

The Hutchinson, **A FAIR OFFER.** (Kansas) News, in a recent number, pays a great compliment to Paul Morton, second vice-president of the Santa Fe road, because he advises the farmers of Kansas to hold onto their live stock, not to sacrifice it, and promises that if there is any corn in adjoining states, the Atchison road will be glad to haul it at very low rates to such points in Kansas as may desire to feed cattle. The News then says:

"This is not the first time by any means, that the railroads have come to the relief of the people of Kansas and helped them out of the hole."

It refers particularly to the grasshopper raid and drouth of 1860. The News then refers to the fashion and passion among certain political leaders who, in late years, have attempted constantly to array the farmers and shippers against the railroads of the country. Nebraska has in its history very much of a similar experience. The editor of THE CONSERVATIVE recalls that personally he organized the Nebraska Relief and Aid Society in the winter of 1874-75, and that he was inspired so to do by the direct request of Mr. Chas. E. Perkins, president of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy railroad, who started the subscriptions by a contribution of \$5,000 for the relief of the sufferers in the western part of the state, and also gave free transportation for all goods and provisions sent in from other states for the relief of the famined sections of the commonwealth. Mr. Jay Gould followed Mr. Perkins with a similar subscription, and the Union Pacific, like the Burlington & Missouri, also distributed, freight free, all contributions of food and clothing in every part of the state that its lines permeated.

How much of this sort of work has been accomplished by the tear-down party, the political agglomeration which is constantly denouncing incorporated capital in the form of railroads, banks, and manufactories? What record is there of any generous, philanthropic movement engineered and carried on for the benefit of the people of either Kansas or Nebraska by the populist party and its adherents?

On the 24th of **IRRIGATION.** this month there will be held at Denver a convention of the friends of forestry and irrigation. The American Forestry Congress meets on that date, and there is in evidence a sufficient amount of testimony to convince one that there will be strong resolutions in favor of government appropriations for the purpose of irrigating the arid lands of the plains between the Rocky Mountains and the Missouri river, and also the arid lands on the Pacific slope.

Years ago the general government

gave to each of the states all the swamp lands in their respective limits. These swamp lands were then given by the states to the counties in which they were located, and the county sold them to individuals. Out of the proceeds, court-houses and school-houses were built in many of the Western states. Immediately opposite Nebraska City, the county of Fremont, Iowa, sold thousands of acres of land at 60 cents an acre, which is now valued at from \$50 to \$75 an acre as cornproducers.

If it was a good thing to give away to the states, the land which was too wet, to be used by them as their legislators thought best, why will it not be better for the general government to give the arid lands within each state, to the state which holds them, and thus avoid enormous appropriations and expenditures from the national treasury for the alleged purpose of irrigation? Why should the farmers of the middle-Western, unirrigated states, who complain of too much competition in the production of cereals and meats, be taxed to make more competition in Colorado, Nebraska, or anywhere else by appropriations to irrigate arid lands? If it will pay to irrigate the arid lands of Colorado there is no need of government appropriations; and if it will not pay to irrigate those arid lands, there ought to be no government appropriations for that purpose. If the valuable arid lands of Colorado are given to that state, and that state wisely uses the gift, will not individual and corporate enterprise develop a system of irrigation far more effective than any which the theorists, whom the government might employ under a national appropriation, would develop? The recent successful irrigation of lands about Rocky Ford and La Junta, in the state of Colorado, demonstrates perfectly that personal enterprise is the very best opener and supervisor of irrigating ditches in the world. The vast sugar beet industry which has been developed in that section of the state, and the great fruit and melon shipments from various parts of that commonwealth illustrate the fact that wherever there is money to be made by irrigating arid lands there are men with money and enterprise to undertake the work.

If it is the duty of the general government to make fertile the arid lands in the West by furnishing water therefor at the general expense, why is it not equally the duty of the national government to manure the worn-out farms of New England and some of the middle states out of appropriations made from the national treasury? If it is the business of government to make fertile the infertile lands of one section of the Union, is it not equally its duty to make fertile the sterile lands of another part of the Union?

The New Republic **PROHIBITION.** at Lincoln continues its crusade for prohibition with ever-increasing zeal. In a recent issue, it declares "drinking in moderation is dishonorable, corrupting and foreshadows the downfall of a people."

What people? Those who *do* drink or those who do *not* drink? And if prohibition came into absolute vigor tomorrow all over the United States together with abstention from the use of tobacco, where would this great and glorious government get its revenues? Is not the treasury of the republic replenished abundantly and almost wholly by these vices—whiskey and tobacco—of its people?

Says the St. Louis **HIT.** Globe-Democrat, doubtless for the benefit of J. Sterling Morton, Judge Munger, Warren Switzler, and others: "In Nebraska Mr. Bryan has hit the reorganizers in the point of the chin. There will be consternation in Missouri also when he swings right and left for deserters."—Fremont Tribune.

The "peerless" is indeed dangerous and "hits" with terrible accuracy, especially when he "strikes" as a prophet. But the poor innocents whom the *Tribune* names, have never even attempted a reorganization of Bryanarchy? No thinking man can be found to undertake the reorganization of a decayed sausage or the de-odorization of a limburger cheese, full of nasty skippers. Perhaps an apology is due the sausage and the cheese for the implied comparison.

THE CONSERVATIVE **NON-PARTISAN.** believes that the best state judiciary in the American union existed before the judges became elective. An elected supreme court of Nebraska, nominated for purely partisan reasons, by either of the political organizations of the state, is not invariably a safe, dignified and impartial tribunal.

Why not have the lawyers of the several judicial districts hold a convention and nominate a candidate for the Supreme Court, on his character and learning? With Woolworth, Mander-son, Richard Hall, W. D. McHugh, Lambertson, Sawyer, Whedon, Wakeley, and dozens more of great learning and high character within the profession here, why should Nebraska have a mere partisan supreme court?

THE CONSERVATIVE **NOTICE.** has a circulation department to which all letters relative to advertisements and subscriptions should be addressed. The editor has nothing whatever to do with the counting-room of the Morton Printing Company.