

# The Democratic Sentinel.

OFFICIAL PAPER OF JASPER COUNTY.

FRIDAY, JUNE 18, 1880

## DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

For Governor—Frank Landers, of Marion county.

For Lieutenant Governor—Isaac P. Gray, of Randolph county.

For Secretary of State—John G. Shanklin, of Vanderburgh county.

For Auditor of State—Mahlon D. Manson, of Montgomery county.

For Treasurer—William Fleming, of Allen county.

For Clerk of the Supreme Court—Gabriel Schmuck, of Perry county.

For Clerk of the Supreme Court—A. N. Martin, of Wells county.

For Supt. of Public Instruction—A. C. Goodwin, of Floyd county.

For Judges of the Supreme Court—James Mite, of Elkhart county.

John T. Scott, of Vigo county.

For Attorney General—T. W. Woolen, of Johnson county.

And his name is Skinner.

Owing to which fact there will not be such a squeable, as has been anticipated, in the radical convention at Logansport, next Tuesday.

The nominee of which will be taken in charge by a regular "Skinner," and undergo a process of skinning by a master hand. The job will be done neat, complete and with dispatch.

Bro. James didn't make the rifle for Secretary of State.

Hon. A. G. Porter, of Marion county, is the radical nominee for Governor.

The Republican make no reference whatever to the Grand Garfield Ratification fizzle.

Democratic National Convention at Cincinnati next Tuesday, at which time and place the next President and Vice President of the U. S. will be nominated.

When Oakes Ames, with his little book, was planting Credit Mobilier stock, he found in James A. Garfield a lot where it could be put to do the most good, and he sowed \$5,000 in James A.'s pockets.

The Democratic Congress passed an appropriation bill amply providing for the needs of the Government. The Fraud vetoed it, and if supplies are shut off, he and his party through him are to blame.

"Joy" reviled in the household of Blaine at the beginning, but in the end was transformed into a JAGarfield, full of Credit Mobilier and Union Pacific Stocks, De Golyer paving stones and noxious weeds generally.

On receipt of information of Mr. Skinner's nomination, Wednesday evening, our neighbor doubled himself up "and lied him to little bed." Cholera morbus, colic, cholera infantum, or something. Better today, with a lot of sad, calm resignation stamped upon his countenance, and a determination to face the inevitable with all the grace and courage he can pick up.

It's real jolly to note the course of the republicans of our native State, Pennsylvania, training to the music of Free Trade leaders. It's a hopeful sign to the country that the Keystone radicals have doffed their protective (?) short clothes and donned a full suit of Tariff Reform. There's hope for the old State yet, so long given over to the domination of negroes and adventurers.

The announcement of Skinner's nomination was received by Democrats hereabouts with unconcealed gratification and the liveliest satisfaction. Republicans would give vent to their feelings of dissatisfaction and disappointment with a sullen croak of "crow." But so far as we could ascertain, our neighbor across the hall was the only one who exhibited violent symptoms which follows a feast on "crow."

There was a time when Washington City was infected with an ambition to pave her streets. James A. Garfield was then, as now, a member of Congress. "Boss" Shepherd was the king bee in the rotten hive of the capital's corruptionists. Garfield was at the head of the Appropriation Committee. Boss Shepherd saw a good thing for himself if he could get Congressional support, in the De Golyer paving system. It only took \$5,000 to fix James A. Garfield, and the Boss had his Congressional support. Garfield had been a preacher, and so much the better. The De Golyer went through. The Boss made his pile, and Garfield had \$5,000 for his share. The Chicago convention was certainly unfortunate in its selection of a "dark horse." He has "too much record."

The New York *Herald* defines the recent radical platform adopted by the Chicago convention, to be as "Nearly Nothing as possible," and says:

The motive which controlled the composition of the Chicago platform was frankly avowed by Mr. Prentiss in the speech with which he accompanied his presentment, when he said that the committee had developed a great diversity of opinions among themselves about suitable recommendations of a policy for the Republican party and therefore had put as nearly nothing into their resolutions as was practicable.

The New York *Times* (radical) declares it incomplete, inane, impudent, and adds:

It is a great pity that the national convention of the Republican party should have put out a declaration of principles and opinions and purposes, with one exception, so incomplete, so weakly framed and so jumbled with matters of impertinence or slight importance.

## POLITICAL SCINTILLATIONS.

The Chicago Convention, like every other event of more or less moment, was and remains a topic for study, rather reflection, and was not without lessons to be analyzed, and made to point a moral, especially when its *task is toiled*. The impudent Conkling, who led the distanced host that rallied and stood with such fidelity to the man on horseback, challenged the admiration of his foes as warmly as he held the confidence of his friends. The swarthy Logan, who in practice daunts "them d—d literary fellers" as vigorous and—inerently a Pennsylvania's Winnebago chief, does in phrase, never covered in the darkest hour of the conflict, D. N. Cameron—sardonic, sly Don—stood to his guns and followed the trail of his ambition with the fidelity of the sleuth hound. Mat. bear's competitor hadn't the mettle to bear his compatriots company to the deadly breach, and Arab back, folded his tent and got him back to Washington. Robeson, the man of large promises and larger pilferings, never faced the battle. For the first three, the "Senatorial Syndicate," there are victories, not remote, which will pale the ephemeral triumph of their foes at Chicago.

The party that calls itself republican, and travesties its profession in its practice, can't live without "Bosses," and now, having struck down all it had worth keeping, it is at sea with an amateur pilot and a shaky helmsman.

A word here of BLAINE, the "idol" of the corporations, who had him chartered to rule in their favor when he played Speaker of the House: The "republican" party were not indifferent to his claim on their favor by these rulings, and if they could have afforded it would have added the nomination for President as a bonus to the cash price they paid him for them. They were not ungrateful, for once, but they were "looking ahead," in contemplation of retaining executive power, and the history of these rulings and Blaine's ready acquiescence in making them, in some mysterious way "got out" and become public property. They didn't believe that the "magnetism" with which he is personally credited was strong enough to show that *ugly fact* under. If that part of his record had escaped the vigilance of acute reporters it is even possible that Conkling would have condoned the indiginity of Blaine posting him as a "strutting turkey cock," and opposed no serious obstacles to his success at Chicago.

When John Sherman's opinion of General Arthur at that time?

In a letter to Hayes, dated January 28, 1879, Mr. Sherman said:

"It is necessary to remove the actual commission of a crime by proofs demanded in a court of justice, then it is clear that the case against Mr. Arthur is not made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate. But if it is to be held that, to procure the removal of Mr. Arthur, it is sufficient to reasonably establish that gross abuses of administration have been committed, then the case against Mr. Arthur is made out, especially if his answer is held to be conclusive, without reference to the proofs on the public records and tendered to the Committee and the Senate