6 ~~(8)~~ 5

I have used it once,
I suppose that you have herd of the Collision on the West end of the Road & then Hagan & an other conductor came near having an other smash up at the East end. Hagan is "laid off" I have not seen him since but Kittell told me all about it & says that Hagan will be put on again soon he thinks. You must wait untill I come for the particulars as well the boys.
I do believe Hallock that

7 ~~+~~

we shall make some money out of those dam mines after all,
I am glad that Irish crowd are out & hope that the chinamen will be all right.
I think I saw that Chapman when I was in the East. You must boss the thing the best you can, as you know what is best to be done better than I do. I thought that we would pay all the debts, & then you & I would look after our own share & let the rest do the same, this is confidential of course. When I get there we will settle long

8 ~~7~~

then & give each one the stock that belongs to them. & after this let them look out for themselves you & I have stood in the breach long enough I think dont you. but say nothing till a full settlement is had.
You will not have time to write me more than one more after getting this I hope I shall telegraph my wife when I start or you which ever I think best. I want to see you about as bad as I do my wife.
Please give my regards to Mrs Hallock & the Dock. Yours ever Henry

---

It is the too much talk that has injured us there. No one outside of the parties know what is going on here. All I can say is if they go in the thing is a bird. I have not seen George yet. I hope to be well soon. Yours in haste, HENRY.

The letter is indorsed:

5510, Hallock et al. vs. Markham. Pltff's. Exhibit "I." Filed December 14, 1887. Chas. H. Dunsmoor, Clerk, by H. W. Edelman, Deputy.

This interesting litigation left nothing to the imagination concerning the reasons that led Mr. Markham and his partners to prefer Chinese workers to white men, and especially to Irishmen. The testimony of partner Conger, found on page 373, vol. 1, of the Transcript, affords this lucid explanation:

"We hired Chinamen to keep down our expenses. We could not see how we could get through with three-dollar-a-day men, and we got over a lot of Chinamen. We talked it over, Mr. Markham, and Hallock and myself, and put in the Chinamen."

Simply to make the record complete, and not because the fact of Mr. Markham's partiality to Chinese labor is not sufficiently established without it, it may be well to introduce the deposition of the men who were employed to haul the Chinamen to the mine:

State of California, County of Los Angeles, City of Pasadena – ss. L. H. Michener and A. O. Bristol, who being first duly sworn, each for himself, deposes and says that they are white male citizens of the United States, over the age of twenty-one years; that they have resided in the City of Pasadena for about twelve years; that they have known H. H. Markham, Republican candidate for Governor of the State of California, for about ten years; that at the time said H. H. Markham and others were interested in the Oro Grande Mining Company as stockholders and directors, we were employed to haul a number of Chinamen to the Oro Grande mines in San Bernardino County; they were two loads in all. We loaded them in Chinatown, Los Angeles City, and delivered them at the company's mill at the said Oro Grande mines, and were duly compensated for said work.

L. H. MICHENER,
A. O. BRISTOL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of October, 1890.

L. C. WINSTON, Notary Public.

Judge Fitzgerald of Los Angeles put Mr. Markham in nomination at the Sacramento Convention and told what a great and good man he was. Judge Fitzgerald had not always held that opinion. In 1887, as a member of the firm of Anderson, Fitzgerald & Anderson, he filed a brief in the case of Hallock et al. vs. Markham, in which he said: "We find from the testimony, first, that he (Markham) deliberately and secretly converted to his own use $500 of the cash received from the Milwaukee parties; secondly, that he concealed the whole transaction with Miner from his principals and associates and secretly converted $6,500 of the proceeds of said transaction; thirdly, that while representing Sanger in the purchase of stock, he pretended that the parties he was buying from sold with the greatest reluctance and demanded the highest price, and was all the time secretly selling a part of his own stock to Sanger; fourthly, that while acting for the Milwaukee parties in the purchase of the 440 shares of stock for them he deliberately deceived them as to the price he was paying for it; fifthly, that he deliberately combined with Clancy to swindle Goldsworthy, (paying Clancy $5,700 for his 170 shares of stock, and paying Goldsworthy only $1,500 for his 180 shares) by making Goldsworthy believe that he was paying both the same price. When we take all these matters into consideration, it shows that all of his transactions should be critically examined, and prepares the mind for crookedness at every step."

An interesting little side light upon the candidate's character is afforded by the following testimony, showing how he got the military title which he has worn so gracefully ever since. We quote from the *Alta:*

Mr. Markham was not a Colonel in the Federal Army during the late war, nor did he win the title by distinguished services in the militia of this or any other State. His partner, O. H. Conger, promoted him to the rank of Colonel by the simple process of prefixing that title to his name on the Lick House register in 1881, and that scratch of the pen alone constitutes his commission.

Mr. Conger's testimony as to this occurrence appears on page 361, Volume I, of the transcript of evidence in the same suit of Hallock and other vs. H. H. Markham, in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. His evidence is as follows:

I went with Mr. Markham to San Francisco. Went to the Lick House, and there I registered H. H. Markham as "Colonel" H. H. Markham, as the first time that he ever went by that name, I am sorry to say.

The letter of which a *fac-simile* is given above, the one which Mr. Markham, Mr. Dan Burns and the Republican State Central Committee consider worth $2,000, is a moral, literary and political curiosity. If a rag-picker's assistant, attempting to make up the deficiencies of his early education by a course of study in a night school, should hand in a composition distinguished by such orthography, punctuation, capitalization and syntax, he would be told to spend his Sundays practising at home before repeating the attempt. But the gentleman who spells release "relese," and concentrator "consintrator," aspires to be Governor of California and ex-officio President of the Board of Regents of the State University.

Morally, Mr. Markham's letter is characterized by an obtuseness equal to that which has led him to deny his own handwriting for the sake of political advantage. It frankly speaks of the operation in which the writer was engaged, as a bunko steerer might speak to his pal, of the progress of a new confidence game. "If," remarks the candidate for the Governorship, "we can only make that prprty pay a respectable dividind, we can sell every doller of our stock in Mil. for a big figure, & the men I sold to are RED HOT to push the thing through." "If," he might have said, "we can salt the mine, so that we can furnish a good assay, we can sell every dollar of our stock for a big figure."

Mr. Markham suggests, with calm unconsciousness of wrong, that he and his correspondent should look out for their own stock, and let their partners, who were intimately associated with them, look out for themselves—this, not after due notice, but while no break was expected. "This is confidential, of course."

Nothing in the whole letter is more characteristic than its proposition to shave the mortgage of the friend who had been so kind that Mr. Markham wanted "to do by him what is right." This man had lent $10,000 to Markham and his partners, and was in need of his money. He was so embarrassed that he was about to mortgage his home to raise enough to help him out of his difficulties. In this strait it was natural to think that he might be willing to part with his claim on the Oro Grande Mining Company at a discount, and Mr. Markham, ever thoughtful, suggested to his correspondent that they might as well get that discount out of the friend by whom they wanted to do what was right as anybody else.

The whole tone of this letter, as of all other letters in the series—some of them being much worse in that respect than this—is low, vulgar, shifty and sordid. In several of the other letters introduced in evidence and now preserved on the records of the court, Mr. Markham luxuriates in language that Mr. Wanamaker would exclude from the mails if he knew about it. Many men of fairly good character indulge in careless talk, but a person who deliberately spells out his ribaldry with pen and ink is lacking in some of the elements that should enter into the composition of a Governor.

But, whatever other faults this correspondence may betray, there can be no questioning the fact that it discloses the virtue of candor. Mr. Markham was writing to Hallock with the freedom of a cracksman writing to his pal. There is no doubt, therefore, that he expressed his real sentiments when he said:

"I am glad that Irish Crowd are out, & hope that the Chinamen will be all right."

He agreed with Dr. Conger that they could not run the mine with three-dollar-a-day men, and that the Chinamen would be a good thing to save expenses. This was three years before he was elected to Congress on a platform of "protection to American labor."

If Mr. Markham had simply written this letter, it might be said for him that he was a stranger in California at the time, and that he has learned better since. But he has chosen to add to his nine-year-old indiscretion the offense of present falsehood. On the publication of the letter this week he declared it a forgery. This was not only an untruth, but a surprisingly audacious one. The letter is spread in full on the records of the Court in Los Angeles, and the original is in the possession of the Democratic State Central Committee. It was read in the course of the trial in 1887, Mr. Markham being present, and he testified at great length subsequently, but at no time on that occasion did he say a word in denial of the genuineness of the letter. He could not have done so, for he would have rendered himself liable to the penalties of perjury if he had.

It is instructive to see the way in which the publication of this damaging document has been met. Mr. Markham says:

"No such letter was ever written. **I never had occasion to write such a letter and I never did an unnatural thing in my life. This whole thing was gone over in my previous campaign, and I offered them, as I do now, $1,000 for the production of the letter."**

—*Examiner,* **October 16, 1890.**

Lieutenant Markham exhibits here the same confusion as to facts that has characterized him throughout the present contest. "This whole thing" could not have been gone over in his previous campaign, because that campaign was fought in 1884, and the case of Hallock et. al. vs. Markham did not come to trial until December, 1887. There may have been rumors of the existence of such a letter in 1884, but rumors are quite different things from Court records, as Mr. Markham will realize before he hears the last of that $1.000.

The *Bulletin's* entire explanation is as follows:

"Our Democratic contemporaries are making a prodigious noise over a matter which has been passed upon in court and in a political fight without injury to the Republican candidate for Governor. The episode shows how hard up they are for campaign ammunition. They are like a boy who whistles by a graveyard. They have lost their heads, too. They should have kept their stale sensation until it was too late to refute it. As it is, it will be dead and cold before election day."

The force of this vindication is apparent. It might have been a little more powerful if courts were in the habit of passing upon such expressions of opinion as "I am glad that Irish Crowd are out & hope that the Chinamen will be all right."

The *Post* says:

....
....
....
....

This, on the whole, is the best defense yet made in any quarter.

The *Call's* position is this:

It is bogus, and burns the brand of cowardice upon the soul of its originator. It will prove a political boomerang to its purchasers and will speed the avalanche that is hurrying to their ruin. It is not, nor never will be, believed by all intelligent citizens, who have not wallowed in the mire of bossism, or have been defiled by the methods of that corrupt destroyer of American manhood.

The lying statements were published yesterday morning, its purchasers being well aware that Colonel Markham would be out of the city and not have an opportunity of seeing it, he having sailed on the steamer for Eureka, Humboldt County.

WARMED-OVER LIES.

It is brought forward at this time as an entirely new matter by the Buckley organs, but, in fact, is simply a rehash of accusations made and refuted when Colonel Markham ran for Congress in 1884. At that time a man by the name of Sam James circulated the report and it was published in the papers. It was strenuously denied by the miners; and afterwards this same man, who was a Democrat, confessed that he had done what he did for political purposes and apologized for his action.

THE CHINESE CHESTNUT.

The Chinamen who were placed in the mine were placed there by Conger, while Colonel Markham was in the East negotiating for the sale of the mine. Colonel Markham enlisted the help of friends in the East and agreed to personally take charge of the mine, which he did. On his return the work was recommenced with white miners and a Chinaman never has stepped a foot in the mine since.

Colonel Markham was elected to Congress in the face of these accusations and at a time when the facts were known personally to the voters, and that in a strongly Democratic district, by a majority of 500.

THE TRUTH WAS KNOWN.

In 1886 he was renominated unanimously by the same people. Between 1886 and the present date the case has been tried. All the evidence that the papers of yesterday morning quoted had been used in court, published in the papers and thoroughly ventilated, together with Colonel Markham's testimony, and was well known to everybody in the four Counties of San Bernardino, Los Angeles, San Diego and Orange, and yet these same counties sent a solid delegation to Sacramento in his interest—not a dissenting voice or vote.

There is some vigor here; only it does not hang together. The *Call* begins by calling the paper bogus and ends by saying that all the evidence had been used in court, published in the papers and thoroughly ventilated; and that, in spite of it, Markham had been given a solid delegation from the southern counties. It is true that the evidence was used in court and never rebutted. That is precisely what is claimed. The value of a political vindication is somewhat impaired by the fact that Mr. Quay was vindicated in Pennsylvania after relieving the State Treasury of $260,000, and that he was vindicated again after getting away with $400,000 more. As to the "strongly Democratic district" which Mr. Markham carried by 500 majority, his majority was 409, and Blaine's, at the same election in the same district, was 1,353. Perhaps the rumor of this letter, since established in court, had something to do with the fact that Mr. Markham ran 944 behind his ticket.

Instead of waiting until Mr. Markham had gone to Eureka before publishing the letter, the Democratic papers in San Francisco published it while he was still in the city, and an interview with him on the subject appeared in the *Examiner* the next day.

Finally, the *Chronicle's* defense is this:

This is clearly what a Democratic contemporary would call "ancient history." Taken in its most extreme light it means nothing more than that Colonel Markham assented to the acts of his partner, who was managing the mine while he, Markham, was away in another State. This is all that Democratic ingenuity and industry can possibly make out of it.

But let us recall a little history that is not ancient. What have Colonel Markham's critics to say to the employment of 300 Chinese by the "Aleutian Islands Fishing and Mining Company," E. B. Pond, president, and the "Central Alaska Company" E. B. Pond, Director? Which do they think the worse, the man who, nine years ago, assented to his partner's employing Chinese, or the man who, in 1889, in his capacity as president and director of two corporations, employed some 300 Chinese?

Whether the question of employing Chinese is a factor in the present campaign every voter must decide for himself; but if it be, no honest voter can hesitate between the man who did no more than express an opinion in 1881 and the man who actually hired 300 Chinese in 1888. That is the whole issue in a nutshell, and this plain, common sense view of it certainly makes the Democratic assault on Colonel Markham appear very trifling and ridiculous.

In other words the *Chronicle* admits the genuineness of the letter—admits that Mr. Markham said that he was glad "that Irish crowd were out," and that he hoped "the Chinamen would be all right"—but asserts that if the Chinese question is to be an issue in the campaign Pond will suffer more than Markham, because he employed Chinese labor last year in the Alaska canneries in which he was interested. Whenever the *Chronicle* makes a charge against Mr. Pond the Mayor's Republican business associates may be relied upon to refute it. In the present instance the refutation came promptly in the form of the following letter, signed by the officers of the companies referred to, and published in the *Alta* the day after the *Chronicle's* defense of Markham appeared:

"The friends of E. B. Pond, irrespective of party, regard with indignation the indecent and untruthful attempts of the *Chronicle* to associate his name with the employment of Chinese labor. Throughout the business community there are almost as many Republicans as Democrats working for his election, and with these such false and malicious statements do not harm him.

"The most serious charge made against E. B. Pond's integrity by the *Chronicle* is that he is willing to risk capital in new enterprises in company with the best Republican merchants in San Francisco.

"As to the charge that he countenanced the employment of Chinese by corporations in the management of which he was concerned, the truth is that he joined in the incorporation of the Aleutian Islands Fishing and Mining Company and also the Central Alaska Company, and for purposes of incorporation became the nominal president, but from the outset objected to the employment of Chinese. The companies later found it impossible to compete with other canneries without resorting to Chinese labor, *and when Mr. Pond was so advised, he promptly resigned from the Presidency and Directory and offered his stock for sale.* Nobody would purchase the stock, as there has never been a dividend from either company, and assessments have been levied yearly. As a fact, these companies together employ 215 white men and 160 Chinamen, and the Chinamen are not employed in this State, but in Alaska. The companies own two steamers, which were built in San Francisco, of seventy-five tons register each, three steam launches, and one full-rigged bark of 759 tons register. All supplies, provisions, machinery, tools, etc., are purchased in this city. The wages of sailors, fishermen and other white employees are better than here. Fishermen receive $10 per month and a percentage on fish, which raises wages to an average of $52.50 per month, besides good board. The Chinamen are not employed regularly. They are paid by the hour, only hired during special runs and board themselves. Mr. Pond has nothing to do with the management of the above companies. For nearly two years full powers have been vested in Charles E. Gibbs, doing business under the name of Scotchler & Gibbs, the oldest canners' agents on the coast; and although these gentlemen have not succeeded in completely dispensing with Chinese labor, they have constantly endeavored to do so.

"None of the undersigned are in any sense politicians, and two of the three signing are Republicans: but they know Mr. Pond well, and, without distinction of politics, they desire that he should receive justice."

ALEUTIAN ISLANDS FISHING AND MINING COMPANY,
Per W. S. Gage, President.

CENTRAL ALASKA COMPANY,
Per W. S. Gage, President.

ALEUTIAN ISLANDS FISHING AND MINING COMPANY,
Per H. W. George, Secretary, Charles E. Gibbs, Agent.

That appears to settle the attempt to acquit Mr. Markham by shouting at Mr. Pond: "You're another!" The last line of defense is marred by the Los Angeles *Times,* which publishes affidavits from men who say that they worked in the Oro Grande Mine in 1883, and that no Chinamen were employed there at that time. As Mr. Markham's letter expressing his gratification at the substitution of Chinamen for "that Irish crowd" was dated August 8, 1881, a few affidavits referring to that year would be a little more useful. In 1881 Mr. Markham was described in his letters of introduction as a resident of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. In 1883 he was thinking of running for Congress in California. It is not surprising to learn that he had developed a distaste for Chinese labor and even an affection for his fellow-citizens of Irish birth within the interval.

The *Chronicle* is entitled to the thanks of the Democracy for the opportunity it has given to point the contrast between the characters and conduct of the two candidates for the Governorship. Mr. Pond, when accused of participation in the management of companies employing Chinese, is at once exculpated by his Republican associates, who show that he insisted upon the exclusive employment of white labor, and that when Chinese were engaged—not in California, but in Alaska—he at once resigned his positions and offered his stock for sale. Mr. Markham, on the other hand, is proven, by the testimony of his partners and his own handwriting, to have advised and consented to the substitution of Chinese for white labor in his mine, and to have exulted in the opportunity of getting rid of "that Irish crowd." Every man who has ever had business dealings with Pond is ready at any time to come to his defense. Markham's partners are his accusers. Business associates ought to be good judges of a man's character.

Mr. Markham and the Republican State Central Committee offered $1,000 apiece for the production of this letter, and when they were accommodated they repudiated their proposition and pronounced the letter a forgery. At the Democratic ratification meeting at San Francisco on the 16th inst., Mr. Chas. L. Ackerman, Chairman of the Sub-Executive Committee of the Democratic State Central Committee, made the following offer to Mr. Markham's champions:

"I challenge that party now to this: Let M. H. de Young, W. W. Morrow, W. H. L. Barnes and James V. Coffey constitute a committee before whom Mr. Markham shall appear and permit a full investigation to be made, provided he will unseal the lips of his counsel, Stephen M. White, and if it is not proved to their satisfaction that Mr. Markham wrote that letter, I will place $5000 in the hands of W. F. Goad to distribute to the poor of the city, provided that if it is so proved he likewise forfeit the sum of $2500; and I am authorized to offer the same odds to the amount of $25,000."

The challenge has not been accepted.