

THE HERALD.

JOHN A. MACMURPHY, EDITOR.

PLATTSMOUTH, MAR. 8, 1881.

THE ALMA HERALD—Wants to X. Publ. by Hatt & Hild at Alma, Harlan Co. Nebr.

REPRESENTATIVE HALL kindly sent us several bills and friendly messages, containing news during the session.

A very heavy snow-storm prevailed east of the Mississippi on Monday evening and Tuesday morning.

FRIDAY THE INAUGURATION takes place and President Garfield becomes the chief Magistrate of this nation.

J. W. Barnhart, formerly of the Johnson County Journal, has bought a half interest in the Democrat at Lincoln.

GEN. GARFIELD left Mentor for Washington Monday and arrived there at 7:30 Tuesday morning. His trip was one ovation throughout.

THE LEGISLATURE closed its labors about Sunday morning last, in the usual hilarious manner, and by this time are home doing chores and "sigh" one more; glad it's all over.

We saw at Lincoln a very pretty album, called "Van Wyck Album," containing just 14 pages, and on each the name of one of the original voters for the General.

We will try and get the high-license and anti-treaty bills in full and publish soon. Just as soon as we can get them correctly. We give synopsis of both this week.

THAT "BOY" from Otoe, Ransom, and the woman's rights man from Lincoln, Whalen, got along pretty well by our watching "real class and keeping them out of mischief during the session.

GAD! Brad Slaughter got a big yellow gold watch and chain from the "members" at the close of the session as a memento of his integrity and strength of lungs in reading 550 bills of which \$5 became laws. "Keep time, March."

THE WAY WE SPEND OUR MONEY—\$500,000 general appropriations; \$180,000, incendiaries; \$20,000, insane hospital; 42,000, penitentiary; \$100,000, capital building, &c. About \$900,000 in all to run this state for two years. How we wish we were the state for a year or two.

THE DEMOCRAT at Lincoln claims to be a great anti-Railroad paper. So does the Globe. But the editor of the Democrat says the Globe is a great rascal, and the Globe man returns the compliment.

(How Now) are we outsiders to know which to believe, when they both declare they cannot believe each other.

SKINNER, Jim Skinner, don't agree with Imhoff about that fish business, he says the reason they didn't get the fish earlier in the season was because the "boys" from abroad were — — — — — (you know how Jim fills this in) smart any way and if they'd had the fish sooner they'd got away with "high license," amendment, Quick's place, and all Lincoln before adjournment.

The first trout of the season were shipped from Romine's Ponds to Lincoln last Saturday to furnish the Sunday dinner of Host Imhoff's guests. Forty-two pounds at 50 cts. per lb. \$21. What brainy fellows these boarders! get to be if Romine and Imhoff keep that up. We came home Saturday morning and believe Imhoff put that job us so we couldn't get a trout. It's mean, worse than he served the Legislature. Just as they go home and don't need any more brains (among us common folk) he goes and gets fish food for a living, to make Lincoln smarter than any of us.

Now in St. Joe this week, we met Mr. A. J. Fleming, new city editor of the Herald of that place, who treated us very kindly and said he was always glad to see old Nebraska friends. Mr. Fleming was in Lincoln during Legislature some years ago, as correspondent for the Chicago Times, St. Joe Herald, and other papers. He afterwards was connected with the Blade, then a daily at Lincoln, and still later went out to try the West, with Webb Eaton, at Kearney, on the press. Not being suited there, he returned to St. Joe, and has been city editor of the Herald for some time.

PEARMAN tells a good one on Hilton of the Blair Pilot. Pearman was talking to a rabid temperance man one day by the window of the Commercial and Hilton was leaning over the desk looking at the register. The t.m., after going for the legislature generally, because they did not pass the prohibition amendment, said: "There's that 'Pete Her over there" pointing to Hilton, 'the biggest and worst whisky man in Omaha, coming here with his pockets full of money to corrupt the legislature. Just see what a bleat he is. Didn't his face show his business; plain full of whisky," etc., etc.

An explanation followed, and the t.m. let up on our editor friend.

We heard Berenthal we did, at St. Joe Monday night, and, oh, gracious! can't she rattle French; talk of a steam thrasher, it's nowhere. We believe that woman has clock-work inside of her, alarm clock work, for she goes off just like one of those rat-a-tet-bang four-o'clock-in-the-morning things. We can't say she was divine for we saw her in the dining room giving French fits to some of her frankness, boldness and novelty. By Mr. Touzalin's method, we think he deserves great credit, and should have been and was copied very extensively. We are sure it is a much more open, manly way to fight (if you must have it) than the supposed sly and unfair means railroads are constantly using.

He speaks as an expert; he departs from the usual rule of railroad men to keep their information to themselves, and buck the people by means of paid attorneys, and sheer force of money and numerical strength—with which they are charged—and adopts the popular method of going into a newspaper and frankly stating his side of the question—and our singular minded friend says we ought not to have put him in. We confess we read the whole article with great interest, and only wish we could have reproduced it entire. If for no other reason than the frankness, boldness and novelty of Mr. Touzalin's method, we think he deserves great credit, and should have been and was copied very extensively.

In this case the Senate of the State invited the railroad men to this conference, and one of them, one of the most intelligent railroad managers, holding high office in a big corporation, takes the pains to elaborately put his views before as many of the people as he can reach through the Republican.

That is a matter we do not choose to go into. It is none of our business what the Bee or any other paper publishes.

In this case the Senate of the State invited the railroad men to this conference, and one of them, one of the most intelligent railroad managers, holding high office in a big corporation, takes the pains to elaborately put his views before as many of the people as he can reach through the Republican.

He speaks as an expert; he departs from the usual rule of railroad men to keep their information to themselves, and buck the people by means of paid attorneys, and sheer force of money and numerical strength—with which they are charged—and adopts the popular method of going into a newspaper and frankly stating his side of the question—and our singular minded friend says we ought not to have put him in. We confess we read the whole article with great interest, and only wish we could have reproduced it entire. If for no other reason than the frankness, boldness and novelty of Mr. Touzalin's method, we think he deserves great credit, and should have been and was copied very extensively.

We heard Berenthal we did, at St. Joe Monday night, and, oh, gracious! can't she rattle French; talk of a steam thrasher, it's nowhere. We believe that woman has clock-work inside of her, alarm clock work, for she goes off just like one of those rat-a-tet-bang four-o'clock-in-the-morning things. We can't say she was divine for we saw her in the dining room giving French fits to some of her frankness, boldness and novelty. By Mr. Touzalin's method, we think he deserves great credit, and should have been and was copied very extensively.

He speaks as an expert; he departs from the usual rule of railroad men to keep their information to themselves, and buck the people by means of paid attorneys, and sheer force of money and numerical strength—with which they are charged—and adopts the popular method of going into a newspaper and frankly stating his side of the question—and our singular minded friend says we ought not to have put him in. We confess we read the whole article with great interest, and only wish we could have reproduced it entire. If for no other reason than the frankness, boldness and novelty of Mr. Touzalin's method, we think he deserves great credit, and should have been and was copied very extensively.

He speaks as an expert; he departs from the usual rule of railroad men to keep their information to themselves, and buck the people by means of paid attorneys, and sheer force of money and numerical strength—with which they are charged—and adopts the popular method of going into a newspaper and frankly stating his side of the question—and our singular minded friend says we ought not to have put him in. We confess we read the whole article with great interest, and only wish we could have reproduced it entire. If for no other reason than the frankness, boldness and novelty of Mr. Touzalin's method, we think he deserves great credit, and should have been and was copied very extensively.

He speaks as an expert; he departs from the usual rule of railroad men to keep their information to themselves, and buck the people by means of paid attorneys, and sheer force of money and numerical strength—with which they are charged—and adopts the popular method of going into a newspaper and frankly stating his side of the question—and our singular minded friend says we ought not to have put him in. We confess we read the whole article with great interest, and only wish we could have reproduced it entire. If for no other reason than the frankness, boldness and novelty of Mr. Touzalin's method, we think he deserves great credit, and should have been and was copied very extensively.

He speaks as an expert; he departs from the usual rule of railroad men to keep their information to themselves, and buck the people by means of paid attorneys, and sheer force of money and numerical strength—with which they are charged—and adopts the popular method of going into a newspaper and frankly stating his side of the question—and our singular minded friend says we ought not to have put him in. We confess we read the whole article with great interest, and only wish we could have reproduced it entire. If for no other reason than the frankness, boldness and novelty of Mr. Touzalin's method, we think he deserves great credit, and should have been and was copied very extensively.

Senator Saunders on the Missouri River.

If the bill for River and Harbor Improvement fund passes the House as amended by the Senate, it will be \$225,000 for the Misssouri from the mouth to Yankton. This is \$35,000 for snag-boat service and for ripraping on Nebraska borders \$92,000, Brownville gets \$10,000, Nebraska City \$20,000, Plattsburgh \$10,000, Omaha \$20,000, Sioux City and Council Bluffs \$10,000.

The Missouri Editorial Association will take their annual excursion on the 10th of May next, starting from Jefferson city and bringing up to Washington, D. C.

All this we learned from Col. J. T. Childs, President of the Association, while at St. Joe this week. Why can't we go too?

Michael Cavy, Esq. et al.

On the outside of this paper is a letter from "Mullen Ranch," signed by the above named gentleman, and representing, we suppose, his sentiments and others there. How many we don't know at present, but will come out there some day and see. A farmer from there handed the letter on the train with a particular request that we publish it. At his request and because we want to say something for the young man's good we have taken the time and trouble to re-write his letter so the printer could use it, for in its original shape, it wouldn't look well in print.

The principal trouble with this letter is it is like the boy's story the politicians told so much about last fall. It isn't true.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD** there are many readers who have known but one side (as you call it) of the question.

The **HERALD** never set out to give the "argument in that meeting &c." neither on one side nor the other. We did not copy the railroad side of the story and not the other side, nor omit what Mr. Rosewater said—not did the Bee publish both sides of the story, but only one side his side, which he as a newspaper publisher has a right to do. And furthermore had it not been for the **HERALD**