

The Democratic Sentinel.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF JASPER COUNTY.

FRIDAY, JUNE 4, 1880

An anti-Grant meeting at Indianapolis on Monday night broke up in a row.

The Democrats of Maine endorsed the nominee of the Greenbackers for Governor.

Up to the hour of going to press no balloting for President has been had in the Chicago convention.

Democratic State Convention at Indianapolis, next Wednesday, when the next Governor of Indiana will be placed in nomination.

The first new wheat of the season was received at St. Louis, Saturday, from Fort Worth, Texas, and was sold at auction on "Change for \$1,624 per bushel."

The recent republican state convention of Iowa was opened with the following prayer by the exceedingly pious chaplain selected for the occasion:

"O, Lord, if Thou permittest the democrats to triumph this fall, thy faithful children cannot but regard Thee as the friend of bulldozers and traitors."

After attempting for several weeks to throw a bomb into the Democratic camp, old "steriley" gives it up; is despaired, and this week proffers his medicine to the Nationals. He labors under the soothing delusion that the people in this locality can easily have the wool drawn over their eyes by such conceited "Smart Alecks" as himself. He is now trying his skill upon Charley Price, and he will wake up one of these days to a realization of the fact that Charley has "given him away" badly.

Congress votes money to meet all the expenses of the Government and the Fraud vetoes the appropriation and prohibits the use of the funds appropriated. Who is to blame? The Fraud, of course, because he refuses to pay out what Congress has sanctioned. It is withheld by virtue of Hayes' veto. But our neighbor says "Every pensioner who is pinched because of the withholding of money can thank the Democratic party for it, * * * because of the president's veto." For gauziness command us to our neighbor.

The old man of the Republicans is getting patriotic again. He commences an article on Democrats and the war, thus:

"When we hear a Northern Democrat boast of how the Democratic party failed to put down the late Democratic rebellion, we are reminded of what the old man said to his plucky spouse—" Didn't we kill the bear," etc.

Well that's a smart reminder. At the time the author of the above item was at home listening to and relishing the anecdotes of the "old man and his more plucky spouse," Democrats were engaged in putting down the rebellion, and the simpleton never realized that fact.

A GREAT MANAGER.—It is evident our neighbor desires to outdo Jay Gould in securing management and control of parties. He has sought to control the National Imperial convention in session this week at Chicago, in the interest of Jim Blaine, the "plumed knight" of the Mulligan Guards. He seeks to control the radical congressional convention in the interest of Thompson, "Jasper county's candidate." He seeks to control the balance of the radical district conventions, and the county convention in the interest of the radical ring in Rensselaer. And he seeks to control the actions of the Democratic and National parties in such a way as to insure to the advantage of the ring that directs him.

The Philadelphia Ledger, (Ind.) states the reason "Why Immigrants Don't Go South," thus: "Those newspapers which significantly inquire why the immigrants that are flocking into the country do not go South, would answer their own questions by saying that life and property are unsafe in the Southern States. So far as in their power lies these newspapers try to create this impression, and doubtless many writers ignorantly believe it. But there is no truth in it. The reason why immigrants do not go South is because of the preoccupation of the land by negroes. The immigrants do not wish to enter into direct competition with negro labor, and they prefer, as a matter of choice, to settle where there is an undoubted preponderance of European or white American blood. For the same reason the Yankee movement from the New England States is Westward instead of Southward. They affect a sentimental liking for the negro, which they carry into their politics, but not into their business."

Valparaiso Messenger: The Logansport Pharos, the democratic organ of Cass County, in speaking of the Hon. John N. Skinner, of Porter county, the radical candidate for Congress in this district, says: "The Valparaiso Messenger solemnly remarks that Mayor Skinner will be the next congressman from this district. The gods have decreed it." Mr. Skinner will get no nearer congress this year than he did two years ago, when he suffered himself to be used as a tool to beat Hon. Morgan H. Weir, the regular democratic nominee. In the first place, it is not true that Mr. Skinner "defeated" Morgan H. Weir, the regular democratic nominee, and in the second place, had Mr. Skinner not been a candidate at all, Mr. Weir could not have been elected.

is, Mr. Weir and Mr. Skinner were both candidates before the Wanatah greenback convention, and the only political difference between them, at that time, was that Mr. Skinner got the nomination and Mr. Weir didn't. Then, when the democratic convention was held at Wanatah, a week afterwards, Mr. Skinner was voted out of that convention, by a resolution introduced by Mr. Murray, and Mr. Weir was nominated without opposition. Mr. Weir and his friends then demanded that Mr. Skinner withdraw in his favor, because, he said, he was just as good a greenbacker as Mr. Skinner. This was not done. Mr. Weir was beaten in his own democratic county by over one hundred majority; while Mr. Skinner carried his republican county by a majority of over one thousand. We take it for granted that the Pharos desires the overthrow of the republican party in this district. As constituted, this district is republican by over 1,700 majority, and what chance of election would a democrat stand against such odds? Now, if Mr. Skinner be nominated or endorsed by the democrats, Porter county will give him enough votes to overcome this republican majority, and to bring him in. The vote in Porter county, for congress, stood, Skinner, 1704, Weir, 494, and Calkins, 1,351. For secretary of state, same year, Moore, republican, 1,621, Shanks, democrat, 1,182, and James, greenback, 775—showing a republican majority over the democrats of 439 in the county. Now add the vote of Skinner and Weir together, and then subtract the vote cast for Calkins therefrom, and Porter county is good for 851 majority for Skinner. This is Mr. Skinner's record. No democrat can be nominated at Monticello—there is no working majority in this district—so far as the support of even a democrat in this district can possibly carry such a large vote in Porter county. In view of this fact, and others that we have stated, will it profit the democrat if they run a straight democrat and lose the election? When the democrats meet in convention, at Monticello, on the 16th of next month, we fervently hope they will have the good sense to nominate Mr. Skinner, and win at the polls.

While, of course, we expect to abide the decision of the Democratic convention called to meet at Monticello on the 16th, there are two or three propositions contained in the above which we think should have weight and favorable consideration in the deliberations of that body. 1st. Every true democrat "desires the overthrow of the republican party in this district." 2d. "What will it profit the democrats if they run a straight democrat and lose the election?" 3d. "Mr. Skinner will more nearly meet the views of the democracy, than a republican representative." As the selection of the Convention we have no doubt Mr. S. will receive a hearty, cheerful support, and victory the result.

For Congress.

The Delphi Times has heretofore been strongly opposed to the "mountain going to Mahomet," but in its issue of this week takes the following sensible view of the situation:

"The question presented by the near approach of the time fixed for the choosing of a candidate for Congress by the Democracy of this district is one which should be receiving the earnest attention of the voters. At the election in 1878, the vote of the district was as follows:

Coities.	Rep. Dem. Nat.	Rep. Dem. Nat.
Lake, -	1,618 975 116	1,531 493 1,703
Porter, -	1,027 442 1,465	1,069 551 1,494
Clinton, -	993 975 563	1,233 1,222 598
Wells, -	715 770 496	1,401 1,389 431
Fulton, -	2,664 2,639 1,098	1,829 2,012 344
Total, -	12,991 11,462 6,332	12,991 11,462 6,332

Thus it will be seen that while the majority of the Republicans over the Democrats was 2,329, the combined vote of the Democrats and Nationals exceeded the Republican by 3,903. It is thus made evident at a glance that the Democracy antagonize the Nationals the election of a Republican is assured. We have, therefore, only to choose between a coalition with the Greenbackers and the certainty of defeat. The question to be answered by the Democratic voters of the district is, Is it more wise to choose a representative who is pledged to oppose the nefarious schemes of centralization and extravagance than distinguish the Republican policy, or to place ourselves in a position where we can but add to the strength of the party whose principles and policies every Democratic and National voter equally despises? The TIMES holds to the principle that it is not only the correct policy but the unmistakable duty of all opponents of Radicalism to form any combination that will compass the defeat of the common enemy. For this, and for additional reasons which we will give, the Times earnestly hopes that the Democratic Convention, which assembles at Monticello on the 16th inst., will nominate for Representative in Congress Hon. John N. Skinner, of Porter county. Mr. Skinner is a Democrat, and it elected to Congress will sit with the Democracy in opposing every scheme by which the Republicans hope to perpetuate their power to rob and oppress the people of the country. If elected, he will represent the people of the Tenth District in a manner acceptable to the patriotic opponents of Radicalism, whether those opponents affiliate with the Democratic or National parties. With him as our candidate success is more than probable. Without him, defeat is certain."

The ladies of the Presbyterian church will give a strawberry and ice-cream festival, at the church, next Wednesday evening. An enjoyable time is promised and every patron will be handsomely treated.

The Black Cashmires at the Cheap Store, are selling very rapidly. As many as five nice patterns are being cut in one day. This is proof positive of their cheapness.

In the contested election case in the House, between ex-Governor Curtin of Pennsylvania, and the sitting member, Yocum, it would have been clearly to the advantage of the Democrats, in a partisan sense, to unseat Yocum and give the place to the radical. But the radical party, which had the power to take such action, "then had not shown that Democrats act upon their sense of what is right and just, and not upon partisanship merely. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The Democrats have it in their power to turn out both Washburn and Kellogg, and thereby gain partisan advantage, but it is clear that they will not so act in either case. Republicans have never acted against party interest in this way, and never will. The same is true in the Donnelly-Washburne and Kellogg-Safford cases. The