

The Independent.

VOL. XIV.

LINCOLN, NEB., NOV. 6, 1902.

No. 24.

VICTORY FOR THE RAILROADS.

Bulletins "Issued Under Authority of The Railroads of Nebraska" Have the Desired Effect.

"OUR MAN" MICKEY PROBABLY ELECTED.

Returns Seem to Indicate Election of Mickey By a Very Close Margin. Returns Coming In Slowly.

Nebraska has again gone republican by a very small margin. Lulled to sleep by the cry of "Let well enough alone" thousands of farmers who are not republicans shucked corn Tuesday and again permitted a republican victory—for there is no gainsaying the fact that of the qualified electors of Nebraska considerably less than a majority are republicans.

The election of governor is still in doubt at this writing (Thursday noon). Thompson carried Douglas county by near 2,500; he carried his home county (Hall) by nearly 500, although it is normally about 200 republican. And he carried Mickey's home county (Polk) by over 400. The Omaha Bee gives a schedule containing purported complete returns from 49 counties showing as follows:

| | |
|-----------|--------|
| Mickey | 65,780 |
| Thompson | 63,588 |
| Plurality | 2,192 |

The same counties in 1900 gave:

| | |
|----------|--------|
| Dietrich | 78,817 |
| Poynter | 78,429 |

Plurality 388
Included in this schedule is Douglas county, which in 1900 gave Dietrich 884 plurality, and this year gives Thompson nearly 2,500, which would seem to indicate that Mickey is running better in the country districts than Dietrich did. The Bee's schedule, however, contains numerous errors; one in Howard county alone gives Mickey 1,000 votes more than he really received. It will doubtless take the official count to decide.

The remaining republican candidates for state office are elected beyond a doubt. They carried Douglas county by close to a thousand, giving them a much stronger lead than Mickey. The fusion candidates are running well up to Thompson in most places except Douglas and Hall. Aside from governor and lieutenant governor, "Uncle" John Powers ran ahead of the rest of the fusion state candidates in Douglas.

Hitchcock was victorious in the second congressional district, defeating Non-Resident Mercer by about 2,000. This is not only a victory for the fusionists of the Second district, of which they may well be proud, but it will also settle the matter for some time to come that Edward Rosewater and the Omaha Bee must be reckoned with by the republican party of Nebraska if it hopes to win.

The republicans carried all the other districts, defeating Hanks in the First, Robinson in the Third, Stark in the Fourth, Shallenberger in the Fifth and Barry in the Sixth. In addition to "sustaining Roosevelt" by the election of five republican congressmen from Nebraska, the railroads rejoice over Burlington Burkett and Norris, Elkhorn McCarthy, Rock Island Hinshaw, and Union Pacific-Elkhorn Kin-kaid, who may be depended upon to look after the interests of their respective masters in all matters where railroad interests are adverse to those of the people generally.

The thirty thousand dollars expended "under authority of the railroads of Nebraska" was money well spent. It will save these roads over a million dollars in taxes the next two years. It will enable them to charge "all that the traffic will bear" without any annoying legislation attempting to regulate rates. And the other taxpayers will have to pay this extra million of taxes out of their own incomes and products, because several thousand men wanted to earn a couple of dollars each by shucking corn Tuesday. The election of the

republican state ticket means that a majority of those who take sufficient interest to get out and vote, prefer to let the railroads escape payment of half a million dollars in taxes every year. It is a victory for tax-shirking on a big scale.

Speaking plainly the election means that the people of Nebraska love to be humbugged and robbed. They have indorsed the pardon of Bartley. They have approved the burning of the Norfolk asylum and the penitentiary. They admire Prout's incompetency as attorney general; they applaud his acts as solicitor of insurance for old-line companies. They are gratified that he dismissed or lost every case in which the state was interested.

The people of Nebraska (that is, a majority of those who have the spunk to cast a freeman's ballot) seem to love anarchy; hence, they elect the republican ticket, for republican officers are notorious for their open violation of law. They have approved Secretary Marsh's violation of the ballot law—a matter about which he told numerous lies. They have approved the bond deals of the state board of educational lands and funds, by which the state was robbed of several thousand dollars in interest coupons. They have approved the action of the state board of equalization.

In the face of impending conditions, however, The Independent is by no means despondent over the result. The congress and president are republican, and upon them must rest the responsibility for financial conditions the next two years. Within that time will be demonstrated the evils of republican financial policies, or The Independent does not read the signs aright. This time "the threat against the tariff" will not avail them as an excuse for a panic. When it comes—as it is sure to come—the republican party must alone bear the responsibility. In the state a similar condition exists. The state debt will pile up the next two years enormously, unless the legislature this winter shall amend the revenue law so that heavier taxes may be levied. The problem of what to do with the idle school funds will make Treasurer Mortensen's life miserable, because Treasurer Stuefer has been extremely fortunate in securing investments for the largely increased receipts in his term and has about swept the platter of all county bonds in sight. The Independent would not be surprised to see a balance of two millions of idle school funds within the next two years.

Chairman Weber telephoned The Independent late Thursday that he had returns from 61 counties which seem to indicate Mickey's election by three to four thousand. The figures were:

| | |
|----------|--------|
| Mickey | 78,215 |
| Thompson | 74,267 |

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| Plurality | 3,948 |
|-----------|-------|

The same counties gave:

| | |
|----------|--------|
| Dietrich | 93,932 |
| Poynter | 92,639 |

Plurality 1,293
The remaining counties will doubtless cut down Mickey's present majority over Thompson.

UNITED STATES SENATORS.

Mr. Bride Discusses the Election of U. S. Senators by Popular Vote.

Editor Independent: When the advocates of the present method of electing senators can find no other cradle in which to lay their child; when they cannot reconcile it with its pres-

ent abuses; when they cannot defend its opposition to the true principles of a popular government, they fall back on their old cry that it is the method provided by the constitution. I have just as much love for that sacred instrument of our liberties as any true American; but recognizing that its good has been perverted in this regard, I eagerly combat for the democratic principles upon which the republic was based.

You are told that we must not change the constitution because it is a time-honored, well-behaved lad. Who, I ask, is its best friend, he who flatters and worships, or he who, seeing that evil exists, reproves and corrects it? He who would make such alterations as changed conditions necessitate, or he who, recognizing that wrongs exist, is blind or careless as to their remedy? "Spare the rod and spoil the child," is an old motto and still a good one.

The framers of this great bulwark of our nation, conceding the probable necessity for amendments, did not leave the question either as to the right to amend or the method of doing it in abeyance; but with that wisdom and foresight, which so clearly marked their every deliberation, provided both the manner and the means of accomplishing this result and of curing all the evils that existed in the embryo government. It is a power which the people have taken on several occasions—each time adding strength to the keystone of the arch of our advancement, each time paving the way for the smooth progress of the car of state on its journey toward "equal rights to all, special privileges to none."

Those opposed to the popular election of senators give showers of reasons why we should not change the methods now in vogue, but their crafty logic, when boiled down to its ultimate conclusion, states the two principles or propositions advanced by every opponent of the world's progress. They tell us, you must prove that there are evils in the present system, and when we have lavished them with the evils and deluged them with instances of it, they reply, prove that your remedy will cure these evils—establish your panacea. This we feel prepared to do.

The principle objection is based upon the false theory that a change in the manner of electing senators will operate to change the very organization of our government. And in their ramblings from the way, they will tell you that the reform asked would destroy the relations not only which the senators bear to the individual states, but that the states themselves would stand in a different homology to the nation. Nothing could be further from the real truth of the proposition. We do not propose to change the relationship of the senate to the states individually, what we demand is that the people shall do, what they now do indirectly and instead of having the senators elected by the legislature, that the people as citizens of the state and as makers of the legislature, shall do it themselves. We would change the senate but in this one particular.

In each step toward the election of a senator under the present method, there are chances for fraud and whenever there are chances there are instances. In my advance I shall cite cases to prove each point, but I would not have you believe that because I cite but one case there are no others. One citation that there has been wrong will prove that there is a possibility for wrong, and wherever wrong is possible, there will be found those unscrupulous to commit it.

It will be argued that if we take from the legislatures the power to nominate and elect the members of the national senate, if we take from them their ability to mingle in the ultra-national affairs, that their standard will be lowered, that their plane would be decreased and the falling tide of the people's confidence in them would completely ebb away. We agree with them that the legislatures have sunk below what should be their standard, we agree with them that the legislatures are not held in the respect that they should be. What is the reason? Let us seek the logical conclusion, let us sift the matter to the very dregs, and from a known result, find out a source equally as clear to him

who would look, equally as clear to him who would dig below the surface.

In the very formation of the legislative districts there are chances for evil, and this evil may be caused by the legislature itself. The districts are so arranged that the party doing the scheming has far the better chance when the time comes to elect. This system is known as the Gerrymander and is one of the worst ways in which to stifle public opinion. It did not exist, nor was it known, until the days of Elbridge Gerry, who so carved up the state of Massachusetts that in spite of an immense popular adversity, succeeded in electing his ticket. The infant did not die in its youth, but in the election of 1856 when Abraham Lincoln carried the state of Illinois by a large majority, yet in spite of this fact, his opponent, Judge Douglas, succeeded in winning. The state was so carved up into legislative districts that a minority of the people were in control of the legislature, and the country was denied the services of the immortal Lincoln in that period which so tried men's souls. But I need not go back forty years. In 1892 in the same state we find one political party carrying the state by about thirty thousand votes, yet having but a bare majority in the legislature. For months the legislature balloted on and on—no agreement could be reached, until one of the members died, and the party which had so strongly polled the vote of the state, succeeded in electing their man. I am sure that the opposition, realizing the great evil of the Gerrymander, will not attempt its vindication. And yet, behind this, how many United States senators have gotten their seats? The review of the elections in Connecticut for the past twenty years will prove the truth of our statements. Our opponents cannot justify this loathsome evil at the very birthplace of their schemes.

Let us pass on to the fight for election to the state legislature; the candidate is nominated and the race is being run to see who will represent the district in the legislature. A United States senator is to be elected and the fight wages on national issues. We never hear it asked of the candidate how he stands on the question of state taxation, we never query as to his opinion on the public highways, it is never realized that the man to be elected will help carry on the business of the state. All is obscured save a seat in the United States senate. The ability of the candidate on questions of general legislation is entirely obscured by the bigger game—a seat in the senate. So I say that the real business of the state is disturbed, its necessities overlooked, and its very welfare threatened at each race for senatorial honors. The result of the whole performance is that the legislators are very often elected because of their support of certain candidates; and, secondly, and more potent, that in state elections when state issues are involved, national platforms are made the fight. I tell you that if a state gets a good legislature under these circumstances, it is by the act of a great and gracious Providence and not through any wisdom or foresight of the method provided.

We are told that our change would have little effect on the individual voter. It places him in this dilemma, that if he favors the state policy of one political party and the national issues advanced by the other, he must swallow the lesser of two evils and be satisfied. In support of this statement, let me cite the instance in Iowa in 1890, when it was well known that the people of the state were disgusted with the management of the state by the party then in power; and it was as well known that the national policy of the other party was equally as obnoxious. What was this party-laden voter to do on election day? It was the fault of the system and not his own fault that he did not vote to suit his conscience. He must either swallow the state policy of the republicans in order to give his national party, the republicans, a seat in the senate, or he must choose an equally repugnant democratic national policy in order to rebuke the state government of the other party. What must he do? Solve this dilemma, all ye who oppose the popular election.

The election is over and the dominant party meets in its caucus to de-