

Red Cloud Chief.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY.

RED CLOUD, NEBRASKA

AGREE TO FUSION

Nebraska Democrats Join Hands With Populists.

GET DOWN TO BUSINESS

Best of Feeling Prevails During the Convention—Short, Emphatic Platform.

For Governor—George W. Berge, populist, of Lincoln.

For Lieutenant Governor—Dr. A. Townsend, democrat, of Franklin county.

For State Treasurer—John M. Osborne, populist, of Pawnee county.

For Secretary of State—R. E. Watzke, populist, of Richardson county.

For Auditor—J. S. Canaday, populist, of Kearney county.

For Attorney General—Edgar Whalen, democrat, of Holt county.

For Land Commissioner—A. A. Worsley, populist, of Boyd county.

For Superintendent of Public Instruction—Albert Softley, populist, of Perkins county.

Chairman P. L. Hall called the democratic state convention to order at the auditorium, Lincoln, and requested that the call be read.

The chairman announced that a state central committee would be selected during the convention. He said at the March meeting of the committee G. L. Loomis was chosen for temporary chairman, and the action of the committee was ratified by the convention. Then Dr. Hall introduced Mr. Loomis as "that old democratic war horse of Dodge."

Mr. Loomis asked for the selection of a temporary secretary. On motion Mr. Corcoran of York county was made secretary and Messrs. Risley and Bauman were made assistants.

The committee on credentials was dispensed with and the list of delegates prepared by the secretary was accepted.

The temporary organization was made permanent.

A committee of seven on resolutions was ordered named by the chair. A committee of five on order of business, to confer with the populists, with P. L. Hall as chairman, was suggested in a motion. The motion was adopted.

The chair named as the committee on resolutions, W. H. Thompson of Hall, R. L. Metcalfe of Omaha, John J. Sullivan of Platte, T. J. Doyle of Lancaster, L. J. Ludi of Saunders, R. S. Oberfelder of Cheyenne and Henry Gering of Cass.

The committee on conference was named as follows: P. L. Hall of Lancaster, H. H. Hanks of Otoe, M. J. Holland of Harlan, J. F. Harrington of Holt and M. J. House of Butler.

It was 9:10 p. m. when Chairman Loomis called the convention to order. He said the resolutions committee would be ready to report. He asked that the senatorial districts select their candidates for presidential electors.

John A. Lynch of Lynch was nominated by Mahoney of Greeley; then followed a lull in the nominations. R. O. Adams of Hall county was placed before the convention. On motion these two were named by the convention by acclamation.

Then the names selected by the congressional districts for presidential electors were read and the convention approved. The full list of electors is as follows:

First—R. H. Franz of Union, Cass county.

Second—Joseph A. Connor of Omaha, Douglas county.

Third—Thomas Ashford, Jr., of Homer, Dakota county.

Fourth—S. M. Bailey, Fairbury, Jefferson county.

Fifth—Patrick Walsh, McCook, Red Willow county.

Sixth—J. N. Tufts, Farnam, Dawson county.

At Large—John A. Lynch of Lynch, R. O. Adams of Grand Island.

The state central committee was empowered to fill all vacancies on the ticket.

Edgar Howard was called for. He said in the interest of harmony a recess of thirty minutes should be taken. A recess of thirty minutes was taken.

W. H. Thompson, for the committee on resolutions, read the following suggested as the democratic state platform, the first sentence eliciting much applause, while some applause followed the naming of the democratic nominee for president:

"We, the democrats of Nebraska, in state convention assembled, hereby reaffirm the principles of democracy as asserted and defended by Jefferson, Jackson and Bryan, and approve the platform adopted by the democratic national convention at St. Louis. We pledge our hearty support to Alton B. Parker and Henry G. Davis, the nominees of the convention."

"We point with pride to the splendid record made by our distinguished fellow citizen, W. J. Bryan, and take this opportunity of again expressing our profound appreciation of his steadfast devotion to democratic principles."

"We denounce the republican state administration for its subserviency to railroad and other corporation influences, for its extravagance in public expenditures, its carelessness in the

management of state institutions and its utter disregard of the public interests."

"We promise a careful and economical administration of the state's business to the end that the people may obtain the best possible results at the smallest possible expenditure of money."

"We promise that the nominees of this convention will not, if elected, accept at the hands of any corporation favors in any form, and that the acceptance of any such favors by any appointed under these nominees shall result in his immediate discharge."

"We favor the enactment of a law which will effectively prohibit lobbying in the state legislature, in county boards or in town or city councils. The penalty for the violation of such a law should be imprisonment in the penitentiary. Representatives of corporations and of other interests should be heard before the regular committees of legislature, county board, or town or city council, or before the open session of the main body."

"We promise the repeal of the Ramsey elevator law and the enactment in its place of the Brady elevator bill, a measure framed in the public interest and defeated by the republican legislature at the behest of the elevator trust."

"We favor the enactment of a statute abolishing the fellow servant law."

"We believe in the dignity of human labor and cordially commend labor's effort to benefit itself by wise and conservative organization. We approve of labor's efforts to enact into law the eight hour day and anti-injunction bills throttled by the republican congress."

"The prompt repeal of the present iniquitous revenue law is demanded and the enactment in lieu thereof of a law in strict accordance with our constitution levying a tax by valuation so that every person and corporation shall pay a tax in proportion to the value of his, her or its property and franchises. In determining the value of railroads and all other public franchised corporations, whether state or municipal, the rules of the supreme court should be adopted, namely, the sum of their debts represented by bonds and floating indebtedness should be added to the market value of their stocks."

"We charge the present revenue law was enacted to distract public attention from the ruthless extravagance resulting in more than \$2,000,000 state indebtedness contracted in violation of the constitution and by subterfuge raising the limit of levy that the people might be further plundered."

"We assert that an economic and honest administration of state government would leave our state free from debt and decrease in taxation."

"We recognize in the life and works of the immortal Lincoln an exemplification of the true spirit and lofty purpose of the public and believe there should be erected a monument in our capital city honored by his name and denounced as unpatriotic the effort of our present chief executive to thwart this laudable purpose."

"We invite all voters, regardless of party affiliations, to aid us in rescuing our fair state from the blighting effect of republican misrule."

Mr. Thompson moved that the resolutions be adopted. Such action was taken.

Mr. Bryan addressed the chair. He was greeted as the gentleman from the United States. He introduced the following resolution, which was adopted:

"We miss from this convention the presence of one of Nebraska's most loyal democrats of Plattsmouth, a delegate to the late national convention, Mr. Frank J. Morgan, of Plattsmouth. We extend to him in his hour of affliction our sincerest sympathy and wish him a return to health and to the party's councils."

T. S. Allen was elected chairman of the state central committee by acclamation after Chairman Loomis had paid a compliment to the work done by Dr. Hall.

Appreciation of the services to the party of Dr. Hall was shown by a ringing vote in which every delegate arose to his feet.

Phil Kohl of Wayne was nominated for secretary of the state committee and was named by acclamation.

The convention then accepted the populist division of office resolution.

Mr. Bryan was added to the committee on rules, which was really the conference committee. He was asked to confer at once with the populists.

The roll call on governor resulted: Berge, 558; Westover, 50; Holcomb, 25; Sutherland, 36; Stork, 66; Harrington, 70; Allen, 5; Barry, 5; Boyd, 12; total, votes cast, 878. Berge was declared to have a majority.

The announcement of the vote was received with cheers. The nomination of Berge was made unanimous.

Douglas county presented the name of Edgar Howard of Platte county for lieutenant governor. It was moved that nominations be closed and the choice be made by acclamation.

Mr. Howard firmly declined the nomination of the convention.

The convention refused to accept his withdrawal until requested to by Mr. Bryan, and then the place was tendered to Dr. A. Woodward of Franklin county, a prominent citizen, who accepted.

R. E. Watzke of Humboldt, Richardson county, received the majority of the votes cast for secretary of state and was declared the nominee.

Edward Whalen of O'Neill, nominated by J. S. Harrington for attorney general, was chosen by acclamation.

A committee to notify the populists of their action was appointed and the convention adjourned.

Seward County to Vote Bonds.

At a meeting of the board of county supervisors held in Seward, Neb., it was decided to submit to the voters of Seward county at the general election November 8, a proposition to issue bonds in the sum of \$100,000 for the purpose of erecting a court house and jail. The bonds are to be dated January 1, 1904, payable to bearer and to run eleven years, bearing interest not to exceed 4 per cent, with interest payable semi-annually in July and January each succeeding year.

Burglars ransacked the Cincinnati hotel at Nebraska City, securing considerable booty. A room occupied by Samuel Woods was entered and a gold watch valued at \$50 was taken. The robbers secured \$20 in cash from another room and articles of minor value were secured from several other rooms visited. The matter was reported to the police, but no clue to the thieves has developed.

Mrs. Louis Wischmeyer of Nebraska City started down town and her husband suggested that she take her pocketbook along, for it might not be safe in the house. She took the pocketbook with her and when she arrived down town she missed the same. There was some talk rustling for a little time and the routs she had gone over was carefully retraced and every one along the route asked about the missing pocketbook. When about to give it up as lost, Mr. Wischmeyer went home and on entering the yard found the pocketbook laying on top of the gate-post where the wife had placed it while she closed and fastened the gate after coming out, but went away and forgot it. The pocketbook contained \$125 and would have been a serious loss.

Fire was discovered in the implement house of Fred E. Brown, Auburn, and before the department arrived the flames destroyed the building. The stock is badly damaged, and the total loss will amount to \$3,000. This is covered by insurance.

Mrs. Thos. Johnson, a widow of Ashland, received a dispatch that her youngest son had been drowned at some point in Missouri. He was a bright, promising lad, fourteen years old, who with an older brother was working for an uncle at railroad construction work. He was bathing in some stream and lost his life.

democrats make the main issue plain.

By Declaring in Their Platform That "Protection Is Robbery," They Declare Anew That They Are Wedded to the Doctrine of Free Trade.

The Democratic party in national convention has declared that "protection is robbery of the many to enrich the few." The Republican party in national convention has declared its belief in and support of protection, as essential to the prosperity of the American people.

Practically all of the issues mentioned in the platforms of the great parties this year will have little consideration in the campaign except this squarely drawn line of difference between them on this elementary principle in the economic policy of the American republic. It will be useless for the leaders of the Democratic party to attempt to make an issue over alleged violations of principles of the United States Constitution by President Roosevelt and his party, when it is a fact perfectly apparent to all thoughtful American citizens that the complaints made by the Democrats in respect to these alleged issues have no real foundation. In an attempt to get away from the overpowering influence of sweeping defeat in two great national campaigns on the issue of the monetary standard, the Democratic party, through its delegates, in national convention assembled, has, by electing to maintain absolute silence on the subject of the money question, sought to eliminate that question from among the issues to be discussed during the campaign. With so many still unsettled problems intimately associated with the financial system, such as national banks of issue, and provisions for increasing the monetary supply, it seems incredible that a party which casts six and a half million votes in a national campaign only four years ago, while declaring against the single gold standard, should so far admit defeat on that question as to desire that there shall be no further discussion of it. But whether the party shall be successful in this attempt to evade an issue which its leaders forced upon the country during two national campaigns, remains to be seen. At this time, when there is discussion of the question whether the tariff law of the United States shall be revised, and when that revision shall be made, it certainly becomes a paramount issue in the campaign when the two parties are lined up with formal declarations, the Republican party for, and the Democratic party against, the doctrine of protection.

In its course upon the money question, the Democratic party in national convention, at different times during the past fifteen years, has made declarations, positive and unequivocal at one time, to be followed by evasion, equivocation and silence at other times. The party has heretofore declared that the principle of protection, which has been the fundamental principle underlying every tariff act since the first tariff law was signed by George Washington, is an unconstitutional principle, and directly hostile to the basic law of the republic. In its platform declaration this year the Democratic party does not say that protection is unconstitutional, but violently assails it as robbery. Surely, it would seem that a principle of government, or of taxation, that is subject to denunciation as severe as would be applied to a criminal offense consisting of one person violently taking the property of another, must not only be unconstitutional, but deserves to be uprooted from the law of the land without the slightest hesitation.

The Republican party declared in its platform at Chicago its faith in and support of protection as essential to the prosperity of the American people.

The Republican party in that platform recognized the present public discussion of tariff revision to the extent of saying that changes in the tariff should be made whenever the good to be derived from such action would not be overbalanced by the evils which might flow from the agitation incident to such changes. What was more important in connection with the tariff issue of the time was the formal declaration in the Republican platform that when changes in the tariff are made the work should be intrusted to the friends of protection, not to the enemies of protection. It is the belief of protectionists that the experience of the American people under the revision of the tariff made by the Democratic party in 1894, which was attended by great industrial disaster—the closing of mills and factories, and the throwing of thousands of men out of employment, and causing widespread loss to American workingmen in reduction of wages, as well as in loss of employment—warrants them in saying that when the tariff is to be revised it should not be revised by the Democratic party.

The Republican party declared in its platform at Chicago its faith in and support of protection as essential to the prosperity of the American people.

The Democratic party in national convention has declared that "protection is robbery of the many to enrich the few." The Republican party in national convention has declared its belief in and support of protection, as essential to the prosperity of the American people.

Practically all of the issues mentioned in the platforms of the great parties this year will have little consideration in the campaign except this squarely drawn line of difference between them on this elementary principle in the economic policy of the American republic. It will be useless for the leaders of the Democratic party to attempt to make an issue over alleged violations of principles of the United States Constitution by President Roosevelt and his party, when it is a fact perfectly apparent to all thoughtful American citizens that the complaints made by the Democrats in respect to these alleged issues have no real foundation. In an attempt to get away from the overpowering influence of sweeping defeat in two great national campaigns on the issue of the monetary standard, the Democratic party, through its delegates, in national convention assembled, has, by electing to maintain absolute silence on the subject of the money question, sought to eliminate that question from among the issues to be discussed during the campaign. With so many still unsettled problems intimately associated with the financial system, such as national banks of issue, and provisions for increasing the monetary supply, it seems incredible that a party which casts six and a half million votes in a national campaign only four years ago, while declaring against the single gold standard, should so far admit defeat on that question as to desire that there shall be no further discussion of it. But whether the party shall be successful in this attempt to evade an issue which its leaders forced upon the country during two national campaigns, remains to be seen. At this time, when there is discussion of the question whether the tariff law of the United States shall be revised, and when that revision shall be made, it certainly becomes a paramount issue in the campaign when the two parties are lined up with formal declarations, the Republican party for, and the Democratic party against, the doctrine of protection.

In its course upon the money question, the Democratic party in national convention, at different times during the past fifteen years, has made declarations, positive and unequivocal at one time, to be followed by evasion, equivocation and silence at other times. The party has heretofore declared that the principle of protection, which has been the fundamental principle underlying every tariff act since the first tariff law was signed by George Washington, is an unconstitutional principle, and directly hostile to the basic law of the republic. In its platform declaration this year the Democratic party does not say that protection is unconstitutional, but violently assails it as robbery. Surely, it would seem that a principle of government, or of taxation, that is subject to denunciation as severe as would be applied to a criminal offense consisting of one person violently taking the property of another, must not only be unconstitutional, but deserves to be uprooted from the law of the land without the slightest hesitation.

The Republican party declared in its platform at Chicago its faith in and support of protection as essential to the prosperity of the American people.

The Democratic party in national convention has declared that "protection is robbery of the many to enrich the few." The Republican party in national convention has declared its belief in and support of protection, as essential to the prosperity of the American people.

Practically all of the issues mentioned in the platforms of the great parties this year will have little consideration in the campaign except this squarely drawn line of difference between them on this elementary principle in the economic policy of the American republic. It will be useless for the leaders of the Democratic party to attempt to make an issue over alleged violations of principles of the United States Constitution by President Roosevelt and his party, when it is a fact perfectly apparent to all thoughtful American citizens that the complaints made by the Democrats in respect to these alleged issues have no real foundation. In an attempt to get away from the overpowering influence of sweeping defeat in two great national campaigns on the issue of the monetary standard, the Democratic party, through its delegates, in national convention assembled, has, by electing to maintain absolute silence on the subject of the money question, sought to eliminate that question from among the issues to be discussed during the campaign. With so many still unsettled problems intimately associated with the financial system, such as national banks of issue, and provisions for increasing the monetary supply, it seems incredible that a party which casts six and a half million votes in a national campaign only four years ago, while declaring against the single gold standard, should so far admit defeat on that question as to desire that there shall be no further discussion of it. But whether the party shall be successful in this attempt to evade an issue which its leaders forced upon the country during two national campaigns, remains to be seen. At this time, when there is discussion of the question whether the tariff law of the United States shall be revised, and when that revision shall be made, it certainly becomes a paramount issue in the campaign when the two parties are lined up with formal declarations, the Republican party for, and the Democratic party against, the doctrine of protection.

In its course upon the money question, the Democratic party in national convention, at different times during the past fifteen years, has made declarations, positive and unequivocal at one time, to be followed by evasion, equivocation and silence at other times. The party has heretofore declared that the principle of protection, which has been the fundamental principle underlying every tariff act since the first tariff law was signed by George Washington, is an unconstitutional principle, and directly hostile to the basic law of the republic. In its platform declaration this year the Democratic party does not say that protection is unconstitutional, but violently assails it as robbery. Surely, it would seem that a principle of government, or of taxation, that is subject to denunciation as severe as would be applied to a criminal offense consisting of one person violently taking the property of another, must not only be unconstitutional, but deserves to be uprooted from the law of the land without the slightest hesitation.

The Republican party declared in its platform at Chicago its faith in and support of protection as essential to the prosperity of the American people.

The Democratic party in national convention has declared that "protection is robbery of the many to enrich the few." The Republican party in national convention has declared its belief in and support of protection, as essential to the prosperity of the American people.

Practically all of the issues mentioned in the platforms of the great parties this year will have little consideration in the campaign except this squarely drawn line of difference between them on this elementary principle in the economic policy of the American republic. It will be useless for the leaders of the Democratic party to attempt to make an issue over alleged violations of principles of the United States Constitution by President Roosevelt and his party, when it is a fact perfectly apparent to all thoughtful American citizens that the complaints made by the Democrats in respect to these alleged issues have no real foundation. In an attempt to get away from the overpowering influence of sweeping defeat in two great national campaigns on the issue of the monetary standard, the Democratic party, through