

FLEET NEARS JAPAN

Vladivostok Squadron is Seen to the Eastward of Kama Bay and Bill Going.

FLEET OCCASIONS MUCH SPECULATION

Not improbable that Russians Will Show Town on Japanese Coast.

BRITISH STEAMER SUNK BY THE RUSSIAN

Knight Commander Sent to Bottom Passengers Detained.

BELIEVED AMERICAN SHIP IS CAPTURED

Steamer Owned by the Oregon Way and Navigation Company Suspected to Be in Hands of the Russians.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

ACTION WITHOUT PRECEDENT

Destruction of Neutral Ship on the High Seas Raises a Grave Question.

(Copyright by New York Herald Co., 1904.)

NEW YORK, July 25.—(New York Herald Co.)—Details of the sinking of the steamer Knight Commander, laden with contraband goods, by the Russian cruiser Vladivostok, show that the crew was ordered off and the cruiser's guns turned on the steamer.

It is stated that any contraband articles were on board. Diplomatic authorities at Washington regard the action of the cruiser as a violation of the law of nations.

The destruction of a neutral vessel entering neutral grounds on the high seas is an unprecedented act, and the State Department is expected to take action as soon as the owners of the cargo file a complaint.

A special cable dispatch to the Herald from Liao Yang states that the Russian flag was hoisted on the steamer after a severe battle near there, fought apparently with the idea of checking the Japanese advance on Liao Yang.

New Chung was reported evacuated by the Russian fleet government. Destruction by fire of the government property has begun, although it is thought the Japanese are not yet in the town.

RUSSIAN TAKING BIG CHARGES

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

Sink British Steamer in Defense of International Laws.

RAILROADS FILE A PROTEST

Concerted Action Taken Against Assessment of the Various Counties.

INSIST THAT IT IS ENTIRELY TOO SMALL

Northwestern, Burlington and Union Pacific Set Up Practically the Same Allegations in the Matter.

(From a Staff Correspondent.)

LINCOLN, July 25.—(Special.)—In an attempt, probably, to influence the State Board of Equalization to increase the valuation of the property of the several sections of the state as returned by the county assessors, or to decrease railroad assessments, the Burlington and Northwestern railroads this morning filed protests against the assessment of railroad property with the state board.

The Union Pacific filed its protest late this afternoon and the tax agents insist that the state has been assessed at 14 per cent of its value, money and credits at 5 per cent of their value, live stock at 13 per cent of value, merchandise at 8 per cent and implements at 4 per cent, while their property has been assessed at more than one-fifth of its value.

It is the general opinion that the railroad agents will not make formal speeches to the board, but will rely upon their concerted protests to do the business.

While the protests may be the means of influencing the board members to increase the assessment in some counties, they will not result in a decrease of the valuation of the railroad property, as the board goes directly back on the ruling made at its first meeting. It was announced then by Governor Mickey that the railroad assessment had been made and that whatever the Board of Equalization did would have no effect on the railroad assessment.

Cite Alleged Precedent.

The protesting railroads claim that they have been assessed at a value higher than they should have been and of other property in the state. In making this statement an interesting disclosure is made, to the effect that, as the railroads claim, the State Board of Assessment promised that the aggregate of all value in the state should reach \$400,000,000, and if the assessors failed to return the amount the board would make an increase sufficient to make it so. No member of the board will stand for the promise said to have been made to the railroads.

The Burlington railroad claims that though it was assessed at one-fifth of its value in 1903 it was raised by the board in 1904 to 100 per cent of its value, which had heretofore been assessed at one-tenth valuation. The Northwestern road claims that it has been assessed at 20 per cent more than the actual value of the road. That its road is worth \$100,000,000 and should have been assessed at \$200,000,000.

In eight counties through which it runs the Northwestern claims that its assessment was raised 25 per cent over last year. The other property was assessed by the county assessors at the following rates: Boyd, 25 per cent increase; Holt, 18 per cent increase; Rock, 5 1/2 per cent increase; Brown, 20 per cent less than last year; Cherry, 2 1/2 per cent less; Sheridan, 2 per cent increase; Dawson, 3 per cent increase; Sioux, 25 per cent increase. The grand total of all the assessment, including railroad property, as figured by the Northwestern road, will be \$328,000,000 for this year, or \$1,000,000 for last year, or 25 per cent increase over the 1903 road claim. One-third of the increase of the road claimed one-third came from property that has heretofore escaped taxation and therefore the actual increase is not more than 25 per cent over last year and of this increase the railroads had contributed three times as much as other property.

The protest of the Burlington is as follows:

Protest of Burlington.

That said assessment violates the uniformity clause of the constitution of the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That said assessment violates the equality clause of the constitution of the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

That the assessment of the said property is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not uniform in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the assessment of the said property is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed, for that the said assessment is not equal in its character and of proportion to the cost of the property assessed.

That the said assessment is excessive, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with other property in the state of Nebraska, for that the said assessment is excessive as compared with the assessment of lands and other property in the state of Nebraska during the year 1903.

TWO DEAD AND SEVERAL HURT

Big Four Passenger Train Struck Electric Car at Indianapolis with Fatal Results.

INDIANAPOLIS, July 25.—Two persons were killed and several injured in a collision between south bound Big Four passenger train No. 13 and a west bound Prospect-blink electric car at Washington and Madison streets at 6:05 tonight.

The dead: SAMUEL ROMANS, about 50 years old, crushed beyond recognition.

MRS. WILLIAM J. HARRIS, colored, 20 years old, badly lacerated about head and body.

The injured: Mrs. Logan, suffered from shock.

Kate Ward, crushed, cut about head and face.

W. R. Shannon, bruised and injured about head.

Mattie O'Neil, 25 years old, cut over eye and seriously injured.

John Mendelblad, head badly bruised.

George H. Albino, cut about head and face.

Joseph A. Harmon, cut about head.

The locomotive struck the front of the electric car, throwing it a distance of twenty feet to one side, its direction being reversed. The train was stopped within a few yards of Washington street and the crew started in clearing the wreckage and caring for the injured.

An emergency call was sounded and the arrival of patrol wagons and ambulances, coupled with the fact that the street was at that hour being traversed by hundreds of people who were their way home from work, causing a panic, which made it almost impossible to learn the number of dead or ascertain the extent of the injuries to many of the passengers who were rushing about, seeking relatives or friends among their fellow passengers.

The cause of the accident is not clear. Conflicting stories are told by passengers and witnesses, several of whom say that the motorman applied the air brakes, which failed to respond. Others claim that the conductor of the electric car failed to proceed ahead of the car for the purpose of stopping the train.

HARRIMAN LINES IS CAUGHT

American Ship is Captured by Vladivostok Squadron of Japan.

PORTLAND, Ore., July 25.—The Portland and Atlantic liner Arabia, seized by the Russian Vladivostok fleet, sailed from this port for the Orient on the night of July 1, carrying about 500 tons of freight, valued at \$100,000. The cargo consisted of 200 barrels of flour, most of which were consigned to Hong Kong merchants, with smaller shipments to Kobe and Nagasaki.

Next to the shipment of flour the most important item in the steamer's manifest was a large shipment of material used in the construction of railway cars, consigned to Kobe and Yokohama.

The vessel was not protected from war risk, and but a slight portion of its cargo was insured against war risk owing to what was then deemed an insignificant rate of 1/2 per cent being asked.

The Portland Arabia company is in reality a branch of the business of the Oregon Railway & Navigation company, which is controlled by the Harriman railway interests. That company has received no news of the capture of the Arabia.

It is believed at the general office of the Oregon Railway & Navigation company that the Arabia was seized because of its shipment of railway material, and that the vessel was not being contrabanded under the rule observed by belligerents in the past.

LIVE STOCK MEETING IN DENVER

Members of the Association Will Bring Up Some Important Questions at the Convention.

DENVER, Colo., July 25.—Statistics prepared by the National Live Stock Association for the meeting which will be held at headquarters in this city on August 1, 4 and 5, between the stockmen representing every state and territory in the west and the Government Special Land commission. The secretary of the association today received information from Washington that Secretary James Wilson of the Department of Agriculture will attend the meeting. Letters have been received from representative western stockmen expressing a desire that something be done at this meeting which will tend to an adjustment of the arid and semi-arid land and forest reserve matters to the satisfaction of all interested parties.

TAGGART LOOKS LIKE A WINNER

Gorman, Sheehan and Belmont May Handle the Funds for the Democrats.

NEW YORK, July 25.—Democrats from all parts of the country are arriving in New York today to attend the meeting of the national committee tomorrow. No doubt is