

The Sentinel.

WITH SUPPLEMENT.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31.

FOR PRESIDENT,
THOMAS A. HENDRICKS,
OF INDIANA.

Subject to the decision of the National Democratic Convention.

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Daily, delivered by carriers, per week..... \$25
Daily, delivered by carriers, including Sunday Sentinel, per week..... 36
Daily to newsdealers, per copy..... 3

Indianapolis Sentinel for 1880—Daily, Sunday and Weekly Editions.

DAILY.

Delivered by carrier, per week..... 25
Daily, including Sunday, per week..... 30
Daily, delivered by carriers, per annum, including Sunday..... 100
Daily, per annum by mail, including Sunday by mail..... 120
Daily, delivered by carrier, per annum..... 120
Daily, delivered by carrier, per annum, including Sunday..... 140

SUNDAY.

Sunday edition of 70 columns..... \$ 2 00
Weekly, per annum..... \$ 1 00

The postage on subscriptions by mail is prepaid by the publisher.

Newspapers supplied at three cents per copy postage or other charges prepaid.

An exchange gives some good advice on an important matter. It says:

When a business man comes to the conclusion that he must go to the expense of the year, in judicial advertising, at an amount equal to one half, or at least one quarter of the sum he pays annually for rent, he may very safely make up his mind that it is high time for him to move his business to cheaper quarters.

A PRIVATE letter from Washington of recent date says:

Several prominent gentlemen from Paducah, Ky., including Mayor Wiel, Major Cobb, Colonel Huston, Judge Marshall and others, have been in Washington the past week to secure the removal of the bill and to have the action of the Custom House and post office at Paducah in conversation with some of these gentlemen, who are well informed as to the political situation, I was assured that beyond doubt General H. H. Seymour, the candidate of the Democracy of Southern Kentucky for the Democratic and that he is daily gaining strength in Kentucky.

THOMAS A. HENDRICKS, of Indiana, is an earnest patriot, a distinguished Democrat, an able man, and would make a splendid president. Still we do not think he can do better than to take the second place on the presidential ticket, and he will be headed by Horatio Seymour.—Washington Post.

If Horatio Seymour is correctly reported, he is of the opinion that Thomas A. Hendricks should have the first place on the presidential ticket. Mr. Seymour expresses the opinion that Mr. Hendricks could carry New York.

No man has a natural right to vote.—Journal.

Every man has a natural right to vote. The right is strictly in accord with the nature of all other rights of manhood. In some countries those who claim the "divine right" to rule, deny men the natural right to have a voice in public affairs; but the right exists nevertheless, and in this country it is acknowledged, except by those who favor an empire instead of a republic.

THE DISFRANCHISING AMENDMENT.

The Sentinel has frequently called the attention of its readers, and the public generally, to the fact that the proposed amendment, No. 1, to the constitution of Indiana provides three distinct methods of disfranchising citizens of the State. We have refrained from discussing the provisions of the amendment from any partisan point of view, notwithstanding the fact that Republican organs have sought to mislead the public mind in that regard. If the people of Indiana see proper to amend the constitution of this State as will deter thousands of worthy citizens from exercising the right of suffrage, they will have the privilege on the first Monday in April to commit the flagrant outrage. As the case now stands, a man, native born, 21 years of age, who has resided in the State six months, is a citizen of the State, clothed with the right to vote and to be voted for. But amendment No. 1 tacks on three additional provisions, either one of which, if not complied with, will as effectually disfranchise him as if he had committed the most heinous crime known to criminal law—had been found guilty and sentenced to be hung or to be sent to the penitentiary. One of these provisions is that the citizen must reside in a certain township 60 days; another, that he must reside in a certain ward or precinct 30 days, and still another provision of the amendment declares that though in the matter of residence the citizen may be entitled to vote, he will be disfranchised if he has not registered, and the people of Indiana are invited on the first Monday in April, 1880, to disrobe themselves of their divine right to vote, and to take their places, under circumstances that involve no question of guilt or crime, with felons and outcasts.

In the case of residence, it is easy to illustrate the disfranchising operation of amendment No. 1. It is so flagrantly unjust that it merits denunciation upon the slightest investigation. For instance, an election occurs on the 5th day of April. If a citizen desires to remove from one township to another and not be disfranchised, he must move no later than on the 5th day of the preceding January. If he should move on the 6th of January he would be disfranchised; one day has killed him as a citizen; he has no right to vote. He may have lived in the county for 30 years, he may have resided in the township from which he has removed the same number of years, but being in the township to which he has removed only 30 days, he is disfranchised and is not permitted to vote, no matter what the importance of the questions to be settled may be. The case is still more objectionable with regard to wards and precincts, for though a citizen may have lived in the township all his life, if he has not lived in a certain voting precinct 30 days all of his voting privileges are thrown away. As we have said, the residence provision of amendment No. 1 bears with special force against the rights and privileges of working men, renters—those whose circumstances make it necessary for them to change their places of residence frequently—and such men are asked to go to the polls on the first Monday in April and degrade themselves by their votes. A Republican paper tells the citizens of Indiana that "their right to vote is not an inherent right, but one created and conferred by the State." Well, we would

like to know, in so far as voting is concerned, what constitutes the "State"—the State of Indiana? Does the Republican paper that stains its columns with such a declaration as we have quoted mean to be understood that the State is independent of the people? Something above and beyond the people? That it is possessed of certain "inherent" powers that the people did not confer and for which the people can not reclaim? The people are the State. The people made the present constitution; the people provided methods to change it, amend it, or abolish it. The people's servants, by authority conferred by the people, invite the people on the first Monday in April to do what? To change the constitution, and, strange to say, the people are invited to so change the constitution as to degrade themselves. The same Republican paper tells its readers that "Men are not born with the right to vote as they are with the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness;" that voting "is not a God given, but a man given right."

We hear much about the "divine right of kings," which we suppose the Republican paper from which we have quoted approves and indorses. We believe in the people's divine right to vote in Indiana—their divine rights of sovereignty—to rule, to make constitutions and laws, and to abolish them at their pleasure. We believe the people are the State, and that all power in the American Republic is inherent in the people; that the Government is of the people, for the people and by the people, and we do not believe the people, on the first Monday in April, 1880, will go to the polls and abrogate their divine rights, or any portion of them.

THE INSANE HOSPITAL REPORT.

We published a few days ago the thirty-first annual report of the Indiana Hospital for the Insane. The report was so full and so entirely satisfactory that its mere appearance carried with it a refutation of the many frivolous charges, to say nothing of the mass of flagrant falsehoods which the Republican press and party leaders have been busily engaged in circulating ever since the benevolent institutions of the State passed into the hands of Democratic management. We call attention to the report now, thinking, perhaps, that the salient features of the report may have escaped the attention of some of the readers of the Sentinel. The tax-payers of the State will be glad, for instance, to cast their eyes over the following brief problem in addition and subtraction, and to know that the neat little sum of \$33,906.53 has been saved to the State by judicious and wise management. Here it is:

Appropriation for maintenance..... \$15,000.00
Appropriation for repairs..... 10,000.00
Revenue from counties for clothing..... 18,282.97
Revenue from sales..... 2,078.84
Appropriation for furnishing department for women..... 25,000.00

Total receipts..... \$196,559.81
DISBURSEMENTS
For maintenance..... \$120,053.23
For repairs..... 10,000.00
For permanent improvement..... 10,000.00
For furnishing department for women..... 21,549.02

Balance unexpended..... \$ 33,906.53

The report of the superintendent shows that over \$30,000 of this unexpended balance remains in the State treasury, while nearly \$3,500 is used for furnishing the women's department as needed. The plan in most of the States is to get all that is possible out of a State Legislature—spend it all, and more, too, and then persuade a succeeding Legislature to make up deficiencies.

Another pleasant feature of the report is the large saving effected by the new management in the monthly expenditures of the institution. Under the old management of the Republican party the monthly average of disbursements for the year ending October 31, 1878, amounted to over \$12,000. Under the new management the disbursements have been reduced to something near \$8,000, showing a saving in favor of the new management of about \$4,000 per month. The saving in the management of the Insane Asylum alone will amount to about \$50,000 per annum.

This admirable showing of the new Democratic management needs no eulogy at our hands. "Figures will not lie," and they tell the story in unmistakable language of a wise and judicious expenditure of the people's money. We conclude with a brief extract from the report, which we hope our readers will patiently read and digest. It is as follows:

If there were doubts as to the propriety of the action of the last Legislature in reorganizing the management of the benevolent institutions, and doubt as to the benevolent nature of the operation under the new law on the finances of the institution alone. The details of purchase and distribution of supplies are too lengthy to print here, but suffice it to say that the new management has always been applied in such manner as to avoid monopoly, to insure good quality and secure favorable prices.

In order to arrive at the results of the management under the present law, it will be necessary to make a comparison with the results under the former law—for instance, the disbursements for the Indiana Hospital for the Insane for the year ending October 31, 1878, according to the records of the trustees and auditors on file, was \$14,369.83, or \$12,630.82 per month, exclusive of revenue from sales or donations. Again, for the first five months of the fiscal year ending October 31, 1878, under the former law, the disbursements were \$9,253.16 or \$12,000 per month, exclusive of revenue from donations, while the last seven months of the fiscal year ending October 31, 1879, or \$17,043.17, or only \$8,524.88 average with the cost per month for the year 1878 is \$8,484.94 less per month, or, as compared with the first five months of the fiscal year 1879, it is \$2,522.13 per month; or, as compared with the last 12 months of the year 1878, and the first five months of the year 1879, 17 months previous to the operation under the new law, it is \$3,837.29 less per month, and this journey is accomplished in three hours.

NOT CREDITABLE.

Hon. Chas. H. Mason, of this State, some time since furnished the Sentinel a paper upon "Centralization," in which the encroachments of the Federal upon the State judiciary are pointed out with such ability and clearness as attracted very general attention. Quite recently Hon. Burton McMillan, of Tennessee, made a speech in Congress, in which he embodied a large portion of Mr. Mason's article. Now is this all. Senator Bayard also incorporated a portion of Mr. Mason's article into a speech. Neither of these distinguished gentlemen thought proper to state from what source they derived their facts and arguments, which, upon general principles, is not fair play. If Mr. Mason, through the columns of the Sentinel, is furnishing both Houses of Congress with material for the best speeches, it would be no more than fair

to recognize him as a M. C. with the pay and perquisites attached. But since that can not be accomplished, it is to be hoped that Mr. Mason will continue his labors, and the Sentinel will see to it that he shall have full credit.

THE IOWA DEMOCRACY AT CINCINNATI.

The Democrats of Iowa meet in convention at Burlington on the 7th of April, being among the earliest in the country. Edward Campbell, Jr., outlines the duty of the party in that State, as well as the probable result, in a letter to a friend in Cedar county, as follows:

Our sister inability to furnish a single Democratic electoral vote admonishes us to be modest, and in the choice of a candidate to appeal largely to the judgment and wishes of the pivotal States, where the real work of electing the president will be done. The work of electing the president is to be done in the Eastern and Southern States as Iowa should go to the convention with no uncompromising preferences or antipathies, but with a full consciousness of the important interests at stake, and the vital necessity for the exercise of a prudent and disinterested judgment. Indeed, in view of our messenger to the Court Journal, dated Washington, December 1, 1882, and from the Imperial Standard, dated Washington, October 1, 1882, to which various telegrams are credited from different sections of the country, telling of the trouble with such insurgents as Blaine, Nast and others, of the progress of imperialism, of the gorgeous and numberless Imperial troops, and of the grand public improvements prosecuted under the Empire. The following extracts will be relished by the lovers of polished wit, whatever may be their views of Imperialism.—Editors of Post.

[Pittsburg Post.]

[One of the cleverest satires of the day is an anonymous pamphlet, published by Ferguson, Bros. & Co., Philadelphia, giving a prophetic pen picture of the coming empire under His Imperial Majesty, Emperor Ulysses I.]

It is illustrated with a cut of a crown, and some of its hits at the leading imperialists are admirable. The chief extracts are taken from the Court Journal, dated Washington, December 1, 1882, and from the Imperial Standard, dated Washington, October 1, 1882, to which various telegrams are credited from different sections of the country, telling of the trouble with such insurgents as Blaine, Nast and others, of the progress of imperialism, of the gorgeous and numberless Imperial troops, and of the grand public improvements prosecuted under the Empire.

The following extracts will be relished by the lovers of polished wit, whatever may be their views of Imperialism.—Editors of Post.

[The Court Journal, Washington, September 1, 1882.]

[From the Court Journal, Washington, September 1, 1882.]

[The Court Journal, Washington, September 1, 1882.]