



Democratic National Ticket.

For President,
WINFIELD S. HANCOCK,
of PENNSYLVANIA.

* For Vice President,
WILLIAM H. ENGLISH,
of INDIANA.

State Ticket.

* For Governor,
FRANK LANDERS.
For Lieutenant Governor,
ISAAC P. GRAY.

For Secretary of State,
JOHN C. SHANKLIN.

For Auditor of State,
MAHLON D. MANSON.

For Treasurer,
WILLIAM FLEMING.

For Clerk of the Supreme Court,
GABRIEL SCHMUCK.

For Reporter of the Supreme Court,
A. N. MARTIN.

For Sup't of Public Instruction,
A. C. GOODWIN.

For Judges of the Supreme Court,
JAMES MITCHELL,
JOHN T. SCOTT.

For Attorney General,
T. W. WOOLLEN.

For Representative in Congress,
JOHN N. SKINNER.

For Representative,
JAMES A. BURNHAM.

For Prosecutor—30th Circuit,
JAMES W. DOUTHIT.

County Ticket.

For Treasurer,
HENRY WELSH.

For Sheriff,
JAMES M. NICKELL.

For Surveyor,
ELLISS R. PIERCE.

For Commissioner—2d District,
JAMES T. RANDLE.

For Coronor,
SYLVESTER HALEY.

Read the Supplement.

All Hancock and English Campaign Clubs and other organizations which support the Democratic candidates are requested to send to

W. H. BARNUM,

Chairman Nat. Dem. Committee, 138

Fifth Ave., New York.

1st. The name and location of their organization.

2d. A statement of the number of members enrolled.

3d. The names of officers.

4th. Accounts of meetings held.

5th. Reports, every two weeks during the campaign, of the number and increase of membership, with the condition and prospects of the campaign.

The National Democratic Committee are now prepared to supply a popular life of General Hancock, beautifully illustrated, written under the direction of the Committee, by Frank H. Norton, and published by Messrs. D. Appleton & Co., of New York. In a handsome octavo of 32 pages, double column. It is historically accurate, and perfectly reliable.

To enable clubs to circulate it, orders of not less than fifty copies will be supplied by this Committee, at the rate of five cents per copy. Sample copies, six cents. Remittances may be sent in money, post-office orders, or postage stamps.

Address, W. H. BARNUM,
Chairman,
138 Fifth Avenue, New York.

MEMORABLE WORDS.

Lincoln's Opinion of Hancock. "Some of the older political journals have said to me that I have watched General Hancock's conduct very carefully, and I have found that when he goes into action he achieves his purpose and comes out with a smaller list of casualties than any of them. If his life and health is spared I believe General Hancock is destined to be one of the most distinguished men of the age."

General Rosecrans, Garfield's old commander, has issued a ringing circular to the Hancock Guards in California.

Senator Conkling says that he does not believe the Democracy of New York will be divided in the state contest in that state.

The reconstructed rebel General Hancock says he will not go for Hancock. He went for him at Cemetery Heights and it was no go.

The New Haven Register says J. A. Garfield is a suggestive way of writing the name of the Republican candidate for President.

From all sections of Indiana the outlook for Democratic success is exceedingly cheering and encouraging. Landers will carry the State by a majority.

Capt. H. Egan, Ex-Auditor of Noble county, and a prominent Republican in that part of the State for many years has announced his intention to support Hancock. He lost both legs in the army and wields a big influence with the soldiers in his part of the State.

The radicals were more blatant in their claims of Indiana in 1876 than they are to-day, but Benny missed it all the same.

Take, for instance, says the Hillsborough, Ohio, Gazette, this fact: In the fiscal year of 1867-8 over one hundred millions of gallons of distilled spirits were manufactured in the United States. The tax was \$2 per gallon. The revenue from that source should have been *two hundred millions of dollars*. The revenue collected from that source was only *seventeen millions of dollars*. Where has the money gone?

The news from Pennsylvania is that Republicans continue to tumble out of their party into the Democratic ranks. John W. Forney is reporting scores of men, heretofore prominent radicals, weekly, and the Philadelphia Times tells of as many more. Col. John S. McClellan, of Venango, Pa., has written to the editor of the Venango Spectator, announcing his intention to support Hancock. Col. McClellan has been a prominent Republican for many years. He was a member of the Legislature in 1850, and Speaker, and President Judge in Venango, from 1853 to 1861, when he resigned from the bench to take command of the Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

What Do the Signs Portend? We write not in the strain of the soothsayer, nor in sympathy with the superstitious oracle. A political canvass of great moment is pending. It so happens that to INDIANA is given the opportunity to point the way to a great triumph for civil liberty, and the re-establishment of this government upon the original safe basis planted by its founders, where, resting, it will be perpetual. The great heart of Indiana throbs in union with the patriotic aspiration for such an achievement. A mighty struggle is being made by many of her misguided sons to divert her voice against the heroic struggle to get the ship of State back to her original moorings. All the appliances which cunning and intrigue can suggest and employ will be enlisted and recklessly thrown into the scale to warp the minds and mislead the judgments of many whose avocations give them scant occasion to fully consider the immense interest at stake. Official patronage, covering a multitude, an immense army of over one hundred thousand retainers, whose money, with their time and their influence, are all embarked in perpetuating the grip they have held upon executive power for twenty years. For nearly four years they have been in possession through the boldest fraud ever perpetrated in the history of government, and that needs the most signal rebuke. One of the active and most unscrupulous agents in effecting this usurpation is seeking to be the successor of the man who is now rioting in possession as the receiver of the funds which he has stolen. The rings which made the country a stench are by common consent allied to the forces which seek to maintain and perpetuate this oligarchy. They have, by hook or crook, so long maintained their hold upon the administration of the government that they have come to regard it as their peculiar property, and exercised its functions to enrich the party committing these high crimes. This is no exaggeration. It is only too mildly painted. It is stand upon the chosen chief of this horde of political vultures, for it is out of their own mouths he is condemned—their words when they were in their right minds, and had no contemplation they would ever be marshaled under James A. Garfield, whose corruption they then so vigorously exposed—whose venality they vividly denounced.

"If a proposed change of government is not sufficient public interest to command the approval of at least half of the voters, the necessity for its adoption cannot be very pressing." Is not the decision of the court good law? Probably, the great majority of the people who criticise the decision most, know the least about it. The decision of the court simply is "that it requires a majority of the electors of the State to ratify an amendment to the constitution, but that the whole number of votes cast at the election at which the amendment is submitted may be taken as the number of voters in the State; that as there were 321,000 votes cast at the election other than for the amendments, and as the law provides that the whole number of votes cast at the election, it is impossible to tell whether the amendments have received a majority of the votes cast at the election or not, and this not appearing affirmatively, they were not adopted."

Three hundred and eighty thousand votes were cast at the election—the amendment in question received 169,000, not a majority. This is the fact, but the law provided no way for ascertaining that 384,000 votes had been cast at the election, and therein it was defective. If the amendment had been submitted at a special election for that purpose alone, and had received 169,000 votes to 159,000 against it, it would have been adopted, because 321,000 would be taken as the number of votes in the State. But it is claimed that, because it is a fact that there was a township election held in the State at the same time and place that the amendments were voted upon, can have no bearing on the other question, because the township election is a general election. This is just where the law is lame. If the election had been held for State officers it would have appeared, without any further laws on the subject, what the whole vote of the State was; but as the laws of the State do not provide any way for ascertaining the whole number of those who vote at a general township election, the law submitting the amendments to the people should have made a provision for that purpose; that it might be known whether or not the number of votes given for the amendments was a majority of the whole number voting at the election. As this was not done, it is not known now, except by evidence, which may or may not be competent. It is contended that the decision of the court in holding the act of March 10, 1879, defective, is wrong. The court is sustained by the decision of the Court of Appeals of New York in the case of Garfield vs. Hinman, S. N. Y., 487.

In that case, the court says in speaking of a law of that State: "The act of 1849 does not prescribe the evidence by which it is to be known, whether the act took effect or not—it was imperfect in its provisions, and there seems to be no mode of ascertaining by legal evidence the result of the vote upon it except by the examination of the returns of the townships inspectors of election. The townships were only empowered to make out certificates. In the present case the result of the popular vote was not admitted in the pleadings nor established by the evidence and there was a total defect in the proof that the act had been adopted by the people."

At a recent Democratic meeting in Illinois, Ex-Governor John M. Palmer made the principal speech, referring with vigor and effect to General Garfield's military career, calling attention to how he mounted his horse just before the battle of Chickamauga and rode to the rear to take a seat in Congress, without regard to the other votes cast. This is not good law. Taylor vs. Taylor, 10, Minn., relied on, was a special election and was not in point in our case. The case of 20th Wisconsin is not like ours. He said it was the opinion generally expressed in army circles at that time that Garfield left the army at a time when no true soldier would have left.

The last case the court says: "This case would be

THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.
Why They Were Rejected—Questions of Law.

There seems to be no necessity for a serious discussion of the decision of the Supreme Court on the constitutional amendments, but as radical cross-road politicians, such as Moses Dunn, who spoke his piece at this place Wednesday evening, set themselves up as legal critics, we present below a brief review of the decision of the court and the reasons for the conclusions reached, for the information of those who may feel interested in the matter:

In June last our Supreme Court decided that the first amendment to the constitution, voted upon at the election held upon the 5th of April, was not properly adopted, and, therefore, not a part of our State constitution. The decision has caused considerable argument both in and without the country. Is not the decision of the court not only good law, but also good common sense? In the case in the Circuit Court, and in evidence in the bill of exceptions in the Supreme Court, that an election was held in the State on the 5th of April, 1880, and that votes were cast either for or against the amendment; that the total number of voters voting at said election were 380,471; that the amendment to the constitution in question received 169,485 votes or more; and that the election of legal voters in the State was 321,028, taken by the State in 1876 according to the census of 1870, the court decided to sustain the amendment to the constitution as it stands.

It is not the decision of the court according to the wishes of any man or any party. The only question presented in the case was whether the amendments were lawfully ratified or not, and not what the consequence would be if they were not ratified. It may be inconvenient to follow a constitution as it is written, but such a consideration should have no weight with a court. It, upon color of construction or otherwise, may depart from a constitution to the wishes of any man or any party.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of

the amendment to the civil service for political crime, and to stand a reform of the civil service for the benefit of the people.

Let us consider the consequences of