

The Sentinel.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14.

ANOTHER "kid glove" nomination.

It is Porter instead of whisky Straight.

ANOTHER iceberg floating around for the Democratic party to smash to pieces.

WHISKY Straight was what they thirsted for, but the Postoffice ring had ordered Porter.

GARFIELD is said to be worth from \$15,000 to \$25,000. Oakes Ames gave him \$320, and De Goyer \$5,000; total \$5,320. That much is a matter of record; the remainder is to be figured out.

It is said that Mr. Hailstall, of the Cincinnati Commercial, acknowledges privately that Garfield is already defeated. We felt sure that the gallant chevalier of Cincinnati journalism really held this opinion, but supposed that he would keep it to himself.

The Republican papers are endeavoring to draw attention to the fact that Mr. Garfield is a "Christian statesman." A genuine Christian statesman is a grand and noble being, but Garfield belongs to the same type that Schuyler Colfax represented, and the people have lost confidence in that particular brand.

The Republican party had better keep its mouth very close as to love for the soldier. Colonel Straight was sacrificed yesterday to a "stay-at-home," while General Hascall's name was fairly biased in Convention simply because he opposed "imperialism" and a third term. Out of the depth of gammon in Radicalism.

The night before the Republican State Convention a delegate said:

"Porter is nominated it will be another Blue jeans vs. Harrison campaign. We want a big gaudy canvas. Straight is a h— of a fighter, and it will take a h— of a fighter to beat Landers. The fight has got to be aggressive on our part."

That is about the size of it. It will be another "Blue jeans vs. Harrison campaign"—only more so.

Every young man in America who studies the life of James A. Garfield can find an inspiration. He can see the possibilities that are in the reach of every man, even though poverty and hardship are his inheritance. A self-made man, who has made himself the truest specimen of manhood.—Inter-Ocean.

Every young man in America who studies the life of Judas Iscariot can find an inspiration up to the time that for thirty pieces of silver he betrayed Christ. Every young man in America who studies the life of Benedict Arnold can find an inspiration up to the time that, for British gold and a commission in the British army, he turned traitor to his country; and every young man in America may find an inspiration in the life of James A. Garfield up to the time when he accepted a bribe from Oakes Ames, and sold himself to De Goyer for \$5,000. With these transactions there is not much inspiration left in the life of Garfield, unless it be to inspire an ambition for infamous notoriety.

The Radical papers should have quoted more largely from the peculiar indorsement that Don Platt gave Mr. Garfield. Here is a few sentences from the eccentric chevalier, referring to the Credit Mobilier candidate for the Presidency:

Politically, he is about as dishonest a specimen as we have, and God knows that is saying much. He sins against the light of his own sunlike intellect and conscience. Eaten up with the corroding poison of political ambition, he sells himself not only to his party, but to that money power lying back of and unseen, yet all seeing, controls its destiny. A free-trader from conviction, he is the public advocate of protection on record; and recognizing the sorrowful fact, as he himself has stated it, that corporations are above law and lawful control, he sells out to the soulless combinations. We can date the day, almost the hour, when Garfield, realizing that to succeed he must succumb, and so bid a last farewell to all the pride, pomp and circumstance of noble independence.

The Albany Evening Journal says: "It is true that General Garfield was assigned \$2,000 of the stock of the Credit Mobilier; it is true that he received some dividends upon his investment, but there is nothing in the transaction which impeaches his integrity." The Journal, however, differs very materially in its estimate of what it takes to impeach the integrity of Mr. Garfield from the estimate made by a Convention of Republicans which met in the gentleman's District just after the Credit Mobilier swindle had been exposed. That Convention declared, among other things:

"That we further arraign and denounce him with the Credit Mobilier, for his false denials thereto before his constituents, for his perjured denial thereof before a Committee of his peers in Congress, for fraud upon his constituents in rendering an untrue and palpable report concerning to forth the finding of said Committee and the evidence against him, when in fact material portions thereof were omitted and garbled."

Bear in mind that this declaration was made by Republicans, and not by Democrats.

GARFIELD AND COLFAX.

The outcome of the Chicago Republican Convention was Garfield. The Chicago Convention was not a mountain in labor, and the product was not a mass. It was the Republican party in labor, and it brought forth a candidate something greater than a mouse, and something infinitely less than an honest man. This was not strange; indeed, it was in accord with the eternal fitness of things. Thorns do not produce grapes, and figs are not the fruit of thistles. Buzzards do not lay eagle's eggs, nor do Republican Conventions, where passion is blended with poltroonery, where hell-born hates hobnob with venality, where all moral diseases find expression in yell, hiss and howl that defy description, put forth men for candidates who are not by their practices worthy of such a parentage. Garfield is worthy of Chicago, and the Republican Convention is worthy of Garfield.

A party that has produced more bad men and bad measures than any other that has ever had an existence could not have done otherwise than produce a candidate bearing its own moral deformities. The Republican party had produced the Louisiana lars; it had warmed into life a J. Madison Wells, a Babcock, a Belknap, a Judas Bradley and a host of others equally unclean; it had created an army of thieves. It had debauched

every department of the Government; it had dethroned truth and exalted perjury; it had beaten down Constitutions, trampled upon law, bayoneted Legislatures and reversed the will of the American people; it had made Colfax Vice President, Robeson Secretary of the Navy, Laundauel Williams Attorney General, and a hundred or more equally execrable villain Federal officials, and was, therefore, ready to nominate Garfield. Colfax, though by no means alone in the infamy of his record, had been, by a combination of felonies, lifted somewhat higher than his associates in crime, and the Chicago Convention, in the frenzy of its madness, concluded to set up Garfield as a historical companion of Colfax. It is, therefore, eminently proper to draw a parallel between these two notorious Republicans. This has been done, and well done, by the New York Sun—so well done that we reproduce the exhibit in another column. The charges against Garfield can not be brushed aside and silenced; they must be met and shown to be groundless. The New York Herald, in commenting upon them, says:

If the Sun's charges are proved General Garfield is not fit to be President. They are so utterly damaging, if true, that we reproduce the Sun's statement in another part of this paper. The parallel which the Sun draws between the case of Mr. Colfax and that of Mr. Garfield is forcible and striking, and tends to show that the ruined Colfax is an injured man if Garfield is innocent. They had the same amount of Credit Mobilier stock assigned them; they alike denied that they had received any; the denials of both were rebutted by strong evidence; but one of them has been seventeen years in disgrace and the other is nominated for the Presidency. If the overwhelming ruin of Colfax is just it behoves the friends of General Garfield to show how their cases differ. We are willing to judge of Mr. Garfield's defense with the same candor and impartiality as if the accusation were new, and as if we had never pronounced a strong opinion against him. But the fact that the charge is old does not absolve him from the necessity of refuting it.

The grounds of defense thus far offered by his supporters are as damaging as the original accusation. They try to belittle it by saying that it is raked up from the past. Do they really think that if General Garfield was corrupt eighteen years ago that is no reason why he should not be elected President now? What is of real consequence is not whether the charges are old, but whether they are true. If true they are as fatal a bar to his election as if the offense had been committed yesterday. Would Colfax be a fit candidate because so much time has elapsed since his exposure?

The Herald, which professes to be the friend of Garfield, points out the fact that any reference to the feeling of friendship manifested by his immediate constituents will not answer the demand until it is known whether they "acquitted or condemned" his crime. Certain it is that he lost immensely in his District—about 6,500 votes. The fact that he took but \$329, which his indiscreet friends regard as too contemptible to make a noise about, does not meet the requirement. He took it as a bribe, and the smaller the bribe the more contemptible the bribe taker. The people must understand this case fully. It is vital. The Republican party has put forth a bribe-taker as a candidate for President. It is an insult to the American people. The Cincinnati Gazette admits Garfield's degradation in saying:

Oakes Ames allotted \$1,000 of Credit Mobilier stock to James A. Garfield. In point of fact Garfield never subscribed for it; never paid for it; never received it; but there was a dividend upon the stock so held by Ames amounting to \$29, which Ames said he paid to Garfield, while we suppose he did, and that was all he received, and all that any one pretended he had received. Garfield denied that he had subscribed for the stock, and technically he was correct; but it would have been better had he told the whole story if it was true that Ames had allotted to and held for him \$1,000 of the stock.

It would be difficult for the Gazette to place Garfield in a more humiliating position before the country, and still the Gazette remarks that "the Democrats are welcome to all the capital they can make out of their effort to explode this burnt powder a second time." The powder, unfortunately for Garfield, has not been burnt—but the fire is getting terribly close to it. His friends are sadly indiscreet, and as the New York Herald remarks, "will damage him irretrievably if he leaves his case in their hands much longer. They have inflicted so much injury already that it will require all his skill to throw their blunders into the shade."

STRAIGHT'S DEFEAT—PORTER.

Colonel Straight was the Sentinel's candidate for the Radical nomination, and to-day we acknowledge the defeat of our champion—the gallant Colonel. We have, during the canvass, taken occasion to criticize the Colonel's political course, but at the same time we have admired the grit and pluck manifested by him in striving for the nomination. He is a gentleman of a big heart, with many noble qualities and generous impulses, and if we mistake not, the Republican party has slaughtered the strongest champion among the various candidates ambitious to be the nominee. Colonel Straight made an excellent and creditable canvass for the nomination.

We warned him a few days since of the unscrupulous ring forces which were at work against him here in the city. As rapidly as the delegates arrived, the flood-gates of abuse and vituperation were opened against Colonel Straight by these very ring forces, and we doubt very much whether his worst political enemies upon the Democratic side could have given currency to so much bitter speech during the entire campaign, should he have been nominated. He was cruelly and disgracefully pursued to the very doors of the Convention, and then inhumanly butchered inside, to the savage delight and wild cheerings of a set of political savages.

The Convention threw away at least 5,000 votes by sacrificing Colonel Straight to the demands of the Indianapolis Radical Ring and substituting Mr. Porter. The Colonel would have made a red hot canvass. As it is we expect a very cool time of it with exceedingly light breezes. Mr. Porter, to be sure, is highly respectable—quite as much of an iceberg, in his way, as Charles Francis Adams. He will arrange a canvass of the kid glove description—very like the one given us by General Ben Harrison in 1876, and it will prove to the Republican party quite as disastrous, if not more so. He is too much of a magnate to aristocratic to secure a very

enthusiastic following among the plain, unpretentious old-fashioned farmers, or even the stalwart agricultural counties, and in such counties as Hendricks, Morgan, Montgomery, Putnam, Bartholomew, Grant and Howard, we have an idea that he will run safely and disastrously behind his ticket. Colonel Straight would have made a much more aggressive canvas against Mr. Lander. As it stands, Mr. Lander will defeat Mr. Porter with more ease than Governor Williams did Ben Harrison.

Mr. Porter can hardly be considered an Indianian. He left the State for Washington three years ago to accept a handsome paying position under Hayes. He knows but little of the interests and tastes of our people. The manners, air and surroundings of Washington City are doubtless more in accordance with his aristocratic feelings and tendencies than the homely, unpretentious habits and customs of our people. The nomination can not be regarded as a strong one. Mr. Lander's majority will be much larger than that which Governor Williams obtained over Harrison. The nomination was simply a triumph over Colonel Straight, and hardly made with any reference to, or hope of defeating Mr. Lander.

WATERFIELD AND CHICAGO TRIBUNE WHITE-WASH.

The Chicago Tribune is making a heroic effort to extricate Mr. Garfield from the Credit Mobilier mire. It publishes extracts from the report of the rascality, and then coolly says:

And that is the whole story told by the Investigating Committee. The whole variance between Ames and Garfield was as to whether Ames paid him \$329 or whether Ames loaned him \$300. In either case Ames declares that Garfield never received any stock or certificates, nor any dividends which the stock

earned from 1867 to 1873.

Now, let us see whether Ames made such a declaration. Here is Ames' memorandum of his account with Garfield:

FROM AMES' DIARY.

Mr. Ames presented the following memorandum of his account with Mr. Garfield:	
J. A. G.	Dr.
1868.— To ten shares stock Credit Mobilier of A. \$1,000.00	Interest 47.00
June 19.— To cash 329.00	Dividend 37.00
1868. By dividend bonds Union Pacific Railroad, 6 percent, less 3 percent \$76.00	Cr.
June 17.— By dividend collected for your account 603.00	Dividend 137.00

Garfield, in his testimony, said:

Mr. Ames never gave or offered to give me any stock or other valuable thing as a gift. I once asked and obtained from him, and afterward repaid to him, a loan of \$300; that amount is the only valuable thing I ever received from or delivered to him.

I never owned, received, or agreed to receive any stock of the Credit Mobilier or of the Union Pacific Railroad, nor any dividends or profits arising from either of them.

Schuyler Colfax told this same lie, and it ruined him. Ames, in the following testimony, denies that Garfield ever paid him back the "loan."

Question.—Has that \$329 ever been paid to you? Answer—I have no recollection of it.

Q.—Have you any belief that it ever has?

A.—No, sir.

Q.—Did you ever loan General Garfield \$300?

A.—Not to my knowledge, except that he calls this a loan.

Q.—You do not call it a loan? A.—I did not at that time. I am willing it should go to suit him.

Q.—What we want to get at is the exact truth. A.—I have told the truth in my statement.

Q.—When you paid him \$329, did he understand that he borrowed that money from you?

A.—I do not suppose so.

This settles the matter. Mr. Garfield was in the same boat with Colfax, and poor Colfax long ago acknowledged that it swamped him.

CLIPPINGS.

We have only one candidate for the Presidency, and that candidate is Thomas A. Hendricks—Hendricks—(Texas item).

A GARFIELD compliment from the Springfield Republican: "He is not of the stainless and irreproachable integrity of Edmunds."

SENATOR KERNAN says that the nomination of Garfield throws Thurman, Jewett and Payne out of the race on the Democratic side.

A FAR SEEKING contemporary observes that Grant, Cameron, Conkling and Logan met at Chicago the morning after the nomination of Garfield, and, after a brief council of war, took a recess until 1884.

The Baltimore Gazette correctly states that Garfield's nomination has conferred an insatiable boon upon the Democracy in rendering anything like lukewarmness or disaffection in the Southern States, where they were said to exist, an impossibility."

The Boston Herald says: "There is no reason why General Arthur should be any more popular in New York State than Governor Cornell, as they are, essentially, politicians of the same stamp, and if his nomination was intended to arouse enthusiasm among those who hold there the balance of power, it was a lamentable instance of misguided judgment."

Garfield's War Record.

December 14, 1861.—Enlisted as Colonel. December 17, 1861.—Made Brigade Commander for gallant services as a politician. January 14, 1862.—Attacked an inferior force under Humphrey Marshall, and routed it without loss to either side.

June, 1862.—Joined to army of observation before Corinth.

July and August, 1862.—Doing hospital duty.

September, 1862.—A member of the Flitton Porter Court Martial.

October and November, 1862.—Running for Congress in Ohio.

January to November, 1863.—Holding a comfortable position on the staff of the Zouave corps.

December 5, 1863.—Resigned.

December 7, 1863.—Entered Congress.

C. M. and C. H.

[Albany Argus.]

These are not the initials of the Republican candidates. They are the initials of what they stand for—Credit Mobilier and Custom House. The career of Garfield in the one and of Arthur in the other, is not what honest men desire to reward with the highest offices in the gift of the people.

The Fraud Issue.

General Garfield was a member of the Electoral Commission. He voted Florida and Louisiana to Hayes when he knew they were for Mr. Tilden. He has several beautiful defenses for doing so. The trouble is that none of these defenses meets the fact that he knew the act was indefensible.

THEY SQUIRM.

The Radical Press Defending the Garfield Credit Mobilier Swindle.

[New York Sun]

That ancient, sedate and respectable daily newspaper, the Advertiser, of Boston, which could not countenance James G. Blaine because of his corruption, professed to be satisfied with the purity of James A. Garfield's character.

And it is the first Republican newspaper, far and away, that has undertaken to defend his Credit Mobilier record. We print every word which the Advertiser has to say on this point:

It is sufficient to say, in answer, that General Garfield solemnly denied connection with that business; that the Committee of Investigation, which brought in a resolution to expel Mr. Osceola Ames and Mr. James Brooks, did not then sit in judgment on Garfield.

Mr. Hawley, of the Credit Mobilier, was one of the most active promoters of the investigation. Both these gentlemen are earnestly and enthusiastically in favor of Garfield as a candidate.

Neither of them would be so bold as to believe that there was the least smell of corruption about his garments; and there is not, and his slanderers know there is not.

Mr. Hawley denied that he had any connection with that business; that he did not receive any stock or dividends from the Credit Mobilier stock assigned them; they all denied it.

But that solemn denial was not considered

a sufficient answer to the charge.

A Republican Committee heard from

the investigating Committee that he had

been a perjurer.

That is the whole story told by the

Advertiser.

That is the whole story told by the

Advertiser.

That is the whole story told by the

Advertiser.

That is the whole story told by the