

Senator John M. Thurston wired John T. Mallalieu of Kearney that he had designated him for the position of supervisor of the next census for the Sixth congressional district.

Fires are still burning in the country north of Ogallala and spreading in all directions as the wind changes. All of Keith county north of the North Platte river is swept clean and the fire is extending into Deuel, Arthur and McPherson counties. No reports as to cattle losses and ranch buildings.

A disastrous prairie fire swept over a district of several miles in the northern part of Howard county last week during the strong south wind and occasioned much damage. Frank A. Carlson lost his barn, granary, corncrib and about 1,200 bushels of corn, and others lost considerable property. The fire resulted from a man's carelessness in starting a fire on a hot, windy day.

Thomas Patterson, aged 65 years, and a boy named Howell started for Big Island, east of North Bend, to cut evergreens. Not returning, searching parties started out and the lost ones were found on the island. Their boat had sprung a leak, causing them to abandon it and take to the water. Both drifted to the island and there was no way of escaping until they were rescued.

It has just come to light that Mrs. C. Howard, who is living with Mrs. H. J. Higgins of Fremont, attempted suicide Wednesday afternoon by taking carbolic acid. It is said that she was recently married to a man named Howard and of late he has refused to support her and that she was driven to attempt suicide, as she thought she had nothing to live for. Her physician says she is entirely out of all danger now. She is about 25 years old and is almost a stranger there.

The territory burned over by the prairie fire in Rock county is about twenty-five miles long and from eight to twenty miles wide. Considerable damage was done to hay, ranges and graves. Henry Habakauat, a farmer living eight miles southeast of Bassett, lost all his buildings. John Mauck lost his stables and three head of valuable work horses. Dick Ballenger lost all his buildings except his house and quite a number of persons lost their hay. Considering the area which was burned over it is remarkable that so little property was destroyed, and this fact is attributable to the effective efforts of the citizens. The fire was the most extensive which that county has ever experienced, but not the fiercest. It commenced a week ago Sunday and has continued ever since, but is now under control. There have been no reports of any fatalities or injuries to people.

Drainage in the Garden.

There is no danger of getting the garden too well drained. If the whole surface was underlaid with tiles at a depth of from two to three feet it would be of benefit to the soil. Practically there should be for perfect results a drain every rod. These drains should be given a good outlet and should be three feet or more below the surface. In theory a tile drain will "draw" a strip about four times as wide as the depth of the ditch, but practice teaches that the tile drains draw much farther than this. In practice drains as far as ten rods apart lower the water table over the whole space between the drains, but this work is not so quickly done as when the drains are close together.

Drainage is always done with several things in view. The first object is to get rid of the surplus water in the soil, the second to permanently lower the level at which water stands in the soil. This level is not fixed, but varies with the texture of the soil. Most soils hold the water too near the surface for the good of the crops. This surface water usually disappears after the spring rains have ceased, but is undrained soil it remains long enough to permanently injure the crops.

Another reason for draining is to make the soil porous so as to admit air and warmth so crops may be planted earlier in the spring and grow later in the fall. Well drained land is not affected seriously either by drought or extremely wet weather, and as a consequence garden crops do better in the garden than it is well drained.

No other crops grown on the farm are so valuable for the area they occupy as garden crops, and they should be given every chance to come to perfection.

It was in a Duluth court, and the witness was a Swede who was perhaps not so stupid as he seemed to be. The cross-examining attorney was a smart young man, whose object was to discredit the witness and discredit his testimony.

"What did you say your name was?" was the first question. "Yahn" - very deliberately - "Peterson."

SHAME OF THE NATION

SENATOR HOAR ON WAR AGAINST THE FILIPINOS.

All Principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution Violated.

A letter bearing the date of February 4, and signed by 100 or more of the most prominent men in and around Boston, headed by ex-Governor George S. Boutwell, commending the attitude in congress of Senator Hoar and inviting him to address them at a future date, has been made public. Accompanying it is the letter of acknowledgment from Senator Hoar, bearing date of March 29, in which he says:

"I do not think there is any reason personal to me for holding such a public meeting. Undoubtedly there should be and there will be many public meetings in the country over to protest against trampling under foot the rights of a brave people struggling for their liberties, the violations of the principles of our own constitution and of the declaration of independence, and the continuance by the American people in the costly and ruinous path which has brought other republics to ruin and shame, which will dishonor labor, place intolerable burdens upon agriculture, and fasten upon the republic the shame of what President McKinley has so lately and so truthfully declared to be criminal aggression.

"But I think it will be wiser to have meetings of that character a little later rather than just now. We do not yet know whether the present war for the subjugation of the people of the Philippines is to continue indefinitely, or whether there is to be a speedy submission to the overwhelming power of the United States.

"PROPER TIME FOR DISCUSSION. If the war shall shortly be ended we shall then be able to discuss the question of our national duty free from the disturbing influences which exist always when the country is at war. If, on the other hand, the war shall long and indefinitely continue, the people will begin to feel the weight of increased debt and increased taxation, the loss of life and health of our youth and the derangement of trade and peaceful industry.

"An attempt has been made to persuade the American people that the resistance to our arms by the people of the Philippine islands has been due to those who oppose the attempt to subjugate them and who opposed the ratification of the treaty by which sovereignty over them was purchased and paid for as an article of merchandise.

"There never was a more unfounded or a more foolish calumny. A strict military censorship was exercised over the cable to the Philippine islands during the whole period. I have in my possession one of the original circulars of the cable company, warning all persons that no dispatch would be transmitted having the least relation to politics, without the assent of the military authorities of the United States."

After quoting some personal experiences growing out of his position, Senator Hoar says:

"PEOPLE TRAMPLED UNDER FOOT. The blood of the slaughtered Filipinos, the blood and the wasted health and life of our own soldiers, is upon the heads of those who have undertaken to buy a people in the market like sheep, or to treat them as lawful prize and booty of war, to impose a government on them without their consent, and to trample under foot not only the people of the Philippine islands, but the principles upon which the American republic itself rests."

Continuing, Senator Hoar refers to the pledges of the country toward Cuba and the president's declaration that any other conduct on our part would have been "criminal aggression," and continues:

"The law of righteousness and justice on which the great and free American people should act, and, in the end, I am sure, will act, depends not on parallels of latitude and meridians of longitude or points of the compass. It is the same yesterday, today and forever. It is as true now as when our fathers declared it in 1776. It is as binding upon William McKinley today as it was upon George Washington or Abraham Lincoln. The only powers of government the American people can recognize are just powers, and those powers rest upon the consent of the governed.

"NO CONSTITUTIONAL WARRANT. 'No man during this whole discussion has successfully challenged, and no man will successfully challenge: 'First, the affirmation that under the constitution of the United States the acquisition of territory, as of other property, is not a constitutional end, and that, while the making of the new states and providing national defense are constitutional ends, but only a means to a constitutional end, so that we may acquire and hold territory for those purposes, the governing of subject peoples is not a constitutional end, and that there is therefore no constitutional warrant for acquiring and holding territory for that purpose.

"Second, that to leave our own country to stand on foreign soil is in violation of the warnings of our fathers and of the farewell address of Washington.

"Third, that there never was a tropical country governed with any tolerable success without a system of contract labor.

"Fourth, the trade advantages of the Philippine islands, if there be any, must be opened alike to all the world, and that our share of them will never

begin to pay the cost of subjugating them by war or holding them in subjection in peace.

"Fifth, that the military occupation of these tropical regions must be kept at an immense cost, both to the souls and the bodies of our soldiers.

"Sixth, that the declaration as to Cuba by the president and by congress applies with stronger force to the case of the Philippine islands.

"Seventh, that Aguinaldo and his followers, before we began to make war upon them, had conquered their own territory and independence from the Spanish, with the exception of a single city, and were getting ready to establish a free constitution.

"EIGHTH, that while they are fighting for freedom and independence and the doctrines of our fathers, we are fighting for the principles that one people may control and govern another in spite of its resistance and against its will.

"Ninth, that the language and argument of those who object to this war are, without change, the language and argument of Chatham, of Fox, of Burke and of Barre, of Camden, and of the English and American whigs, and the language and argument of those who support it are the language and argument of George III. of Lord North, of Mansfield, of Wedderburn, of Johnson and of the English and American Tories.

"Tenth, no orator or newspaper, or preacher here a supporter of this policy of subjugation, dares repeat in speech or print any of the great utterances for freedom of Washington, of Jefferson, of John Adams, of Abraham Lincoln, or of Charles Sumner.

"The question the American people are now considering, and with which they are about to deal, is not a question of a day, or of a year, or of an administration, or of a century. It is to affect and largely determine the whole future of the country. We can recover from a mistake in regard to other matters which have interested or divided the people, however important or serious. Tariffs and currency and revenue laws, even foreign wars, all these, as Thomas Jefferson said, 'are bills that will pass under the ship.'

"But if the republic is to violate the laws of its being, if it is to be converted into an empire, not only the direction of the voyage is to be changed, but the chart and the compass are to be thrown away. We have not as yet taken the irrevocable step. Before it is taken let the voice of the whole people be heard. I am, with high regard, faithfully yours,

"GEORGE F. HOAR."

TOLD OUT OF COURT.

To the list of fervent compliments paid to the court by defeated attorneys following may be added:

"I think our supreme court is a good legislative body? What do you think?" "The court rejected the correct view in order to follow the d-d sentiment of a one-horse text-writer."

"It is one of the misfortunes of practicing before courts of final resort that an argument presented on the facts shown by the record becomes of no value by a statement of facts manufactured by the court.

Judge J. M. Hurt tells a story in the Dallas (Tex.) News on a couple of members of the Dallas legal profession, which goes in this wise:

They were on a hunting and fishing expedition to Wynne's lake. On the day of their arrival one of the heroes of the story, who was at that time district judge, found a canoe that had been buried in the mud. He excavated it and found it to be in pretty good shape. He washed off all the mud and calked a few holes in the bottom, and it was a good boat. It was a long, narrow affair, and was evidently never intended to be built for two.

However, when the judge started out to fish in his canoe, his lawyer friend insisted on going with him. The judge was sitting in the end toward the lake, where the water was about six inches deep and the mud about four feet.

"Now, keep out of this boat," exclaimed the judge. You will turn it over, sure, if you try to get in it."

"That's all right," said the lawyer. "I am an old boatman, and have fished in a dugout many a time, and you know a man has to sit mighty level in a dugout."

With that he stepped into the canoe and he capsized instantly. The lawyer saved himself by a quick spring for the bank, but the judge, who was about fifteen feet off shore, was thrown in the shallow water and mud. He crawled out like an old hog coming out of its wallow, and when he reached the bank he delivered his opinion of the lawyer in anything but judicial language, and wound up in italics, punctuated with dashes and exclamation points, saying that he hoped the lawyer was satisfied.

The lawyer apologized profusely and assured the judge that there was nothing intentional about it; that it was purely an accident, and to show that he was sincere divided what clothing he had with the judge and helped wash his wet and muddy suit. Peace was thereby patched up and all went well.

At the next term of court the lawyer had a case, in which he was very much interested, to come up in the judge's court. He worked on it very hard, and thought he had it perfected. All during the trial he sat up nights studying every point. He made a long and very exhaustive argument, and thought to himself that he had a sure thing, but the judge decided in favor of the other fellow. It was a great disappointment to the lawyer, and after court had adjourned he called the judge aside and said:

"I told you out at Wynne's lake that I turned out best accidentally, but I want to tell you here and now that it was intentional, premeditated, and done with express malice aforethought."

BRYAN SENDS REPLY

ANSWERS PERRY BELMONT'S LETTER.

Quotes Some of Belmont's Utterances Regarding Chicago Platform.

Lincoln, Neb.—(Special.)—Mr. Bryan tonight gave to the press his letter in reply to Perry Belmont's letter to him. At the time Belmont's letter was written Mr. Bryan was in Tennessee, and in an interview he said at the time that he would look over the copy of Belmont's special, sent by the letter, and point out where Belmont's utterances are in conflict with the democratic creed, as set forth in Jefferson's first inaugural address.

The letter tonight given out in the result of Belmont's request that this be done. It follows:

Lincoln, Neb., April 8, 1899.—To Hon. Perry Belmont, 555 Fifth avenue, New York—Dear Sir: Upon my return to Lincoln I found your letter and postscript given to the press some days before.

I cannot find anything in my letter to which you can consistently object. You began your speech in Madison Square Garden on August 18, 1896, by saying that it was time for plain speaking and proceeded to accuse the Chicago convention of a "betrayal" of the democratic party.

In your Brooklyn speech, on September 15, 1896, you spoke of the Chicago platform as "the strange doctrines born in Chicago, of a coalition between the unthinking element of the old party and the socialists, who masquerade as populocrats."

It seems that in using the words "betrayal" and "masquerade" I unconsciously fell into the style which you employed in 1896, but I did not reflect upon the intelligence of the gold standard advocates by characterizing them as an "unthinking" element.

My letter was much more conservative in tone than the editorials and resolutions directed against you by the democrats of your state in 1896. In your book, volume 5, page 19, you reproduce an editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Citizen of October 8, 1896. That editorial was more severe in its condemnation of you than the New York Journal editorial, from which you quoted in your letter, and yet instead of using the Citizen you contented yourself with furnishing evidence to show that you further shared your views upon the money question.

WHERE RIGHT BELONGS.

You ask, first, that I point out where in your utterances are "unpatriotic, undemocratic, un-American or in conflict with the democratic creed as set forth in Jefferson's inaugural address."

We have no accepted standard by which to determine whether a given opinion is patriotic or American, but we have means of determining whether an opinion is democratic and in accord with the teachings of Jefferson.

I presume you use the word "democratic" in a party sense, otherwise that term would be as difficult to determine as "patriotic" or "American." The right to determine what is democratic to a party sense belongs to the democratic party.

The Chicago convention was more purely representative than any other convention held in recent years, because the rank and file of the party spoke on public questions through instructed delegates. The Chicago platform is the latest authoritative definition of democracy as applied to existing conditions.

If a minority of the delegates to a national convention, representing a minority of the members of the democratic party, has a right to determine what is democratic, then each member of the party has a right to define democracy for himself, and to assert that he is a better democrat than anyone else.

Unless you insist that each individual can define for himself what is democratic, you must admit that the opinions of the democrats who supported the Chicago platform ought to outweigh the opinions of the 133,000 who supported the Indianapolis platform.

Or, if you prefer to confer the matter to your own state, the opinions of the 551,326 who voted for me ought to outweigh the opinions of the 18,899 who joined you in the support of Palmer and Buckner.

JEFFERSON'S CREED.

You ask that your opinion be measured by the democratic creed set forth in Jefferson's first inaugural message. As that message dealt with general principles and not with particular measures, those principles must be applied to present issues before comparisons can be made. The parent principle is the one placed first in the catalogue, namely: "Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political."

Jefferson's political creed was condensed into the motto: "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none." Let me apply this principle to three questions upon which you have taken a position in the volumes sent me: First—Standard money. Second—Paper money. Third—Income tax.

Jefferson favored the double standard as against the single gold standard, and during his administration our nation had the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the legal ratio of 15 to 1. The ratio was changed to 16 to 1 during Jackson's administration.

The Chicago platform pronounced against the gold standard and in favor of the return to the free and unlimited coinage of gold and silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, without waiting for the aid or consent of any other nation.

As a delegate to the Chicago convention you voted for a minority report, which declared against independent free coinage on the ground that it would not only imperil our finances, "but would retard or entirely prevent international bimetalism, to which the effort of the government should be steadily directed."

CAN HE EXPLAIN.

As a delegate to the Indianapolis convention two months later, you supported a platform which declared in favor of the gold standard without adding any declaration in favor of international bimetalism. You may be able to explain why the minority rejected at Indianapolis the plank for which it fought at Chicago.

Certain it is that if the gold standard is entirely satisfactory, then a return to bimetalism, either by international agreement or by the independent action of this country, is both unnecessary and undesirable. The promiscuous use of the terms "gold standard" and "international bimetalism" by our opponents indicates either a mental confusion on their part or a purpose to confuse others as to their real designs.

That the purchasing power of a dollar of standard money depends upon the number of dollars is a fundamental proposition, and this being true it necessarily follows that legislation which affects the volume of standard money affects the value of each unit.

MADE DEAR OR CHEAP.

In other words, money being a creation of law, the dollar may be made dear or cheap by legislation. Bimetallists, both independent and international, contend that legislation which gives gold a monopoly on mint privileges has for its object and effect the enhancement of the purchasing power of the dollar, rising dollars and falling prices are synonymous terms.

Rising dollars are profitable to those who own money and fixed investments, but they are injurious to those who own property, owe debts or create our wealth.

Mr. McKinley, 1891, charged in a public speech that Mr. Cleveland, during his first administration, was dishonoring one of the precious metals, discrediting silver and enhancing the price of gold. He insisted that Mr. Cleveland was trying to "make money scarce and therefore dear," and added: "It would have increased the value of money and diminished the value of everything else. Money the master, and everything else a servant."

If Mr. McKinley, then, understood the real purpose of the gold standard, as I believe he did, who could think Jefferson capable of advocating a policy, which instead of securing equal and exact justice for all made "money the master and everything else the servant?"

CARLISE'S UTTERANCE.

Mr. Carlisle in a speech in 1878 said: "The conspiracy to destroy by legislation and otherwise from three-sevenths to one-half of the metallic money of the world is the most gigantic crime of this or any other age."

If Mr. Carlisle was then right, as I believe he was, he was denouncing the gold standard. Who can believe Jefferson capable of such a crime?

Bimetalism stood for 81 years, from 1792 to 1873, without any political party condemning it at a national convention. The gold standard was adopted in 1873 without any party asking for it, and was retained for twenty-three years before any national convention declared it to be good.

In 1896 the democrats, populists and silver republicans declared for independent bimetalism, while the republican party was pledged to international bimetalism. Thirteen and a half million voters supported parties pledged to the double standard as against the gold standard, while only 133,000 supported the only ticket ever nominated upon a platform declaring the gold standard to be a blessing, and you, as a member of that party, were so disgusted in one campaign that you have ever since been trying to wear the name "democrat" without accepting the political principles for which the word stands.

You ask whether I deem the money question, as presented in the Chicago platform, to be now paramount to all others, and whether I insist upon the infallibility of the ratio of 16 to 1. I do not assume to speak for the democratic party. Speaking for myself as an individual and basing my opinions upon my own observations, I reply that I have found no disposition among democrats to abandon either the principles of bimetalism or the ratio of 16 to 1.

THEY ARE NOT DECEIVED. Those who supported the Chicago platform are not deceived by quibblings over the ratio, when such quibblings come from men like yourself, who advocate, not international bimetalism, but independent bimetalism at some other ratio, but the single gold standard.

After the election Mr. McKinley sent a commission to Europe to secure international aid in getting rid of the gold standard and a republican congress appropriated money to pay the expenses of the commission. The commission failed because of English opposition, and English opposition was due to the opposition of English financiers.

Jefferson democrats must have a better reason for submitting to the gold standard than the fact that the English financiers favor it as a means for raising the purchasing power of their money.

Circumstances determine the relative importance of questions and no one is able to say at this time in what proportion the various issues will engross public attention.

WILL BE REAFFIRMED.

I have no doubt that the Chicago

platform will be reaffirmed. Unless the republicans withdraw their demand for an increase in the standing army that question also will be under discussion. The issue raised by the threat of imperialism may be settled before the campaign opens, or it may occupy an important position in the campaign.

The anti-trust issue will doubtless hold a more prominent place in 1900 than in 1896, because the rapid increase in the number of trusts the last two years has aroused the public to a realization of the viciousness of the trust principle.

But the industrial trust, which seeks to destroy competition, is another manifestation of the monopolistic idea, which underlies both the gold standard and the attempt to give banks the control of the volume of paper money. The fight against industrial trusts, therefore, will strengthen rather than weaken the fight against the gold standard.

In your speeches you take an emphatic stand in favor of a bank currency, to which Jefferson was so emphatically opposed. One of the chief differences between him and Hamilton grew out of the bank question. He said in one of his letters:

"I have ever been the enemy of the banks, not of those discounting for cash but of those fostering their own paper in circulation and thus banishing our cash. My zeal against those institutions was so warm and open at the establishment of the Bank of the United States that I was derided as a maniac by the tribe of bank-mongers who were seeking to flitch from the public their swindling and barren gains. To surrender to banks the right to issue paper money confers upon them a valuable privilege denied to other people, in violation of the motto above referred to, and, in addition to this, gives them practical control over the property of the people."

QUESTION OF BANKS.

You believe that the issuing of paper money is a function of the banks and that the government ought to get out of the banking business. Jefferson believed that the issuing of paper money is one of the functions of government and that the banks ought to get out of the governing business.

You oppose an income tax. The income tax of 1894 was intended to equalize the burdens of the federal government. Until the recent war taxes were levied almost all the federal revenues were collected from internal revenue "axes and import duties.

Both of these systems place the tax upon consumption and bear most heavily upon people with the smallest income. They are, in effect, graded income taxes, with the per cent decreasing as the income increases. The doctrine of equal and exact justice to all requires that the burdens of government shall be proportioned to the benefits received. The income tax was a step in this direction.

I have selected those three questions because they are important and because your position upon them has been clearly defined. Your speeches abound in expressions of confidence in the gold standard; your correspondence with Mr. Warren sets forth your opposition to the income tax and a newspaper item quoted in your book gives you credit for drafting that portion of the Indianapolis platform which related to the retirement of the greenbacks and the substitution of bank currency.

TENDER SOLICITUDE.

Your prophecy that "law to prevent wage earners to salary earners from demanding and securing payment in gold dollars would not be a winning issue" evinces a tender solicitude of the laboring man. I might suggest that bimetalism alarms you more than it does the wage earners.

It was not the employees who were fighting at the specter of free silver in 1896; neither did the laboring man share your desire to add to the privileges of the banks. On December 20, 1897, a year after the election, the Federation of Labor adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That we declare ourselves most positively opposed to the Gage financial bill, recently introduced in congress by the secretary of the treasury. It is a measure that, if adopted as a law, will only the more firmly rivet the gold standard on the people of the country and perpetuate its disastrous effects in every form.

"Resolved, That we pronounce the Gage bill an undisguised effort to retire our greenback currency and all government paper money, with a view to the substitution of national bank notes in their stead, and thus passing the national bank system for years upon the American people."

I am not willing to believe that you are more interested in the laboring man than they are in themselves, or that you know better than they what is good for them. Yours truly, W. J. BRYAN.

LIKE QUAIL.

The Kansas City Journal is an unwavering supporter of the McKinley administration and therefore an advocate of imperialism. In its issue of Tuesday, April 11, the Journal, with apparent glee, prints the following:

"Company I had taken a few prisoners and stopped," writes Charles Bremer of Minneapolis in his account of the charge at Calocan. "The colonel ordered them up into line time after time, and finally sent Captain Bishop back to start them. There occurred the hardest fight I ever saw. They had four prisoners and didn't know what to do with them. They asked Captain Bishop what to do, and he said, 'You know the orders,' and four natives fell dead. Then the line moved on through the city, three-quarters of a mile in advance. It was fine shooting, as it was open ground, and we picked them off like quail."

It is unnecessary to make comment on this. Volumes could not tell more.