormous. It is certain that a much greater per capita circulation is now required to produce the same results than was required in the 80 years ago, and more, because money is a medium of exchange for property, and by the introduction of labor saving machinery, property is produced immensely more rapidly and in vastly greater quantities per capita than it was then. Whether we get that great English prosperity in all its fullness or not depends upon whether or not we get money enough into circulation for it. And having provided in our platform that all paper money shall be legal tender to pay all debts, public and private, we may be sure that any necessary amount can be circulated without the least depreciation of it below the parity of coin in value.

In estimating the amount to be circulated, we must cut loose entirely from the ordinary governmental estimates paying no attention to them whatever, for they are all put up in the interest of the few, the plutocracy, whereas we are now planning for a prosperity that in the language of the historian shall be universal, that is reaching and bringing cheer to everybody, to the oppressed wage-earners of every kind as well as to all others. An abundant money circulation greatly enlivens the industries, enlarges production, opens up before everybody something to do that pays, and gives to all wage-earners in mines and factories and everywhere better wages and privileges without any labor organizations or strikes, than they can otherwise obtain by organizations and strikes.

It is hard and expensive and of little avail to fight the trusts and other monopolies, but by an abundant money circulation they can easily be de-

CANDIDATES FOR GOVERNOR

Short Biographical Sketches of the Various Persons Who Have Been Mentioned in Connection With the Fusion Nominations—Every District Represented

Gubernatorial possibilities are scattered all over the state. Every congressional district is represented by at least one man who would make good timber for governor—yet there is not a "stick" among the lot. No one of them could be opposed because he would make a bad governor. Each has some element of strength peculiar to himself, and each has his friends and admirers who delight to honor him. Just which one would, all things considered, best serve the people of Nebraska, is a difficult matter to decide; but that is the work the two conventions have to decide at Grand Island next Tuesday. So far as The Independent has learned the following tabulation includes the name of every man who has been mentioned in the public prints in connection with the fusion nomination for governor: FIRST DISTRICT.

William J. Bryan, democrat, Lancaster. Gen. Victor Viqualin, democrat, Lancaster. George W. Berge, populist, Lancaster.

SECOND DISTRICT. Constantine J. Smyth, democrat, Douglas.

THIRD DISTRICT. William A. Poynter, populist, Boone. John C. Sprecher, populist, Colfax. Daniel J. Koelngstein, democrat, Madison.

CHARLES WOOSTER, democrat, Merrick. WILLIAM L. STARK, populist, Hamilton.

FOURTH DISTRICT. E. O. Kretschmer, populist, Gage. FIFTH DISTRICT. Roderick D. Sutherland, populist, Nuckolls.

W. H. Thompson, democrat, Hall. Dr. Robert Damerell, populist, Webster.

DR. J. N. LYMAN, populist, Adams. SIXTH DISTRICT. Michael F. Harrington, populist, Holt.

DR. CHARLES E. COFFIN, populist, Valley.

By no means all of these gentlemen have consented to allow their names to go before the conventions, but they have been discussed as possibilities nevertheless. And it may be that John O. Yeiser, populist, Douglas; Judge W. H. Westover, populist, Sheridan; Dr. P. L. Hall, democrat, Lancaster; E. A. Gilbert, populist, York, and a number of others will receive complimentary votes in the conventions.

Below we give short biographical sketches of a number of those who have been mentioned prominently in connection with the gubernatorial nomination. Mr. Bryan, Governor Poynter, Senator Allen, Congressman Stark, and M. F. Harrington are omitted because they are so well known to the people of Nebraska. Mr. Kretschmer assumed The Independent that he is positively not a candidate, and that the mention of his name in this connection was wholly without his consent. Mr. Sprecher, following the policy adopted by his personal organ, the Quill of Schuyler, totally ignored The Independent's letter of inquiry for information upon which to write a biographical sketch of him.

CHARLES WOOSTER. The following letter is self-explanatory: "Yours of the 11th inst., written on the theory that I was a candidate for the fusion nomination for governor, and asking for certain information, was quite a surprise to me. I am not a candidate, am not seeking the office and have no information that the office is seeking me. Therefore I think a write-up in The Independent will not be necessary. Thanking you just the same, I am, your truly, "CHARLES WOOSTER, "Eagle Island Farm, Silver Creek, Neb."

CONSTANTINE J. SMYTH. Constantine J. Smyth, age 42, came to Nebraska from New York in 1878; worked at night on the Omaha World-Herald and went to college during the day. After leaving college was employed as a clerk for five years, during which time he studied law at night. He was admitted to the bar in 1885.

In 1886 he was elected as a democrat from Douglas county to the legislature. After many vain endeavors to bring about the election of a democrat to the United States senate, he cast his vote for General Van Wyck, and for this act was roundly denounced by the corporation democrats of the state. The Nebraska City Press said at the time: "When Smyth changed his vote he was greeted with cheers and hisses which it took several minutes to suppress. The excitement was intense as it was thought that Smyth's change would produce the final rush which was to elect Van Wyck."

Mr. Smyth contended in that legislative for the equitable taxation of railroads. The Bee, editorially, commended his "strong and manly fight." There began the fight now being made for the just taxation of railroad property. He fought the bill providing for the state board of transportation and strenuously contended for the passage of a maximum freight rate law. He advocated the exemption of \$300 worth of the property of the poor from taxation, and was the unrelenting enemy of Mosher and his penitentiary gang.

In 1889 Mr. Smyth was elected without opposition as a member of the board of education of Omaha and served four years. He was from the beginning one of (Continued on Page 8.)