

Are We Inconsistent?

Patrons and others have charged that we are inconsistent; that while we profess to be supporting the prohibitory amendment that we are running the advertisements of the Nebraska Prosperity League, which is fighting prohibition, and that we are supporting Keith Neville who has announced that he is against prohibition and in favor of high license and close regulations. It is true that we are running the advertisements referred to, and it is equally true that we are supporting Neville, and it is the first time in thirty-five years, or since we have published a newspaper, that we have supported a democrat. As to the advertisement, our advertising space is for sale; it is the revenue producer of this paper as it with every paper published, and it is sold to the individual or firm who desires to use it legitimately, regardless of what he may say in the space he buys. We sell it to democratic candidates, whom we oppose and fight, for the very good reasons that it produces revenue for us and allows those candidates an opportunity to be heard—and fairness demands that every man be given an opportunity to be heard. And so with the Nebraska Prosperity League; financially we "forage on the enemy," and at the same time accord it the right to be heard. Absolutely unfair is the man who would demand that we attack the saloon interests and deny them the right to buy space, as do others, to make reply. We positively do not care for the patronage or good will of those who are so extremely narrow in their views or so fanatic in their beliefs as to condemn our action in this regard.

In supporting Keith Neville we have no apology to make. It is a pleasure for us to support him, intimately knowing as we do his absolute integrity, his sterling manhood, his business ability—a man who has the consciousness to do right and will always be fair. It is the first time in the history of the state that either party has come into western Nebraska to select a man for chief executive, and to us that means much. For thirty-five years we have labored in common with others to build up the west half of the state; we have seen it emerge from a strictly cattle country to become the homes of successful farmers, and we desire to see it further advanced, and we know that with Keith Neville as governor this result will be attained. Loving western Nebraska as we do, we would be false to the best that is within us, if we did not support this Western Nebraska born man; this product of a section of the state that is rapidly becoming an empire within itself.

As to Mr. Neville and prohibition let us say this: That much as we value him as a friend, much as we desire to see him governor of Nebraska, we would rather see him go down to defeat through his honest declaration of his stand on the prohibition question than by straddling the question and proving himself a coward secure his election by fifty thousand votes. Honesty is one of the characteristics of the man. There is no evasion, no nagging nor uttering, no side-stepping—he is either for or against.

Though we differ with Mr. Neville on the prohibition question, our intimate knowledge of him convinces us that if the amendment carries, and we are certain that it will carry, that as governor he will see that so far as his official acts are concerned the will of the people as expressed at the polls will be carried out to the exact letter.

Elsewhere is published an article written by "Dick" Metcalfe, a supporter of the prohibitory amendment, a former candidate for governor, and one of the brainiest newspaper men Nebraska has ever known. His remarks on Neville and prohibition are well worth reading by every voter who is fair-minded and the essentials of his views coincide exactly with ours, hence we do not repeat.

To those who are making a fight in Lincoln county for prohibition we have no hesitancy in saying, and saying in a spirit not boastful, that if you do as much personal work for the amendment as we have done and will do the majority in Lincoln county will exceed a thousand. And to our critics we say: Don't waste your breath.

Miss Helen McNeel has resigned her position as saleslady in the O'Connor store.

Mrs. Collins, of Rockwell, Ill., who recently came here has accepted a position at The Leader.

Mrs. John Frederici went to Nevada Saturday to visit her husband who has been employed there for some time.

Why I am for Keith Neville.

R. F. Metcalfe in "The Nebraskan."

In a recent issue of the Lincoln (Neb) Journal, Dr. A. L. Bixby prints the following:

"Dick Metcalfe's Omaha Nebraskan comes out strong in favor of making Nebraska dry, but clings tenaciously to the democratic party which, as a party, is in favor of keeping Nebraska wet. It might be too much to ask Richard to become a republican, and vote as so many good men pray, but he might be politically independent, like his Uncle Leander, which would put him in a position to

"Accept the truth wherever found. On Christian or on heathen ground."
 "Mr. Metcalfe is ardently for Keith Neville for governor. Mr. Neville is known as a man who never drinks. He takes care of himself physically as well as financially, but he favors the saloon as an institution, no doubt because of the belief that it saves him a considerable sum in municipal taxes. It isn't that the people of North Platte or any other community are benefitted by the saloons. Mr. Neville is the candidate of the wet element for the highest office in the state. He says if elected he will enforce the law, yet the element behind his candidacy is fighting against the abolition of the saloon on the ground that 'it ain't no use,' that the amendment, if it carries, cannot be made effective. And this same element is actively interesting itself in the election of a legislature that will kill all legislation in support of the amendment, that it may be fulfilled in Nebraska as was spoken by the prophet, J. B. Hayes, to-wit and viz: 'Prohibition does not prohibit.' If the truth is to make us free, let us seize hold upon it and cling for dear life, hey, Met?"

In the beginning if I become "politically independent" like my "Uncle Leander" Bixby, I would be "independent" just like a fine old republican famous in the history of Omaha politics. It is related that on one occasion he was making a "non-partisan" speech. With dramatic force he exclaimed, "I don't care what a man's politics is—just so he's a republican."

"Doc" Bixby is supporting the republican nominee for governor who happens to be dry. If Mr. McKelvie, who is not quite so dry as Mr. Sutton is, had been nominated, or if Mr. George, who might be called "half and half," had been nominated, or if Mr. Miles, who is wet, had been nominated "Doc" Bixby would be supporting the republican nominee.

That's the way with a lot of these republican leaders who are trying to persuade the dry democrats to desert Mr. Neville—one of the most capable and honorable men ever nominated for governor of Nebraska. If "Doc" Bixby and other republican "drys" so anxious for the election of men who favor the prohibitory amendment, why do they not give their support to the democratic state nominees who are in favor of the amendment, as against republican state nominees who are opposed to the amendment. The explanation is 'hat a man's attitude on the prohibitory amendment operates in their view against a democratic candidate, but does not operate against a republican candidate.

Of nine republican candidates on state ticket, not more than five are dry, while four are wet. Of nine candidates on the democratic state ticket, two are wet, one has failed to disclose his position, while six have declared for the amendment. But "Doc" Bixby and other republican leaders who are seeking to persuade dry democrats to desert the democratic candidate for governor, continue to give their support to the entire republican state ticket, and to oppose the entire democratic state ticket, regardless of the fact that on the latter there are a larger number of drys than there are on the former.

More than a year ago the Nebraskan laid down the proposition that the prohibition question was not a political question, but should be settled through the initiative and referendum and that the spirit of that law was to enable dry democrats and dry republicans to co-operate for prohibition through the initiative and referendum while co-operating with their party associates upon the candidates and party principles with which they are at agreement. The Lincoln Journal in a strong editorial endorsed this view.

That proposition was upheld by the attitude of both the republican and the democratic state conventions.

The nearest approach the republican state platform made by way of reference to the prohibition question was in the following plank:

"The republican party stands unqualifiedly for carrying into effect the will of the people as expressed at the polls for the enforcement of law both constitutional and statutory in accordance with their true intent. In case of amendments to our constitution we favor the enactment of all needed legislation to accomplish their intended purpose."

The democratic state platform had this to say:

"The democratic party takes pride in the initiative and referendum system which it gave to the state to enable the voters to pass directly and outside of the lines of partisan politics on the questions that are essentially non-partisan in their nature. Under this system the voters have passed already on the question of woman suffrage. Under it they will decide this year the fate of the proposed state-wide prohibitory amendment involving a question that, as President Wilson has said, is essentially non-political and non-partisan. The democratic party holds fast to the principle that it is the duty of any party in power to carry out the will of the people, as to any law or constitutional amendment so submitted and adopted, and it so pledges its candidates. It promises the people that if the amendment is adopted at the polls it will support such legislative acts as may be necessary to put the popular decree in force. Should the proposed prohibitory amendment fail of adoption, the democratic party will accept its failure as a declaration by the people that they are satisfied with the local option system."

In effect of course these platforms are practically the same; but the republican platform-makers were, to a certain extent, walking on egg-shells and it will be observed that they did not take the trouble to specially mention the prohibitory amendment. The democratic platform makers laid down the principle boldly and clearly, just as the principle has been endorsed by the Lincoln Journal and other newspapers of the state and promised explicitly and directly that democratic office holders would do everything in their power to enforce the prohibitory amendment if that amendment should be adopted.

It must be admitted therefore that so far as platforms are concerned, the democratic state platform on this point has the advantage of the republican state platform.

Now both of the candidates for governor have personally promised to enforce the law. I have no doubt that Mr. Sutton's word is perfectly good on this point. But with what reason will anyone undertake to question Mr. Neville's pledge? Among his neighbors and acquaintances, men and women who have known him from childhood, Mr. Neville stands as an honorable man, one whose word is as good as his bond. To be sure, he is personally opposed to state-wide prohibition, but he has a right to that opinion. To say that he is the "tool of the liquor interests" would be to say that the thousands of good men in Nebraska who are opposed to prohibition are the tools of the liquor interests. To say that as governor he would be the tool of any special interest is to undertake to refute the most notable array of testimonials to an individual's character that has ever been offered in support of a candidate for public office—the testimonials by the people of North Platte, regardless of political prejudice, with respect to the high character of Keith Neville. Right here let us remember that while North Platte went dry by a substantial majority, Keith Neville, in the primary, received very nearly a unanimous vote.

If prohibition carries in Nebraska this year, it will be somewhat different from a prohibition victory in 1899. Then the sentiment against the saloon was not as strong as it is today. Today many men who in 1899 fought prohibition, are supporting it and there are many who do not believe prohibition to be wise, who are satisfied that the power of public sentiment will bring it about in Nebraska as in other states. It does not stand to reason then that in the light of this strong, ever-growing public sentiment, any man who could be elected to the office of governor of Nebraska would fail to do everything in his power to enforce the popular decree, in the event of the amendment's adoption.

Liquorists anxious for a Wilson victory in Nebraska cannot gain anything by playing into the hands of men who, posing as the uncompromising champions of the prohibitory amendment, give their support to republican candidates regardless of their attitude on that question and for the purpose of disorganizing the Wilson forces plead with dry democrats to do the very thing which they (these republicans) will not do.

The governor of Nebraska will have something to do in addition to the enforcement of the prohibitory amendment. That office has come to be a business institution. Enormous business interests are entrusted to it. The security of hundreds of thousands of dollars and the welfare of many men, women and children who have become charges of the state are dependent upon having a level-headed man in the governor's office—a man of sound judgment and good business capacity. Keith Neville, it is true, inherited

wealth, but he has increased that wealth by his own good business judgment and all the time he has given, according to the testimony of his neighbors, out of his abundance liberally and plentifully to deserving men, women and children. One of the notable things, aside from the universal testimony of neighbors in behalf of the democratic nominee for governor, is the enthusiastic support given him by young men, many of whom he has helped in a material way—helped to an education, helped to place and honor in the community and state, and helped in the development of ideals along commercial, social and political lines.

Even though his good character and the testimony of his neighbors were not sufficient to make it be known that Mr. Neville would not be the "tool of the liquor interests," I have reason growing out of personal experience, that makes me know that he is not, and would not become the tool of the liquor interests. When I was a candidate for the democratic nomination for governor, when every brewery and saloon in Nebraska was a recruiting station against me, when every man whom these influences could control fought my nomination, when some of the very men who are now the most critical toward Mr. Neville were fighting against me and fighting shoulder to shoulder with the liquor interests of this state, Keith Neville was giving me his cordial support. He knew what my attitude was on the liquor question and he respected my opinion just as I know his attitude and respect his opinion. I honor him for frankly stating that opinion and I know he will be faithful to his pledge. I give him my support under the solemn conviction that if elected he will prove to be one of the best governors in Nebraska history.

Why should any dry democrat give his support to the republican nominee for governor simply because he says he intends to cast his vote for the prohibitory amendment? In the great battles of the past Mr. Sutton has not been conspicuous on the firing line. I do not remember to have heard of his activities in the great contest of 1910. I know him to be a good man, but I know nothing in his record to impress me with the idea that it is my duty to abandon my own party and vote against at least as good a man as he and one whom I regard as being far better qualified to discharge the duties of that office.

Of course Mr. Neville is receiving wet support, but Mr. Sutton is not without wet support himself. Wet and dry republicans alike are supporting him.

In his campaign for governor he carried Douglas county, the wettest in the state, by a generous vote. In that primary Mr. Miles received 401 votes in the Third ward, but in that same ward Mr. Sutton received 122, distancing McKelvie, George and Madgett, the other candidates. They did not prefer Mr. Sutton to Mr. Miles, who was frankly opposed to the amendment, but they did prefer him to Mr. McKelvie, who was not supposed to be very strong on that line. They preferred him to Mr. George, who was "half and half," and they preferred him to Mr. Madgett, who was uncompromisingly in favor of the amendment.

But Mr. Sutton's prohibition views do not appear to have injured him much in the Third ward of Omaha during his somewhat extensive public career. Indeed he has always been fairly popular in that ward. In 1910, while Mr. Sutton was judge of the district court, he became a candidate for congress in the republican primaries. Senator Charles Saunders, distinctly wet, was his principal opponent. In that primary, the Third ward gave Mr. Sutton 313 votes to Mr. Saunders 40—nearly eight to one in favor of Mr. Sutton. Mr. Sutton was nominated for congress in the Second district in 1910. In November the Third ward gave Mr. Sutton 1,078 votes as against 799 for his democratic opponent, Mr. Lobeck. At the same time Mayor Dahlgren, who was candidate for governor against Mr. Aldrich, carried the Third ward by a big majority. Mr. Sutton and Mr. Dahlgren were plainly Third ward favorites. In 1911 Mr. Sutton became candidate for renomination as district judge. In that primary Judge Day received 196 votes; Judge Sears received 100; Judge Howard Kennedy received 92; Judge Troup 93; Judge Redick 90; but Mr. Sutton received in the Third ward at that election 335 votes. This was more than the entire vote received by Judge Kennedy, Redick and Troup, and it was considerably more than the combined vote of Judges Sears and Day. In the fall of 1911 at the general election the Third ward gave Mr. Sutton, as candidate for district judge, 893 votes, as against 395 votes for his highest democratic opponent.

So it will be seen that so far as the Third ward of Omaha is concerned, Mr. Sutton has been something of a favorite during his public career.

In its issue of August 27, the Lincoln Journal prints an editorial referring to the Third ward and points out that in the recent primary Mr. Neville carried the Third ward, saying: "The Third ward never votes for anybody for nothing."

Inasmuch as Mr. Sutton was the Third ward's first favorite every time

he ran and the Third ward's second favorite in the recent primaries, the Lincoln Journal may explain to its constant readers how it happens to be such an offense for the democratic nominee to have carried the Third ward once, while the very ardent friendship shown by the Third ward during all of the public career of the republican nominee is unworthy of consideration.

The truth is that Mr. Sutton is a politician, one of the shrewdest and smoothest I have ever known. He takes his votes where he can find them. His record as a politician and the attitude toward him of the influences he now denounces, as revealed in his various votes in Douglas county, and particularly in the Third ward, is not such as to justify any democrat in leaving his party to vote for him upon the statement that he intends to cast his vote for the amendment.

Mr. Sutton was not such an ardent and enthusiastic prohibitionist as to make the platform on which he is running a ringing declaration in favor of the amendment. Indeed, he permitted it to omit altogether specific mention of that amendment. His promise to enforce the amendment in the event of its adoption is not one whit better than the promise made by the democratic nominee, and so far as concerns the vast and important duties of the office of governor, Mr. Sutton's general qualifications are not to be compared with those of Keith Neville.

I am, therefore, independent. Just like my "Uncle Leander" Bixby and other republican leaders are independent. I am giving my support to the democratic nominee for governor. I am doing so because he is a democrat within the broad meaning of the term; because he is eminently qualified for the important duties of the office; because I am sure he will accept his commission as a sacred trust, discharging his duties with honor to the state, and returning his commission without a stain upon it.

I believe with the Lincoln Journal's editorial declaration above referred to

and printed in an issue of January, 1915, "The people of the state provided the initiative and referendum for the express purpose of allowing such confusing questions as the liquor war to be treated independently of parties. With other issues not at all parallel to prohibition demanding party attention, the parties, if they want to put the state above party, will keep clear of the prohibition issue." The two parties acted on that line. The voters should go and do likewise.

So far as I am concerned, I shall vote for the prohibitory amendment and for the candidate for governor who is not depending upon a single and a non-political issue to carry him through, but whose ability and experience qualifies him for the discharge of the various duties of the important office to which he aspires.

Arthur Allen and Sam Souder spent the week end in Sutherland and Hershey.

Mrs. James Hart and son left Sunday evening for Chicago to visit relatives for several weeks.

Jesse Vernon who had been employed with City Engineer McNamara, left last week for the state university.

Mr. and Mrs. George Schatz, of Ogdun, who have been visiting relatives in town will return home today.

Jack Shields, of Maxwell, visited local friends yesterday and attended the Catholic Girls' Club dance last evening.

Misses Alice and Margaret Fitzpatrick will leave next week for Omaha to visit their sister and attend the Ak-sar-ben.

Mrs. Edward Inman will leave today for Grand Island to visit her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Miller, for a week or longer.

Mrs. F. A. Johnston and daughter Ruth left Saturday evening for Lincoln where they were called by the death of the former's niece.

OPEN AN ACCOUNT WITH
The First National Bank
 of
 NORTH PLATTE, NEBRASKA.
 Member Federal Reserve Bank System.
 CAPITAL AND SURPLUS:
One Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars.
 STABILITY, EFFICIENCY AND SERVICE
 HAVE BEEN THE FACTORS IN THE GROWTH OF THIS BANK, AND THE SAME CAREFUL ATTENTION IS GIVEN TO SMALL ACCOUNTS AS IS GIVEN TO LARGE BALANCES.
 INTEREST PAID ON TIME DEPOSITS.

Announcement of the
Fidelity's New Policy
 The Policy that is Different
 There has been a growing demand for a plan of insurance which will combine as far as possible the features of those most popular of insurance policies—
The Life and Endowment Plans.
 The life plan makes protection during life the chief object of insurance and the most important period that we need this protection is during our active period of life, say from 20 to 60 years of age.
 The Endowment plan combines protection with an investment feature, from which the insured will reap the benefit of living at the end of the endowment period. Under the usual endowment forms, says 10, 15, 20 or 25 years endowment policies, the premium is high for the protection afforded (above the average man's ability to pay) and where the sacrifice is made and they are carried, the endowment period comes early in life and you use the money, lose the protection early in life and when you come to old age you are not much better off.
 The Fidelity now issues a policy, to a great extent, combining the life and endowment features and overcoming all these objections.
The Installment Endowment at Age 60
 This policy gives protection during the active period of your life, viz.—From the time you take it out until you are 60 years of age. You make your last premium payment when you are 60 years of age, and commence drawing the face of the policy in ten equal installments. The premium on this policy is just a little more than for a whole life policy. Phone the office for an appointment for further particulars and advantages of this policy.
Fidelity Reserve Company
 (THE HOME COMPANY) Phone 59