

**FARMER'S OPINIONS.**

**The People's Plan of Campaign in the People's Opportunity to Perfect a Union of All for All.**

**EDITOR ALLIANCE.**—The National Farmer's Alliance in the Plan of Campaign adopted at Omaha, struck the keynote of the People's campaign of 1892. "By that sign we will conquer." By thus uniting on six grand essential issues as the permanent national platform of the Independent party whereon all practical reformers can stand, while agreeing to disagree on non-essential and unseasonable issues, the plan of campaign will become the secure foundation for a new republic wherein "An injury to one shall be the concern of all."

It was fitting that said plan should be given to the people by the Farmer's Alliance in National Convention assembled, in the state of Nebraska, the birth place of the People's Independent party.

Having a national platform that is to stand unchanged until after the presidential election in 1892; the endorsees of said plan can organize untroubled by the possibility of a change of the national platform in a national convention dominated by hobby riding enthusiasts; honest but impractical reformers; the delegates of mythical parties; and the mercenaries of monopoly, and the old parties who would surely overload the platform and destroy the party.

By thus uniting all for all, the wreckers who are plotting in the interest of the moss-back parties, and make merchandise of their untried leadership would be cast out unless made secure by such a safeguard as this Farmers' Alliance plan of campaign. Every national convention would be contested by corporation attorneys, and the mercenaries of monopoly; bogus greenbackers would send full delegations from every state. "The restless devils of discord" would fraternize with the "Apostles of decay."

By this act of real statesmanship the National Farmers' Alliance have saved the people from themselves. Send out your pledges for signatures.

OLD EQUITY.

**The Supreme Court Again.**

The following able argument in relation to the late partisan decision of the Supreme Court is by a Nebraska lawyer. While the subject may be getting a little bare, we desire it to be fully presented in every light, and therefore publish the argument:

INDIANOLA, Neb., Feb., 1891.

**EDITOR ALLIANCE.**—Having been an interested reader of the proceedings of the Legislature, and realizing that two of the most important questions that the Supreme Court has ever had before it have been recently passed upon by that tribunal; viz: a mandamus to compel the speaker of the House to publish the returns and the necessity of the Governor's approval to a joint resolution fixing a time to take up a contest in the Legislature, I herewith submit a few thoughts upon the latter question only, with a view to opening a discussion of the subject, that this question may be better understood.

I realize the fact that this question is of much greater moment than will admit of an opinion based upon a passing casual investigation.

I think I am correct if I say Nebraska has had no *de jure* Governor since the first Thursday after the first Tuesday in January 1891. I have two reasons for this opinion. 1st. The Supreme Court advised Gov. Thayer to quietly submit to the order of things under a *de facto* Governor. 2nd. The office of Governor is now under contest and no *de jure* Governor is recognized. Keeping these facts in mind what is the status of the case?

In the first place the supreme court coerced (if I may be permitted to use the term) the speaker and the joint assembly into declaring Boyd elected, thus placing in temporary power the party, or defendant, whose title to the office and its prerogatives is directly assailed and challenged.

In the second place the *de facto* Governor being the defendant and the direct party in interest in the case, must (according to the decision of the supreme court) decide whether the case shall proceed or not, or in other words the defendant in the case must be allowed to settle the pleadings and make up the issues, or the case cannot proceed. After some examination I cannot believe that the authorities sustain that view, and I do not believe that, with a reasonable length of time (which the court did not have) to thoroughly investigate the case, the court would have given the opinion it did, and I do not believe the court will adhere to that decision in any future case should one in point ever come before it again.

The provision of the constitution under which the court rendered the opinion is Art. 5, Sec. 15, and reads as follows:

"Every bill passed by the legislature, before it becomes a law, and every order, resolution or vote to which the concurrence of both houses may be necessary (except on questions of adjournment) shall be presented to the governor. If he approve he shall sign it, and thereupon it shall become a law; but if he do not approve he shall return

it with his objection to the house in which it shall have originated" etc, etc. The balance of the section pertains only to the manner in which the bill may become a law, notwithstanding the disapproval.

Upon the first reading, and casual observation of that portion of the section it would seem that the language is *conclusive*, and can have but one construction, and I believe the supreme court took that view of it. But the question arises, will the section bear analyzing? and will the construction remain the same? Let us see. The first part of the section says, "Every bill, before it becomes a law," shall go through such and such a process. Now what is meant by, "before it becomes a law?" Why, evidently before it can be placed upon the statute books, before it can be placed before the people as one of the laws for their government. Then the section goes on and says, "If he approve, he shall sign it," etc. Approve what? Evidently the bill, order, or resolution, that is to become a law. Then if the governor approve and sign it, what effect does the signature have? The section declares "It shall become a law."

Now suppose the concurrent resolution fixing the 17th of Feb as the date the general assembly would take up the contest had been signed by the speaker of the house, president of the senate and the governor, will it, or can it ever become a law? Will it ever be spread upon the statute books of this state as one of the laws enacted by the 22nd general assembly? I do not think anyone will do violence to the English language by affirming this proposition. Then if it cannot and will not ever be a law what will it be? It will simply remain on the journal of the general assembly, as a rule, and a part of the proceedings evidencing the fact that at that time, Feb. 17, both houses were ready and willing to proceed, and determine the fact of who is really entitled to give the final sanction to all bills, orders or resolutions that are entered as laws. The constitution Art. 3, Sec. 7, provides that "each house shall determine its own rules by which it shall be governed" and exercising this exclusive power the two houses of the Nebraska legislature jointly concurred in the rule or resolution fixing a certain day when a certain order of business would be taken up.

I am convinced that the great weight of authority is against the decision of the supreme court, and only have room in one article upon this subject to cite a few of the many authorities arrayed against it. Referring to the power of the Legislative department, Sir Edward Coke in 4 Inst. 36 said: "It (speaking of Parliament) hath sovereign and uncontrolled authority in making, confirming, enlarging, restraining, abrogating, repealing, reviving and expounding of laws concerning matters of all possible denominations, ecclesiastical or temporal, civil, military, maritime or criminal." And speaking further upon this same subject he says: "All mischiefs, and grievances, operations and remedies that transcend the ordinary course of the laws are within the reach of this extraordinary tribunal."

I do not contend, however, that the legislative department of our government and states have such unlimited control as was vested in the English Parliament, however all these prerogatives will apply in a very great measure to our legislative bodies.

Again we turn to the 6 American and English encyclopaedia of law, page 414, we find the positive rule laid down, that "In election contests it is held that no person can be a judge of his own case."

Following this rule, it was held in Davys vs. Savidge, Hobart 89, City of London vs. Wood, 12 Mod. 687. "This rule is as old as the common law; and in England it has been said that an act of parliament which should be so contrary to natural equity would be void."

In the case of Rice vs. Foster 4 Harr. 485 (Del.) Chief Justice Booth said: "An act to make a man judge his own case would not be valid, because it was never the intention of the constitution to vest such power in the legislature the exercise of which violates the plainest principles of natural justice." Then again in the case of Com. vs. McClosky 2 Rawl. 369 (Pa.) the following strong terse language is used. "Unless the words of the act be plain and explicit the court is bound in decency to conclude that the legislature had no intention to violate the principles of equity, or without necessity to contravene the first principles of the social compact. That it is against reason and justice, and the fruitful source of faction, corruption and abuse that the party interested should judge his own cause. It is not to be presumed, but directly to the contrary, that the legislature have invested the respondent with such extraordinary powers."

Sustaining this same doctrine see Brightley's El. cases, and Stockton case in U. S. Senate.

Cooley in his constitutional limitations 3rd. Ed. 175 after commenting upon the question uses this language:

"And for similar reasons a legislative act which should undertake to make a Judge the arbitrator in his own controversies would be void, because though in form a provision for the exercise of judicial power in substance it would be the creation of an arbitrary and irresponsible authority, neither Legislative, Executive or Judicial, and wholly unknown to constitutional Government." And again at 410 and 411 same volume

he says, "there is a maxim of law regarding judicial action which may have an important bearing upon the constitutional validity of judgement in some cases. No one ought to be a Judge in his own case," he then quotes the citation of the English authority referred to in the former part of this article. Continuing, Justice Cooley says: "This maxim applies in all cases where judicial functions are to be exercised, and excludes all who are interested however remotely, from taking part in their exercise. It is not left to the discretion of a judge, or to his sense of decency, to decide whether he shall act or not; all his powers are subject to this absolute limitation, and when his own rights are in question he has no authority to determine the cause." A vast array of authority in the United States support this doctrine. The supreme court in passing upon the question in the course of the opinion says, "Now unless we are astray fundamentally in our view of this constitution and law, it was essential to the validity of a concurrent resolution for any purpose whatever, that it should have been signed by the presiding officer of the senate as well as of the house."

In the case of Cottrell vs the State, 9, Neb., 125. It was held that "The failure of the presiding officer of the senate to sign a bill which was afterwards signed by the governor and which the journal of the senate shows passed the senate by a constitutional majority, does not affect the validity of the act." This decision is again adhered to and reaffirmed in Taylor vs Wilson, 17, Neb., 80.

After examination into this case and the authorities for and against the opinion, I have fully convinced my own mind at least that there is a very large preponderance of authority against it. So large in fact that it almost amounts to unanimity.

S. R. SMITH.

**The Alliance as an Educator.**  
Of the many beauties of the Alliance there is none more worthy of mention than its educating influences. It opens its doors alike to men and women, and extends a special invitation to the young. Many sons and daughters have not the opportunities of their more favored companions, and what education they get must be got at the district school or by the fire side. Whatever influence can be brought to bear to encourage and strengthen them should be availed of. The Alliance offers such assistance. Here the young can mingle with their elders. In the Alliance the young may learn habits of precision, thoroughness and perseverance, and inculcate ideas of the nobility of their calling. The bashful uncouth manners can in a great measure be overcome by simple association in the Alliance hall. The passing through the official chairs of the Alliance will give them a training which will prove invaluable in later life, for many of our legislators have been promoted from the farmers' private ranks. The Alliance is not simply a listening school, but it is a place for work, a talking school where all are free to have their say upon all questions. Unlike many other orders refinement and culture are not the criterion so much as true worth, and the staid farmer is as quick as his city brother to discover these qualities which stand the test of time and vicissitudes of life. The true rule or aim of an Alliance is to learn the higher cultivation of the soil, perfection in all farm work, as well as advancement of agriculture, and to furnish the safe foundation for a wise and happy people.

H. C. JORDAN.

**Vicious Financial Legislation is what's the Matter.**

KENESAW, Neb., Jan. 23, 1891.

**EDITOR ALLIANCE.**—Now is the time for the farmers to make a strike that will shake the nation. Congress is hindering the nation as it was never hindered before. It is not tariff, election frauds or railroad oppression which are grinding down the people and shrinking the value of farm lands and products, but it is the accused and treasonable methods of Wall street in withholding from the people the required amount of money with which to do business. The tariff-election will fare at Washington, schemed and worked by Wall street to defeat honest money legislation, is the most damnable conspiracy and worthy of denunciation by mass meetings all over the country. Reed, Sherman and Harrison should be held impeachable. Why not offer a resolution in the legislature denouncing the present congress for its damnable conspiracy in withholding financial relief to the country. Call upon the state farmers Alliance of other states to do likewise. It will be a big thing for the farmer's crown. This session of congress almost gone and nothing but a circus. Inaugurate mass meetings at once for silver coinage and immediate financial relief. Four or five monster mass meetings in Kansas and Nebraska would arouse the West as it was never aroused before. Turn loose the bloodhounds of war.

A. D. SHANKS.

**The Alliance Growing right Along.**

BELMONT, Neb., Feb. 4, 1891.

**ED. FARMER'S ALLIANCE.**—I am more than pleased with your paper; also with you for the way in which you deal out medicine to the o. g. p. I know it must be nauseous to them, but it's for their good you know, so don't be sparing of it, and so poor despised "naysayers" will set back and watch the squirming, wringing contortions they go through in swallowing it. The Alliance is growing right along in North-west Neb., even though our crops don't, and our Alliance, 1289, voted the Independent ticket straight to a man. We have 50 members and only organized in the spring. It is with pleasure we read of the Alliance dropping the Omaha Bee, World-Herald, Lincoln Journal, and all local papers who are fighting us and our cause. We are doing the same here. Here's our hand, fellow Alliance men. In the language of Gen'l Grant "we will fight it out on this line, not if it takes all summer—but if it takes forever." Yours fraternally,  
C. C. BACON.

**Government Ownership of Railroads.**

HAWTHORNE, Neb., Feb. 3, 1891.

**EDITOR ALLIANCE.**—In a recent issue of your paper your contributor "Uncle Jake" asks for an outline or exposition of some practical plan whereby the government can acquire the ownership of the railroads. I, too, would like to see such a plan outlined.

"Uncle Jake" supposes that the purchase could only be accomplished by the issuance of interest bearing bonds in payment. Granted! I do not think it would require a thousand years to liquidate those bonds, as he supposes; neither do I think that the lower rate of interest the longer would be the time required for liquidation as he seems to think. On the contrary, I think the time required would be shorter. Let us take a case. I have at hand the report of the U. S. Railroad commissioner for the year 1881. From this report I gather that at that time the Union Pacific Railway Co. owned and operated 1821 miles of railroad; that the net earnings of these 1821 miles of road from its freight and passenger traffic, after deducting all operating expenses, were \$11,290,840.

Now it is written in the bond, i. e. the charter, under which this corporation "lives and moves and has its being," that the government may take possession of this road and all its equipments or appurtenances thereto belonging, at any time by paying for the same at "fair valuation." I think that "Uncle Jake" will agree that \$50,000 per mile is a valuation somewhat in excess of "fair."

Now 1821 miles at \$50,000 per mile amounts to \$91,050,000, the interest on which at 3 per cent would amount to \$2,731,500. Deduct this amount from the \$11,290,840 of net earnings and there would remain \$8,559,340 to be applied in payment of principal. So apply these net earnings annually and the debt would be paid in less than ten years.

There is some difference between 10 and 1,000 years. Reducing the rates of freight and passage 25 per cent, the operating expenses remaining he same, net earnings would be reduced 50 per cent, and if applied as above the debt would be paid in less than twenty years, which is still a good deal less than one thousand years. If proper allowance be made for increase of business from year to year and decrease in amount and ratio of expenses the above estimate of time would be somewhat reduced.

"Uncle Jake" thinks that "the government would have to employ the present owners to manage the roads, and that while the government would own the railroads the railroad men would own the government."

I don't just catch on to that. The present owners have to go outside of their own number to get efficient managers. Could not the government employ the same men or other and better ones? While I think it true—and this is one of the things complained of—that some of the present managers, who are not even owners, or at most only part owners, do to a certain extent own the roads practically, and that they manage the road mainly for their own interests, without proper regard for the rights and interests of other owners, I think they would not be able to play this game quite so successfully, if the government were the owner and they were in its employ. Government has more power than minority stockholders.

"Uncle Jake" asks, "What is to hinder operators of railroads from pooling their interests under government ownership as under private?"

As I am a full blooded yankee, I will answer that question with another. What is it that hinders the soldiers of our army, the sailors of the navy, with their officers, or the postal and other employees of the government from pooling their interests in opposition to the government?

There seems to be no good reason why the government should delay or hesitate in taking possession of the U. P. railroad; and there are many good reasons why it should not delay. It seems that the government is bound to lose largely by this road in any event, and that the longer it delays, the more it will lose. In entering this door the way may appear clear for further advances, so that in due time the whole railroad system will come under the control and ownership of the government. Yours,  
UNCLE FULLER.

**An able Letter from a Lady Member.**

EDGAR, Neb., 1891.

**EDITOR ALLIANCE.**—The name of our Alliance is Grand View, instead of Fairview, as I headed it before, but no difference about that, we are in a flourishing condition. The ladies are coming in all the time, and we have both pleasant and profitable meetings. When we first proposed debating on the most important subjects of the day, the men said "Oh, we never debated before, we can't." But we said they could try, and they did, and they done well, and they are gaining confidence in themselves, and it is astonishing how much information we are gaining in this way. Mr. Editor, I see you have placed my letter in the columns of your valuable paper. And I won't retract one word of it. Some democrats think I made it pretty strong when I said I believed you were the Moses to lead the people out of bondage. I mean it. Through your example and your valuable paper you are leading thousands out of the bondage of ignorance, (yes ignorance.) For can you ever remember a time when the radical ones in either party voted other than for party. Why, the republicans would vote for a republican no difference whether he was a black leg, a thief, a liar or a murderer, so he was a republican, and the democrats would do the same. And I will say that I verily believe there never has been such an intelligent vote cast as was polled last 4th of Nov. And may your courage never fail, and in '92 there will be thousands more led out of bondage, and there will be a lot more of those black legs throttled. Let the American people never tire until we see a purer government, and see the poor of our land have enough to eat and wear. Mr. Editor I don't like to say that all the loyal ones have been culled from both parties, as I verily believe that a great many in the towns voted for the old parties because they had not the chance

to go to night school as the farmers did last year. But I believe organizations are starting in towns to enlighten them a little, and I hope that all the poor will join and learn something for their own comfort and that of their families. The republicans and democrats of the country united for one common cause, and the party question was left out, only some few will be republicans and ditto the democrats, but you know the saying "convince a man against his will and you leave him of the same opinion still." I would like to see the ladies join the Alliance and try to help along the good work. I would like to see more loyal papers spring into existence, we need them. Such papers as the Clay Centre Gazette and Nuckolls county Herald, which are only democratic papers, we are going to discontinue, as we don't need them, we want loyal papers. I don't see how we could possibly get along without the Alliance paper, as we know we get the solid truth. We could not spare you from your responsible position. May you live to see the day when the last tyrant shall be ousted. Yours for home and justice.  
MRS. WITMER.

**An Open Letter to Senator Koutz.**  
CAMBRIDGE, Feb. 4, 1891.

SIR:—Judging from your speech delivered at McCook on the 28th of Jan., it appears to us that you are in a fair way to violate your obligations to your constituents. At the time you were nominated at Indianola you pledged yourself if elected, to support the principles of the independent party, to work for the passage of a law to reduce the freight rate to that in force in Iowa, and also one to make eight per cent the legal interest rate. You said "you had been a soldier, and would fight and die for the principles of the independent party." You say now that your party is asking too much, that you are in favor of protecting railroads, banks, and other corporations. Now were not these the institutions you were elected to aid in making laws to control? Let us hear from you through the FARMERS' ALLIANCE, and oblige,  
THOS. ANDREWS.

**Garnishment of Laborer's Wages.**  
HARTINGTON Neb., Feb. 2, 1891.

**ED. ALLIANCE.**—Will you permit me through the columns of your valuable paper to ask what good will result from the passage of the law asked for by "The Nebraska Business Men's Association." That Sec. 531 and subdivision "A" thereof of the civil proceedings, compiled statutes of 1889, be amended so that the exemption law be not applicable to 30 per cent of the wages or salary of any clerk, mechanic or laborer, and not more than three executions at any one time against such amount. Will the passage of such a law help to collect the debt? Or is it only an expensive way to harass the laboring element of the state? As each garnishment process in every case will consume more than ten per cent, as claimed to be liable to execution. It seems to me this is the most diabolical plan that ever went before an intelligent law making body. To me it seems the only intention in asking it is to bring into public odium those who would vote aye upon its passage. Now what amount of cost would be necessary to collect 10 per cent of \$50? At least five dollars justice cost, not less than \$1.85; the executing officer not less than \$1.75; on the first papers entering judgment, the attendance of garnishee \$1.00, besides execution, sale, etc., which would cost \$3.00 more, aggregating \$8.20 costs to collect \$5, leaving an indebtedness of \$3.20 costs, with no part of the original debt diminished. This to be repeated three times by the same party upon the same debt at the same time, and to continue until the debt is fully paid. Such a law would be an outrage as it would neither help the creditor or the debtor, but would politically swamp the Alliance party, the very purpose for which it was intended. If I am wrong I would like the public journal favoring such a law to explain otherwise.  
Yours truly,  
JUNIOUS.

**Independents Fulfill your Pledges.**  
JACKSON TOWNSHIP HALL CO. NEB.

**ED. FARMER'S ALLIANCE.**—In reading the legislative proceedings in your issue of Feb. 7th, I was amazed to find the monopolists and capitalists had their champion in the upper house, in the person of Senator Switzler of Omaha, judging from the resolution which he introduced in the senate. By reading under the lines it might read thusly: "Whereas, an erroneous impression prevails that the legislature contemplates passing radical measures on the subject of interest and mortgages, therefore be it distinctly understood that this august and honorable legislature is controlled by royal bankers, aristocratic capitalists and railroad magnates. And therefore *clodhoppers, punkin rollers and hayseed farmers* need not expect any measures of relief from this honorable body;" and it would seem as if the house concurred in Switzler's views, for I find next day they declared H. R. 2, relating to usury, lost. It is in keeping with the pledged given last fall by Alliance leaders? It was boldly proclaimed from every platform, that a strict usury law and a law regulating mortgages should (amongst other laws) receive the first attention, in case of success at the polls, and we farmers shouted aloud and contributed our quarters and dollars to defray campaign expenses while the bankers, the money lenders, and the railroad magnates done everything to defeat and hinder, and now they get what legislation they want and we farmers are told "begone, we are fools anyway." In conclusion I will prophesy if these independent members return home without enacting those measures of relief, the Independent party in Nebraska is dead and buried, and in 1892 it will roll up its accented 25,000 majority for the republican ticket.

**AN ALLIANCE FARMER.**

Glen Rock Alliance.  
GLEN ROCK, Neb., Feb. 9, 1891.

**J. BURROWS, DEAR SIR.**—I send you a copy of a resolution passed in Glen Rock Alliance No. 409 at our last meeting. Be it,  
Resolved, that we ask our legislatures not to appropriate any money to be used for the Columbian fair to be held in Chicago in 1892. Please give this a place in your next issue.  
FRANK NIEBEL, H. C. WEBB, Secy. Pres.

**Resolutions of Respect.**

SALTILLO, Neb., Feb. 7, 1891.  
WHEREAS, It has pleased Divine Providence to remove from our midst the youngest child of our brother, August Spann.  
Resolved, That this Alliance deeply sympathizes with the parents in this their sad bereavement.  
Resolved, That as a token of our respect for the parents that these resolutions be placed on our records and a copy be tendered the parents and a copy be furnished the FARMERS' ALLIANCE for publication.  
W. M. FOSTER, DAN HOY, A. HUSTON, Saltillo Alliance No. 1353. Com.

SPRAGUE, NEB., Feb. 7th., 1891.  
WHEREAS, It has pleased divine providence in his goodness to remove from the family of Bro. Lewis Griffin his beloved wife, therefore be it,  
Resolved, That this Alliance deeply sympathizes with him in his great affliction, and  
Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Bro Griffin and family also a copy spread upon the records of this alliance and a copy sent to the publishers of the "FARMERS' ALLIANCE" for publication.  
A. EGGER, Vice Pres., B. BECK, Sec., Alliance No. 1598.

Feb. 1, 1891.  
WHEREAS, Death has taken from us our worthy brother and neighbor O. O. Reed, therefore be it,  
Resolved, That we, the members of Napoleon Alliance No. 1509, extend to the wife and family of our departed brother our sympathy, trusting that the Lord will comfort them in their affliction.  
J. CROWLEY Sec.

**Pla to Valley Alliance.**  
Resolutions unanimously adopted at a regular meeting of Platte Valley Alliance No. 2021, Feb. 5, 1891.

Resolved, That we condemn and repudiate the two twin sheets, the Omaha Bee and the World-Herald as unworthy the support of an honest man.  
Resolved, That we do approve the course of our paper the FARMERS' ALLIANCE and the *Workman*, and pledge our support and influence as long as they continue to advocate our cause.  
Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the FARMERS' ALLIANCE and the *Workman* for publication.  
T. H. REED, M. C. REED, Pres. Secy.

**Highland Alliance in favor of Municipal Suffrage.**

CORTLAND, Neb., Jan. 23, 1891.  
WHEREAS, We recognize in the drink traffic an evil of gigantic proportions, and realizing the danger menacing the rising generation, especially in the cities and villages through its evil influences, and

WHEREAS, The evils of this business fall heavily on the women of our state, and the municipal ballot will be a means of protecting their homes; therefore be it  
Resolved, That we as members of the Highland Alliance No. 981, as a matter of justice to the women of the state of Neb., do earnestly ask of our legislature now in session that they pass such laws as will confer upon women the right to vote in all municipal elections.  
R. E. CORKHILL, Sec.

**Denouncing the Demo-Rep Combine.**  
MASCOT, Neb., Feb. 4, 1891.

WHEREAS, We, the members of J. Burrows Alliance No. 1721, view with alarm the growing tendencies of what was known as the republican and democrat parties to unite in one common combine to further the interest of monied corporations and scheming politicians, therefore be it  
Resolved, That we, as members of J. Burrows Alliance, bind ourselves by our solemn obligation not to deviate from the course we have taken until the government of this state is placed in the hands of the people where it properly belongs, and further that a copy of these resolutions be sent to the Alma Times and State Alliance paper for publication.  
This resolution was presented at a regular meeting of J. Burrows Alliance, Feb. 4, 1891, by a unanimous vote.  
S. P. BAKER, Sec.

**K. of L. Resolutions.**

WHEREAS, Our present election laws in Nebraska do not result in an honest ballot and a fair count, therefore be it  
Resolved, That it is the sense of District Assembly No. 146, Knights of Labor now in regular session in Minden, Kearney county, that the most improved Australian system of voting should be extended to every voting precinct in the state, and that the day of any general election be a legal holiday; and be it also  
Resolved, That we call upon our senators and representatives to work and vote for the above measure, and be it also  
Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be signed by the master workman and secretary, and a copy be sent to Minden Workman and the FARMER'S ALLIANCE, and a copy be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and a copy be sent to our senators and representatives.  
MRS. LA WELLS, Dist. R. S.

**To the Senator from Gage County.**

GLENWOOD, Neb., Feb. 5, 1891.  
The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by Glenwood Alliance, No. 989:  
WHEREAS, It is the unanimous demand of the Alliances of Nebraska, that a law be passed by the present legislature, fixing the legal rate of interest at 1 per cent and the contract at 8 per cent, and the taking of a greater sum punishable by forfeiture of both principal and interest, and with fine or imprisonment or both; and whereas there seems some doubt of such measure passing the senate, therefore  
Resolved, That we demand that our senator from this county, who was elected by the Independent vote, use every honorable means to ensure the passage of such law, and it is further  
Resolved, That we demand that all senators elected by the Independents use all their efforts to accomplish this object, and it is further  
Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to Senator Collins, and to the FARMERS' ALLIANCE for publication.

**LEROY PAYNE, Pres., J. M. MILLHOLLAND, Ass't Sec.**

J. H. McMurtry, real estate and loans, abstract and notary. McMurtry block, adjoining Alliance headquarters, corner Eleventh and M streets.