

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.



FOR PRESIDENT
GROVER CLEVELAND,
of New York

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
THOMAS A. HENDRICKS,
of Indiana

DEMOCRATIC STATE TICKET.

For Governor,
COL. ISAAC P. GRAY, of Randolph.

For Lieutenant Governor,
GEN. M. D. MANSON, of Montgomery.

For Secretary of State,
CAPT. WM. H. MYERS, of Madison.

For Auditor of State,
JAMES H. RICE, of Floyd.

For Treasurer of State,
JOHN J. COOPER, of Marion.

For Attorney General,
FRANCIS T. HORN, of Bartholomew.

For Superintendent of Public Instruction,
JOHN W. HOLCOMBE, of Porter.

Reporter of Supreme Court,
JOHN W. KERN, of Howard.

Judge of Supreme Court,
J. A. S. MITCHELL, of Elkhart.

For Congress—Tenth District,
THOMAS J. WOOD, of Lake County.

For Judge, 30th Judicial Circuit,
AMES T. SAUNDERSON, of Newton county.

For Pro. Attorney, 30th Judicial Circuit,
DAWSON SMITH, of Benton county.

For Representative,
DAVID H. YEOMAN, of Jasper county.

COUNTY TICKET.

For Treasurer,
WILLIAM M. HOOVER,
of Marion Township.

For Sheriff,
ADAM HESS,
of Gilham Township.

For Commissioner—First District,
BRONSON N. HARRINGTON,
of Union Township.

For Commissioner—Second District,
C. G. AUSTIN,
of Carpenter Township.

For Surveyor,
JOHN P. DUNLAP,
of Marion Township.

For Coroner,
WILLIAM BECK,
of Marion Township.

HON. WM. R. MYERS.

J. H. Turp has sued the Montello Herald and the White County Democrat for libel.

Mr. Blaine will attend the New England stock show next month. The plumed knight, it seems, takes an interest in all kinds of stock, live as well as railroad.

Hon. W. M. Springer has unyelled a deficit of \$114,000 in the accounts of Rev. Mr. Terrell, formerly an Indian agent, who was connected with Major Powell's surveys.

The mutilation of the gravestone in the Blaine family graveyard is called a democratic conspiracy to involve Blaine in a scandal. Come to think of it, the Mulligan letters were probably a democratic conspiracy organized for the same dastardly purpose.

Seymour Cooper, clerk of the superior court at Baltimore, has demonstrated his skill as a penman by engrossing a postal-card the letters of acceptance of both Cleveland and Hendricks. He will get discouraged if he makes a similar attempt with Butler's address to his constituents.

Read "The Widow's Reply," Rosy checked William should be immediately interviewed. What so thin as the explanation of Calkin's retention of certain school funds he received. If the mortgaged lands

so valuable as ... Republican is would have their readers believe one would suppose that they'd be readily sold, or that William would refund the loan and take lands. He prefers to retain the money. Will our gentle neighbor give his readers an honest opinion in the matter? Dare he do it?

THE WIDOW'S REPLY.

MRS. DUNCAN'S ANSWER TO MAJOR CALKINS.

She Defends Herself From False Statements.

In the Chicago Inter-Ocean, of the 23d of August, appears the following letter from Mrs. Duncan:

Chicago, Aug. 22.—Please do me the favor to publish my statement of the facts concerning my removal from the Westville (Ind.) postoffice. In your Sunday issue of the 17th inst., there appeared a matter, purporting to come from the Hon. Wm. H. Calkins, that does me great injustice. He says that I was removed from the Westville post office for "irregularities in conducting the office and in answer to a petition from the leading citizens," etc. In regard to the irregularities charged, it should be understood that a personal enemy of mine made complaint against me. The Washington authorities sent Special Inspector Turner to investigate the matter, and after making a full examination he stated publicly that my office was unusually well conducted, and that his report to the department would be such as to preclude the possibility of my removal from spite, he being convinced that there was no other reason. They did not again attempt to secure my removal until Mr. Turner was transferred to another district.

As to a "petition from leading citizens," there was none. The patrons of the office will testify that there was no petition circulated among the citizens for my removal. A few enemies, inspired chiefly by motives of revenge, secretly plotted for my removal and wrote letters to Washington. When this became known it created great surprise. Three of my friends, all professional men in high standing, immediately wrote to headquarters a statement of my circumstances and the general wish of the people to have me remain in the office. A reply soon came from Congressman Calkins that "the matter had gone beyond his control," and that "the petition for my removal was from persons whose desires in the matter he could not disregard."

My friends then forwarded a remonstrance signed by 206 patrons of the office who were amply competent to judge of their "desires," and the work was all done in one day, and without removing the remonstrance from the counter in the office. Many more desired to sign it, but time could not be given them to come in, and it was hastily mailed to First Assistant Post Master General, the Hon. Frank Hatton, accompanied by two more urgent private letters in my favor. Mr. Calkins further stated that my successor "is the widow of a soldier who died of his wounds." The war wife and daughter of this soldier were living at the time of his marriage with the present Postmistress, and Mr. Miller did not die "of wounds received in the army." The statement that he did will be a surprise to his physician as well as to the people who knew him as an unusually strong and vigorous man. The further statement that I was in good health and had two able-bodied sons-in-law to help me, is not true. I was neither "strong" nor "healthy." My husband's son, the hope of our old age, was killed at the battle of Atlanta, and his death so shocked his father, who was in feeble health, that he never rallied, and both were sacrificed to our country's cause. With the aid of my family I faithfully performed the duties of the office, although we were afflicted with much illness.

As to the statement that I had an income outside of my salary, I would say that my earnings never amounted to over \$50 per year, and that during only the last three years. Mr. Calkins says that my appointment was made without the "knowledge or consent of but a few of the patrons of the office," and charges that I came from "another State." In 1870 I moved to Westville, where I had formerly taught school and had many friends and relatives and had often joined in their church services. Mr. Allen Warlock, then the Postmaster, wanted me to buy his home and take the office. He resigned in my favor and sent a petition signed by a dozen prominent citizens to Congressman Jasper Packard, saying that Mr. Packard's inequity with them would be sufficient, I disapproved of his plan and was greatly relieved when the honorable member of Congress refused to take action without a general vote of the community interested. Mr. John Warlock then took a petition and visited every business house in the village and returned it to me in three hours' time signed by 104 patrons of the office asking for my appointment. General Packard will remember that he accepted the petition and recommended me with pleasure. The fact that I retained the position thirteen years and leaving it after but ten days' notice without indelicacy to the department or trouble to my bondsmen is all the comment needed.

In his interview, Major Calkins says, "as far as the assessment is concerned, Mrs. Duncan probably did receive a circular letter, as all the others did, and I understand she did pay \$10 of the \$12." Mr. Calkins knew that I was poor and had an aged mother, an invalid daughter and two grandchildren to support; he knew that I ought not to do did not pay one penny of the assessment; he

knew that his letter to me was not a circular, but that it was a written letter on government writing paper. He says my "money cut no figure in my removal," but states that "before he would remove me he had his committee send me \$10." About four months after I received the assessment letter a letter came to me from LaPorte, containing \$10, with a statement that it was sent to me as a part of the surplus of the campaign fund." I was surprised, but as it was said to be "a surplus campaign fund" I retained it and replied that I would hold it in trust for use in the next campaign. It seems that the supposition that I had been as sessed created conscientious difficulties, and for this reason the \$10 was sent to me, and really did "cut some figure." In conclusion I may say that the only part of Mr. Calkins' statement that is true is where he commends Mr. M., the present P. M. She is a worthy lady, and has three children. If Major Calkins has anything more to say about this post office matter I hope he will be compelled to tell the truth. If he had done this in his interview I would not have felt obliged to defend myself from his false statements.

Mrs. M. M. DUNCAN

Chicago Times: Mr. Blaine's great census argument in favor of the system of licensed rapine by classes specially favored by the government, has been riddled again and again, until there is not left a piece of it big enough to make a hole in. The tail of Mr. Blaine's ticket does not seem to have found this out. He repeated the argument in substance, with some additions which were anything but improvements, in his speech last Saturday evening. He stated that the wealth of the country according to the census of 1860—the accumulations of the country, exclusive of slaves, since its first settlement amounted to \$14,000,000,000. In 1880 the accumulated wealth of the country was \$44,000,000,000. The increase was more than double the previous accumulations "in twenty years under the Republican-American tariff policy," as contradistinguished from the English-democratic free-trade or tariff for revenue policy."

Since Mr. Blaine stated substantially the same thing in his letter of acceptance, his attention has been sharply called to two or three things. One is that he omitted to state that the accumulations of wealth from 1840 to 1860 were more than double the previous accumulations. He omitted to state that it would be impossible to name any period of twenty years in which the accumulations were not more than double the previous accumulations. But this is undoubtedly true. It is undoubtedly true of any country possessing considerable natural resources that have been settled within the past four hundred years, with the exception, perhaps, of countries occupied by a comparatively feeble population, living under the Blaine economic system, such as Blaine's special pets, the Spanish-American countries.

Another thing to which Mr. Blaine's attention has been called is the fact that he like the tail of his ticket, assumes that all the rapid growth in wealth since 1860 has been made under the American system of licensed rapine, while all the previous slow growth or what is assumed by the republican chieftains to have been slow growth, was made under "English Democratic free trade." Mr. Blaine's attention has been called to the fact that there is no truth whatever in this assumption. The very first tariff was avowedly framed for "protection" as well as for revenue. It would, indeed, have been very unsatisfactory to one of Mr. Blaine's partisans of the present day. But rapid progress was made in the practice of the Blaine's system of economy, and from the outbreak of the war of 1812 to 1847, with brief intervals of relief, the country was favored with the Blaine system in about all the perfection of which it is capable. Thus for thirty-five years, with but brief interruptions, the country was showered with all the blessings attending the system of licensed rapine, and we have the word of Mr. Blaine and his followers for it that the country accumulated less than half as much during those and all other years up to 1860 as it has accumulated since then.

Another thing to which Mr. Blaine's attention has been called is his assumption that the rate of material progress in this country has been greater since 1860 than it was during the immediately preceding years of comparatively free trade. His attention has been called to the fact that this assumption is his own as the one last commented upon. It is pretty fair to presume that he knew the assumption was false when he made it, as he took special pains to discredit the census returns of 1850 in relation to wealth, which are the only census returns affording data for comparisons. Mr. Blaine will not be permitted to accept such data as suit his purpose, and at the same time reject such as do not suit his purpose. When he appeals to the census, he must stand or fall by the same. Now, taking the very statistics to which he appeals, without regard to any suit a special purpose, we find that the increase in accumulated wealth from 1850 to 1860, under the Blaine system, the increase was only 52 per cent, after making due allowance for the depreciation of the currency in which the value of the property of the country was stated. During the next decade, under the same system, the increase was 79 per cent. The increase per head of population during the decade of comparatively free trade was 67 per cent; during the next it was less than 23, and during the last 37 per

cent. That doesn't look as though all the prosperity of the country had been reserved for the years since the republicans resuscitated the old whig tariff system, in 1861.

When General Logan attempts to supplement Mr. Blaine's statistics he makes a mess of it. For example, he says: "The advance in the wages of labor from 1860 to 1880 was 150 per cent, and the increase in the number of hands employed 108 per cent." He is speaking of hands employed and wages paid in the manufacturing industries. From what source he gets his very remarkable figures does not appear. He certainly does not get them from the census, for the census figures show that the increase in the wages on the average to each hand employed was only 4 per cent, from 1860 to 1870, and only 11 per cent from 1870 to 1880. How these figures can be combined so as to make the increase 150 per cent, in the twenty years passes comprehension. According to the census the increase from 1850 to 1860 was 17 per cent, or fully as much as during double the length of time under the Blaine economic policy.

General Logan also speaks of the increase of capital invested in manufacture since 1860; but he omits to state that the increase from 1850 to 1860 was 90 per cent, and only 67 during the next ten years, and only 64 per cent during the ten from 1870 to 1880. The tail of the ticket, like the head, seems not to have heard of the census of 1850, or to have heard of it only from some manufacturing monopolists who told him it was a humbug, and he had better not say anything about it.

ADVERTISED LETTERS

Letters addressed as below remain uncalled for in the Post Office at Rensselaer, Jasper County, Indiana, on the 23d day of August, 1884. Those not claimed within four weeks from the date below given will be sent to the Dead Letter Office, Washington, D. C.

John Barkley, Sylvina Gerard, Vestus Gerard, 2, Charles Harrington, R. Sarah Mosier, Miss Clara Mooney, Charles Remel Willie Thompson, Mr. Jacob Watson, E. H. Watson.

Persons caring for any of the letters in this list will please say they are advertised.

HORACE E. JAMES, P. M.

Rensselaer, Ind. August 25, 1884.

Notice is hereby given that the co-partnership heretofore existing between the undersigned, under the firm name of J. C. Norman & Co., in the saw milling business, was dissolved by mutual consent, 12th July, 1884, Charles F. Shroyer retiring.

The business will be continued by Joshua C. Norman and Solomo A. Norman, who assume all debts and responsibilities of the late firm.

JOSHUA C. NORMAN,

SOLOMON A. NORMAN,

CHARLES F. SHROYER, JR.

August 15, 1884.

NON-RESIDENT NOTICE.

The State of Indiana, Jasper County.

Jasper Circuit Court, October Term, 1884.

Nancy A. Raymond

Complaint No. 3275.

It appearing by affidavit, now filed in the office of the Clerk of the Jasper Circuit Court that the above named defendants, and no other parties to the above entitled action, the object of which is to subject the property of the defendant Leonard W. Raymond and his rights, credits and choses in action, in the hands of his executors, to the payment of any judgment which may be obtained in the suit of plaintiff as the abandoned wife of said defendant. And that said Leonard W. Raymond is not a resident of the State of Indiana.

Notice of the pendency of said action is therefore given to Leonard W. Raymond, who is directed to appear at the next term of said Court to be held at the Court House, in the Town of Rensselaer, County and State aforesaid, on the third Monday in October, 1884.

JAMES F. IRWIN,

Clerk J. C. Coart.

L.S. JNO. H. ASH, Piffs Atty.

August 29, 1884.—\$8 75.

Leonard W. Raymond, John E. Medworth, Rich and Hudson and Lyman Raymond.

Complaint No. 3276.

It appearing by affidavit, now filed in the office of the Clerk of the Jasper Circuit Court that the above named defendants, and no other parties to the above entitled action, the object of which is to subject the property of the defendant Leon W. Raymond and his rights, credits and choses in action, in the hands of his executors, to the payment of any judgment which may be obtained in the suit of plaintiff as the abandoned wife of said defendant. And that said Leonard W. Raymond is not a resident of the State of Indiana.

Notice of the pendency of said action is therefore given to Leonard W. Raymond, who is directed to appear at the next term of said Court to be held at the Court House, in the Town of Rensselaer, County and State aforesaid, on the third Monday in October, 1884.

JAMES F. IRWIN,

Clerk J. C. Coart.

L.S. JNO. H. ASH, Piffs Atty.

August 29, 1884.—\$8 75.

Leonard W. Raymond, John E. Medworth, Rich and Hudson and Lyman Raymond.

Complaint No. 3277.

It appearing by affidavit, now filed in the office of the Clerk of the Jasper Circuit Court that the above named defendants, and no other parties to the above entitled action, the object of which is to subject the property of the defendant Leonard W. Raymond and his rights, credits and choses in action, in the hands of his executors, to the payment of any judgment which may be obtained in the suit of plaintiff as the abandoned wife of said defendant. And that said Leonard W. Raymond is not a resident of the State of Indiana.

Notice of the pendency of said action is therefore given to Leonard W. Raymond, who is directed to appear at the next term of said Court to be held at the Court House, in the Town of Rensselaer, County and State aforesaid, on the third Monday in October, 1884.

JAMES F. IRWIN,

Clerk J. C. Coart.

L.S. JNO. H. ASH, Piffs Atty.

August 29, 1884.—\$8 75.

Leonard W. Raymond, John E. Medworth, Rich and Hudson and Lyman Raymond.

Complaint No. 3278.

It appearing by affidavit, now filed in the office of the Clerk of the Jasper Circuit Court that the above named defendants, and no other parties to the above entitled action, the object of which is to subject the property of the defendant Leonard W. Raymond and his rights, credits and choses in action, in the hands of his executors, to the payment of any judgment which may be obtained in the suit of plaintiff as the abandoned wife of said defendant. And that said Leonard W. Raymond is not a resident of the State of Indiana.</