

LESSONS OF THE HOUR.

The Attempted Assassination Monopolizes the Attention of Ministers.

The Rev. Hinsdale, of Hiram College, Discourses on that Theme.

And Presents His Deductions in a Favorable Light.

WASHINGTON, July 10.—Rev. Dr. Hinsdale, president of Hiram college, spoke at the president's church on Vermont avenue. Rev. Dr. Harrison, chaplain of the house of representatives; Rev. Mr. Leach, of the navy yard; M. E. Church, and Rev. Dr. Shippin, who has come into notice as a fellow-boarder of the assassin, each delivered sermons on the assassination.

Dr. Shippin spoke on "The Righteous Judgment of God," and he drew a picture of a judgment day on earth that had occurred during the past week. The president's pew at the little Christian church on Vermont avenue was empty. A bunch of evergreens placed in it by some friends indicated the hope and faith of his friends. The sermon was preached by Dr. Hinsdale, the president of Hiram college, of which Garfield was formerly president. He took for his text, Isaiah xlv, 8-9—"My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways."

The preacher began with remarking upon the extraordinary events of the last week. They had made a profound and lasting impression upon the minds of men, not only at home, but abroad and they suggested the topic. One of the lessons of the hour was the danger of the high political excitement, especially when it partakes of a factional character. The current talk about plots and conspiracy is wild and foolish and tends to produce an unhealthy state of public mind. The would-be assassin of the president is a man of loose brain, depraved moral character and his murderous act is his own. Of this there seems no doubt, but the causes stimulating his dreadful deed was the exciting state of the political world. Such an intense and morbid state of the political opinion and feeling is to be deprecated. What political party shall be in the ascendancy and who shall represent the people in high places is an important question, but they are far less important than the life of the chief magistrate and the good order and fate of society. The second lesson is the incalculable value attaching to sound habits and an orderly life and strong moral habits. Had the president's blood not been poisoned by alcohol or had his constitution been broken down by irregularities he would have been dead at this hour, nor would he have lived so long had he not been a man of great faith and self-control. The popular faith and hope has been based, in a great degree, upon these facts, and the hope of the president. The president's great qualities have given just confidence and stability to the public mind, and they are a strong pledge of his complete recovery. Mr. Garfield's heroism was also eulogized.

The third lesson reveals human nature in its best phases. The assassin has been universally condemned. We are not a Mexicanized people. The pistol is not regarded as the proper political method. The universal expressions of good will and sympathy are most significantly beautiful; they are confined to no party or church; they are peculiar to no section or locality, north, south, east or west; republicans and democrats, men of all races, religions, and conditions have united in a chorus of honor and sympathy. Nor have these feelings been confined to this country. The old world has mingled her voice with the voices of the new. We have seen a touch of nature that makes the whole world kin. The religious manifestations of the week have been strikingly significant and beautiful. They revive the old hold that the unseen world has upon the popular mind.

DISTON'S GREAT SCHEME.

Formal Organization of the Company that is to Reclaim Florida.

Philadelphia Record, June 9. At the northeast corner of Third and Chestnut streets was established yesterday the office of one of the boldest enterprises ever undertaken in America. Conspicuous in the management is Mr. Hamilton Diston, head of the great saw works. Ex-mayor Stokely is president and Mr. Diagon treasurer of the new company, which starts under the rather long title of the "Atlantic and Gulf Coast Canal and Okechobee Land Company." Engineers have been sent to Florida, the surveys made under the auspices of the national government have been verified by the company, three large dredges are now on the way to Jacksonville, and work is to be pushed with vigor. The daring and immensity of this scheme may be inferred from the fact that the territory in question exceeds by a thousand square miles all of the land included in the four states of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey and Delaware. The company intends to open up over 17,000 square miles of the most tropical portion of the most tropical state in the Union. The engineering features of the work are interesting; a report upon the subject having just been issued by Mr. James M. Kramer, C. E.

Lake Okechobee is the grand inland reservoir for the waters of middle Florida, having no natural or direct outlet. The principal feeder to it is the Kissimmee river, which pours in a constant supply of 207,300,000 cubic feet of water every twenty-four hours. The amount of evaporation from water surfaces exposed to sun and wind is set down in the book at the rate of from one-eighth to three-eighths of an inch per day, according to conditions. Lake Okechobee having an area of 1,000 square miles, the evaporation from the surface of the lake aggregates, at the lowest rate, 290,400,000 cubic feet of water, which is more than one-third in excess of the supply from the main feeder. During the ordinary seasons and particularly during

periods of drought, the level of the water in the lake is lowered, the surrounding land becomes in a measure desolate and large herds of cattle obtain excellent pasturage in the savannas and swamp lands of the interior. Then when the rainy season comes, four months in the year, the waters of the lake gradually rise, overflow the immense tracts of sugar land, the soil of which is identical to that of Cuba, and back to the waters of the river emptying into the lake. It is the purpose of the company just formed to permanently lower the surface of lake Okechobee, which, according to the United States survey of 1879, is twenty-five feet above mean low tide, by constructing the drainage canal twenty-one miles in length to the St. Lucie river at a waterfall of one foot a mile. This plan is similar to that recommended by Colonel Meigs to the national government in 1879. In the proposed canal this waterfall will give a velocity of two and two-thirds miles per hour and a capacity of passing 700,000 cubic feet in twenty-four hours. Three stream dredging machines of the Menge patent, constructed on the continuous ladder principle and resembling the buckets in a grain elevator, are now being put together at Jacksonville, the hulls being already in shape. Each dredge will be capable of making a clean cut of 22 feet in width. The dredges will be ashed in pairs, so that at one operation they will open a canal 44 feet wide. To dig the canal from Lake Okechobee to the St. Lucie river will require the excavation of 9,000,000 cubic yards, which, at a rate of 2 cents a yard (the Menge figure), will amount to \$180,734, and at an outside figure of 5 cents a yard will amount to \$451,336.

In addition to this canal it is the design to build another canal from Lake Okechobee to the Caloosahatchie river, emptying in the gulf; also to deepen and straighten the streams emptying into Lake Okechobee, to dig lateral canals or ditches, and at various points to tap the ridge separating the saw-grass marshes from the Atlantic and the gulf, thus draining the remotest sections of that great region.

The area of land reclaimed will embrace every class of Florida land, including "high and low hammock," "swamp lands," and under the terms of the contract between the company and the state of Florida one-half of the 8,000,000 acres to be reclaimed by the lowering of the lake waters will revert to the company. Valuable deposits of hematite ore and marl are also reported.

The same company has bought the franchise of the Atlantic Coast Steamboat, Canal and Improvement company for the construction of sixty-one miles of canal which, by linking the waters of the rivers and sounds skirting the eastern coast of Florida, opens up nearly 330 miles of continuous inland navigation connecting the St. John's river with Lake Worth and developing a huge stretch of land which has been neglected simply because it was not accessible, and which produces crops of the wildest scope, embracing tropical and semi-tropical fruits and fibrous plants, and maturing to a degree developed at no other point in the United States. The cost of building these canals with labor-saving appliances is placed at \$203,984, and with the dredges now building can be completed in nine months. In consideration of this work the company will receive land grants of 400,000 acres immediately adjoining the canal. It is expected that both lines of canal, measuring eighty-two miles in all, will be completed within fifteen months.

The Doane Law and the Railroads.

The law known as the Doane railroad law, passed by the Nebraska legislature last winter, went into effect June first. For months previous to that time we read in certain leading papers almost daily that the law was a stupendous fraud that would work only mischief and be an engine of oppression to shippers instead of a real measure of relief as intended. The law has been in force now one month, and from the same source we hear the jubilant cry, "we told you so." As was predicted the law has not brought the relief that was intended, and it is very natural that a great many people should already be asking for its repeal. Whether it should or should not be repealed, is however a debatable question, with a strong argument for the negative. To understand the matter fully it is best for the reader to take a glance at the law. Section 2 provides that no railroad company in the state of Nebraska shall charge a higher rate for the transportation of any freight than the published rates on the first day of August, 1881, nor a greater amount for a shorter distance than for hauling it a longer distance, nor give any secret rates, rebates or drawbacks.

The provisions of the law are simple, and need not be misunderstood. The law itself is just and works, (or would not in a proper observance) and is not in any way oppressive to shippers. It is a fact long known that the cost is often as great in shipping between local stations only a short distance apart as for shipping from one principal point to another where the two are widely separate. The Doane law does not pretend to fix a rate. It merely says that one shipper shall have the same privileges as another; that shippers shall not be floored on short hauls; and that the rates shall not be higher than were charged at a certain given period—Nov. 1st, 1880. The railroad companies of Nebraska could have well afforded to comply with the law in the spirit of the law itself, a spirit that would also have quieted any demand for more extreme legislation. Instead of doing this, however, it is very evident that they have studiously endeavored to make the law odious by tacking on all the tariff the law will permit, as though the law is intended to mean that they must charge close up to the maximum of transportation Nov. 1, 1880. This is especially true on rates for long hauls, which are raised to the highest possible limit to make them proportionate, as near as possible, with the rates for short hauls. An action just the reverse of this would have been better for the companies, i. e., a reduction on short hauls, as the law contemplates, so that every species of freight

for short distance should not be compelled to pay for the drawbacks and special favors granted to heavy long distance shippers.

It must be admitted that the Doane law is weak in this point, no matter what the intention may have been; but the companies need not expect to gain anything by sliding through loopholes to work their spite on a people who have suffered much injustice at their hands. Such action will not be construed by the people as an argument that the law is unjust, or that a regulation of tariffs by legislation, in any form, is improper. Human nature is much the same the world over, and nowhere that we have yet heard of has the attempt to drive people been a success. In this instance the companies have yet to discover their error—to learn that there is a golden mean between the spirit and the letter of an enactment that it would be well for even a railroad company to consider. The Doane law is not unjust to the railroad companies, and need not be to the people if the railroad companies obey it in the spirit. A failure to do this will, we have no doubt, lead to the election of a "granger" legislature that will go to the extreme of the railroad legislation, perhaps pass laws that will in some respects be unjust to the companies. It would therefore be wise for them to call a halt if they do not wish this thing to come to pass, for the movement, once started, would draw largely upon the support of a conservative, disinterested class, whose love of fair play would induce them to take a hand in punishing arbitrariness and "pure cussedness" wherever found.

The convictions of the Express on this subject are strong. It believes that railroad companies have rights that the people are bound to respect, and it believes none the less that the people have rights that railroad companies must respect if they value the safety of their charters, for chartered rights are not construed to mean the granting of privileges to extort the last drop of blood from the last pound of flesh of the people that made their charters the blood and bone of their organizations.

Destroying the Doane Law.

Certain journals are trying to make capital out of the fact that the Doane law proves to be inadequate to meet any reasonable person, but they want to show the people that if they attempted to interfere with them they could retaliate, and we take it the result will be far different from what they expected; instead of the people bowing like humble slaves, they will assert their manhood and call a halt, and make such laws as will reach the case. Our advice to the railroad corporations, therefore, is "go slow," and do not exasperate the people.

Unrivaled

As being a certain cure for the worst forms of dyspepsia, indigestion, constipation, impurity of blood, torpid liver, disordered kidneys, etc., and as a medicine for eradicating every species of humors, ordinary pimples to the worst ulcer, Bruck Blood Bitters stands unrivaled. Price \$1.00; trial size 50 cents.

A Single Stone

From a running brook slew the giant Goliath, and millions of noble men since that time have died from a single stone in the bladder, which Warner's Safe Kidney and Liver Cure would have dissolved and carried away.

Great German REMEDY FOR RHEUMATISM, NEURALGIA, SCIATICA, LUMBAGO, BACKACHE, GOUT, SORENESS OF THE CHEST, SORE THROAT, QUINSY, SWELLINGS AND SPRAINS, FROSTED FEET AND EARS, BURNS AND SCALDS, GENERAL BOOILY PAINS, TOOTH, EAR AND HEADACHE, AND All other Pains ACHEs.

No Preparation on earth equals Dr. J. C. Ayer's Sufferer's Friend. It is a safe, sure, simple and cheap Remedy for all kinds of Rheumatism, Neuralgia, Sciatica, Lumbago, Backache, Gout, Soreness of the Chest, Sore Throat, Quinsy, Swellings and Sprains, Frost-bitten Feet and Ears, Burns and Scalds, General Booby Pains, Tooth, Ear and Headache, and all other Pains Ache.

NOTICE. Gilbert Wesson will take notice that on the 15th day of June, 1881, Luther R. Wright, a Justice of the peace in and for Douglas county, Nebraska, issued an order of attachment for a sum of \$60 and interest from January 1, 1880, in an action pending before him wherein Richard H. Darrow is plaintiff and Gilbert Wesson defendant, that property to-wit: Funds belonging to you have been attached under said order. Said case was continued to the 15th day of August, 1881, at 9 o'clock a. m.

LEGAL NOTICE.

In the district court, Douglas county, To Samuel C. Davis, Caroline Davis, Elizabeth B. Tomlinson and the heirs or devisees of Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, whose real names are unknown, non-resident defendants. You are hereby notified that John T. Davis, plaintiff and present owner of the land hereinafter described, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error erroneously described as the north 1/4 of the west 1/4 of the southwest 1/4 of sec. 10, T. 1, S. 10, R. 15, and that the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, did on the 17th day of June, A. D. 1881, file his petition in the district court in and for Douglas county, Neb., against you as defendants setting forth that on the 12th day of January, A. D. 1850, the said Henry T. Tomlinson, deceased, conveyed to the said Samuel C. Davis a deed of land situated in said county in which a portion of the lands included in the conveyance was by a clerical error errone