

The Plattsmouth Weekly Herald

KNOTTS BROS., Publishers & Proprietors.

THE PLATTSMOUTH HERALD

Is published every evening except Sunday and Weekly every Thursday morning. Registered at the postoffice, Plattsmouth, Neb., as second-class matter. Office corner of Vine and Fifth streets.

TERMS FOR ADVERTISING. One copy one year in advance, by mail, \$6.00. One copy per week, by carrier, 15. One copy per week, by mail, 15.

TERMS FOR WEEKLY. One copy one year, in advance, \$1.50. One copy six months, in advance, .75.

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN TICKET.

FOR PRESIDENT, BENJAMIN HARRISON, of Indiana. FOR VICE PRESIDENT, LEVI P. MORTON, of New York.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM.

The republicans of the United States, assembled by their delegates in national convention, pause for a moment to honor the memory of their first great leader and immortal champion of liberty and the rights of the people...

FOREIGN RELATIONS. The conduct of foreign affairs by the present administration has been distinguished by inefficiency and cowardice...

FISHERIES QUESTION.

We arraign the present democratic administration for its weak and unpatriotic treatment of the fisheries and its pusillanimous surrender of all privileges to which our fishery vessels are entitled in Canadian ports...

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.

The men who abandoned the republican party in 1881 and continue to adhere to the cause of honest government, but of sound finance, of freedom and purity of the ballot...

AGAINST PAUPER AND LABOR TRUSTS.

We declare hostility to the introduction into this country of foreign contract labor and of Chinese labor to our territory...

PUBLIC LAND LEGISLATION.

We reaffirm the policy of appropriating the public lands of the United States to the homesteads for American citizens and settlers not aliens...

ADMISSION OF TERRITORIES.

The government by congress of the territories is based upon necessity only to the extent that they may become states in the union...

THE MORMON QUESTION.

The power of the Mormon church in the territories exercised in the past is a menace to free institutions too dangerous to be long suffered. Therefore we pledge the re-

Republican State Convention.

The republican electors of the state of Nebraska are requested to send delegates from their several counties to meet in convention at the city of Lincoln Thursday, August 23, 1888, at 2 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of placing in nomination candidates for the following state offices.

- Governor. Lieutenant Governor. Secretary of State. State Treasurer. Auditor of Public Accounts. Attorney General. Commissioner of Public Lands and Buildings.

THE APPOINTMENT.

The several counties are entitled to representation as follows, being based upon the vote cast for Hon. Samuel Maxwell, judge, in 1887, giving one delegate at large to each county, and for each 150 votes, and major fraction thereof:

Table with 4 columns: COUNTY, VOTES, COUNTY, VOTES. Lists counties and their respective vote counts for the 1887 election.

It is recommended that no proxies be admitted to the convention except such as are held by persons residing in the counties from which the proxies are given.

To Chairman County Central Committees:

WHEREAS, At the republican state convention held at Lincoln October 5, 1887, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the state central committee be instructed to embrace in its call for the next state convention the submission of the prohibition question to the republican voters at the republican primaries.

Two strong reasons for the adoption of the bandana of Thurman as the flag of the democracy in the coming campaign, were first, on account of its resemblance to the English Royal Jack, and its consequent appropriateness for a free trade party.

Second, because it is warranted to stand three months of service without showing its soiled condition, and this last recommendation appealed to the hearts of the unwashed democracy.—Ex.

GROVER.—Daniel! Don't you think the atmosphere hereabouts is rather rare, since I made that speech to the "Messenger" committee?

Daniel.—Well, yes; rather light Grover.

Grover.—Don't you think we had better send for Higgins and Fellows and have a report on the state of the party.

Daniel.—Yes, Grover; and at once, for this Harrison boom is filling the air in New York and Connecticut with a volcanic dust which grows in its luster.

PATRICK EGAN is called a professional Irishman by the hydrophobic democratic press. Yes, Mr. Egan is an educated Irishman who has professed Republicanism, and this is the head and front of his offending. An Irishman that refuses to be dragged behind the conquering car of English free trade and English democracy in this country, is a scallawag in the estimation of the northern democracy.

Gen. D. M. SEELY, Secretary.

THIS wild, woolly, west, doesn't want any free trade, not such gentlemen; we want manufactures; and now, just as the manufacturer is putting his foot west of the Missouri river to build up manufactures and give us a home market, out west, for our produce and then, in a measure, relieve us from the burden of long hauls to the lakes and seaport market.—The vexed transportation problem we don't want any free trade for the west. Give us protection, give us manufactures—give us a home market, the best market in the world—an American market—is what we want.

ALREADY our democratic enemies are sneering at the republican emblem, the American Flag. Very well, gentlemen! "We will rally 'round the flag" and you can rally 'round the rag.

CLEVELAND AND PROTECTION

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND in his message of Dec. 6th, says we have too much revenue. The country must have expressed a smile upon beholding a democratic administration condemning our federal system of revenue, because of its productiveness; yet, we are all willing to concede the fact that, a large surplus should not be permitted to accumulate in the national treasury and the question is, how should we go about the matter to safely remedy this unnecessary flow of money in the national treasury?

Mr. Cleveland in his wisdom says the internal revenue tax is not a burden on the people but that the tariff is. He reiterates the state and insipid argument that the tariff raises the price to the consumer, of all imported articles, by adding the price paid for duties; hence, he argues that the principle of a protective tariff is wrong and a burden to the consumer, and being so is unwise as a governmental practice. Now then there is no dispute that the republican proposition to do away with the internal revenue tax, the moment it is no longer needed, is correct; and, if that will reduce this "surplus," we hear so much about, and there is no better or wiser way suggested, by which it can be done, the democratic party would be supposed to favor it but Mr. Cleveland claims that the tariff is an evil within itself and by its repeal the problem is solved and the surplus nuisance abated.

Mr. Cleveland is wrong in his promises; the protective tariff does not enhance the price of imported goods as he claims. Today the free list contains every, or almost every, article that we do not produce in this country. The clothing of our people is cheaper, style and quality considered, than in any other country our wages are better, our laboring classes can purchase as much with their money as any people in the world; they live better, have more comforts in their homes; more freedom in every way, than any other people; hence, the republican party contend that Mr. Cleveland and his party are wrong and if permitted to have their way would, in the end, degrade the labor of America, destroy our manufactures and drive us to submit to a foreign market and English prices for labor and products. If we are correct in our two propositions, first that American labor is better paid, and second that the American laborer's money will purchase as much as the English laborer will, we have established a proposition that in itself completely destroys Mr. Cleveland's platform, and it becomes unnecessary to go further to show that the president misconceives and misunderstands the policy of protection under which this nation has grown so rapidly and developed such wonderful resources.

TO HEAR the democratic editors harping on the whisky question is more than amusing. The Chicago platform worries these gentlemen. The republican party is square out on the revenue question, in favor of "all needed reduction of national revenue, by repealing the taxes on tobacco, which are an annoyance and burden to agriculture and the tax on spirits used in and for mechanical purposes."

Where the democratic party on this portion of our platform? Then the Chicago platform goes further and says: "If there shall still remain larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the government, we favor the entire repeal of the internal taxes, rather than surrender any part of our protective system at the joint 'best of the whisky ring and the agents of foreign manufacturers.'" This portion of the platform democracy does not relish, why? Because it is for protection to our labor; protection to our productions, both raw and manufactured; and, principally opposition to the foreign manufacturer and his agents—the democratic party. This platform is unusually bold and explicit; there is no suffering no "Mill's bill" in jone breath and "Platform of '84" in the next; no double header by which free trade can be knocked at the South and protection to the North. Of course our democratic opponents don't like the Chicago platform.

The strike among the furnace men of Pennsylvania is charged up to the tariff with all the cheek the millionaire Scott, who has taken charge of Mr. Cleveland's cause, possesses. The idle furnaces and falling scale of wages in the iron region is directly traceable to just such men as Messrs. Scott, Cleveland and Co.

RECORD IS IT!

Mr. Hitchcock's democratic mouth piece Mr. Morrisey and the Omaha Herald are very much worried over Ben Harrison's Chinese record! Yes, Mr. Harrison has a record on the Chinese question. Now then what has Grover got? Has he any record on the Chinese question? Where was Grover when Mr. Harrison was making that record. Mr. Harrison also, has a war record, a good one; what is Grover's, is it good? Does it recommend itself to the youth of this country? What sort of a record is it for a young able bodied man, with neither family or business to tie him down, to oppose the war for the union, to oppose the draft for able bodied men to fill, the quota of the empire state to hire a substitute (?) to go to the front? How does that record compare with Ben Harrison's? Let the old soldiers who vote the democratic ticket answer that question; but further, Ben Harrison has a record as a lawyer; Grover Cleveland chose the same profession, what is his record? What do you think of a member of the learned profession in Buffalo, in the pride of his young manhood, abandoning his profession and running for sheriff? How does that look anyway? What would you think of Judge Wakeby, Judge Down, John M. Thurston, John L. Webster or Gen'l Cowin, leaving their lucrative and honorable practice to run for sheriff of Douglas county? But further, Mr. Harrison has the record of an irreproachable private character, without the taint of the saloon, without the taint of the libertine. What is Grover Cleveland's record? You are in the business now, wanting voters to consider the record of Mr. Harrison, let us have the corresponding life of the man whose election to the greatest office within the gift of the American people, will always be a reproach and stigma upon the moral intelligence of this great liberty professing nation. On with the record business!

Geo. WILLIAM CURTIS, standing where Lincoln stood, on the famous heights at Gettysburg, delivered an oration the other day in the presence of the survivors of the eventful conflict which occurred between the Union and Confederate forces July, 1863; and the most significant portion of that oration was a plea for untrammelled suffrage in this country. Here are some of his words:

Akin to this is the problem of the suffrage. Subject to the constitutional guarantee of a republican form of government, and of no discrimination against race or color, the regulation of the suffrage is wisely left to the states. But the action of every state upon subjects of a common interest necessarily affects the Union. The suffrage is the mainspring, the heart of our common life, and whatever affects it injuriously, touches the national sensorium and the whole country thrills. No community politically founded upon the legal equality of the suffrage can habitually disregard the equality without moral deterioration, growing indifference to the authority of law, and destruction of the democratic-republican principle. If ignorance and semi-barbarism, not less so is constant and deliberate defiance of law. In a national union of states where free elections are assumed, systematic fraud or violence or suppression of votes, in the event of a closely contested poll, would inevitably destroy the conviction that the apparent result represented the actual will of the legal voters, and that result would be challenged amid violent disorder. It is not enough that a national election be fair, it must be the national conviction that is fair.

Now the question: Why did Mr. Curtis think it proper on that occasion, to dwell upon and urge an observance and reverence, for the "constitutional guarantee" of a republican form of government? which professes to confer the inestimable privilege of suffrage without "discrimination against race or color?" The great mugwump who is supporting Mr. Cleveland spoke fit words for any American assembly, especially any congregation composed largely of representative men from the south; the answer is because Mr. Curtis acknowledges the fact, that at the south for political purposes, the democratic party does openly and continually disregard that constitutional guarantee which Mr. Curtis recognizes as the principal corner stone of our free institutions. And, yet, knowing this, Mr. Curtis trains with and supports a party which is in power today, and, if it remains in power a single day after March 1889, must retain that power by an exercise of that sinful revolutionary practice which he condemns: Another curious feature of Mr. Curtis' address, in this connection, was the practical illustration he used to emphasize the wholesome doctrine he would inculcate; he uses New York and "the large class of ignorant un-American voters who barely speak our language" etc., as the horrible example. Now if Mr. Curtis had been delivering an address before Tammany or "the county democracy" we might be able to intelligently comprehend this illustration. Yet there was none of Tammany at Gettysburg; that class of fellows never fool around a battle field, either in times of peace or war. The subject, the occasion, the Confederate presence, all, were calculated to call for the truthful after past illustrations furnished from each and every "solid south" state, where the intelli-

gent, the high born, the ruling class, have practiced the baleful doctrine. Mr. Curtis deprecates ever since the prosecutions of the Ku Klux during the reconstruction period. Evidently Mr. Curtis went as far in his application as his present political affiliation would permit.

If there be a national question, a question, which vitally interests every American citizen from the Penobscot to the Rio Grande, a question which, while Americans are Americans, will not be set aside, but must be honorably entertained and patriotically adjusted, it is the question of free legal ballot.

Says Mr. Curtis in closing this portion of his address. This is in full accord with the republican national platform; it is true, it is one of the great issues today between the two great parties and Mr. Curtis is with the party that is against "a free legal ballot." Surely, "politics do make strange bed fellows." Speaking for the class of "ignorant un-American voters" in New York state Mr. Curtis says:

It is large enough to control the state, and as the electoral votes of New York is very important, it might easily decide a national election.

Exactly, and every man, woman and child in New York knows that this very "ignorant un-American vote" is a dead sure democratic vote; for Cleveland in '84, for Cleveland in '88; for the democratic ticket and the "Gin Mill" always. How an honest man could deliberately utter these truthful truths and support an administration which has gained all it possesses by a deliberate practice of depriving "legal voters" of the right to vote is more than honest men can understand. What stronger argument can be made in support of the Chicago platform and ticket?

HERE is a passage from an editorial in that conservative and thoughtful journal, the London Globe, which itself respect, American citizens would do well to consider carefully before he casts his vote next fall.

"As a rule the presidential contest has very little interest in the Old World. On the present occasion, however, an issue is involved which very closely concerns Europe, more particularly Great Britain. Mr. Cleveland has taken his stand on free trade, and, although his party managers have considerably plumed down his platform, he is universally recognized in the states, as pledged to initiate a new departure in fiscal policy. Nor can there be any doubt that he would act up to this understanding were he elected. The central issue of the contest lies between the maintenance of the present fiscal system intact and its modification in the direction of free trade. And on that broad question Mr. Cleveland's candidature naturally and necessarily carries English sympathy."

Thanks are due to the Globe for such a frank and explicit showing of hands. England's only interest in American politics lies in the direction of breaking down the American protective system, in order that English greed may be gorged at the expense of American industry. Let the workmen of America keep the Globe's words well in mind, and determine who "naturally and necessarily carries English sympathy."

TALK about that walk away will you! Have you noticed a high protectionist, Mule Barnum, restored to favor and placed at the head of the democratic national committee? Have you read Grover's letter to Tamany in which he denies he or the democratic party are for free trade? It beats the "battle flag" retreat all hollow—If the great walk away party is not thoroughly scared we have missed our guess. After months of free trade bluster, Cleveland's message, the Mill's bill, the Saint Louis convention, the assassination of Sam Randall and all such free trade feats, to see the whole party, Grover and all, on the back track within two weeks of the republican nomination is too utterly utter—the walk away seems to be a walk backwards.

The Daily Call, of Lincoln, under the management of Messrs. Bushnell, Fairbrother and Cox, is a venture the Lincoln people should stand solidly by. This new evening adventure has everything in its make-up to warrant success. In business qualifications for management, in brains and solid accomplishments for editorial work, we do not know of a newspaper in Nebraska that presents as strong a combine, and we predict for the Call a profitable and useful future. Go in, boys, and may the Capital BROS recognize that there is a Call for publicity in all their devious meanderings.

The question in the coming campaign for the presidency is rapidly settling down into this: Are we to have cheap blankets or cheap whisky? The more the republicans make this issue clear the easier will be the canvass.—New York Herald.

If the democrats desire to have this "cheap blanket" and "cheap whisky" issue discussed they will find the republicans ready for them. Protection developed blanket as well as other sorts of manufacturing in this country, and made that article as cheap here as it is in other country of the world, quality considered. High license is keeping whisky, comparatively speaking, dear and scarce. The cheap blanket and dear whisky men are the republicans. The Herald knows enough of current politics to know that this is true.—Globe Democrat.