

The Sentinel.

WEDNESDAY, MAY 16.

The Czar of Russia keeps in and about his winter palace 7,000 servants.

THIRTY-NINE divorces were recently granted in two days at Springfield, Mass.

A MAN in Ireland was recently confined in jail ten weeks for blaspheming the Queen.

The New York Tribune is out in favor of B. S. Cox for Speaker. That will kill him.

A YANKEE editor in a financial article says: "Money is close, but not close enough to reach."

Chicago must have had the moving fever on May 1. Seven thousand families are said to have moved on that day.

Mrs. LANTRY says she thinks American women are too plump. The American women think Mrs. Langtry runs too much bone and too little meat to be beautiful.

It seems impossible to reconstruct Senator Harrison's Presidential boom. The thing started by the Chicago crank seems to have been a boomerang.

A LITTLE black-eyed woman in Chicago says that, if there is anything in the theory of transmigration, she wishes to make her next appearance in the form of a flea, for she knows a fellow that she would like to torture the life out of.

Miss RAMMABEL, a native of India, is said to be the most learned woman in the world. Twenty years of age, she can read, speak and write in twelve languages, besides being up in astronomy, mathematics, history, etc. She is now studying to become a physician.

The extraordinary fertility of the soil of Southern Louisiana is such that the cultivation of corn and cane for 100 years has had little effect upon its productiveness, and it is said that its possibilities are equal, if not superior, to the most productive soils in the world.

UPON the heading, "Something to be Thankful For," a New York paper remarks that while the inhabitants of New York and adjacent suburbs have been clinging to their flannels with an affection worthy of the depth of winter, it is comforting to know that the thermometer in Florida has been toying with the nineties and that the moonquakes are in full bloom. There is no part of the world where there is not something to be thankful for, and here, at all events, we can sleep in peace.

INDIANA—NO. 1.

Much has been written about Indiana, but the subject is not easily exhausted, and in this wonderfully progressive age the frequent reproduction of facts with such additions as developments warrant, find ready readers and command attention. In writing of Indiana of the present, it is not to be presumed that within the scope of an ordinary newspaper article facts and figures can be grouped which will do more than by sum totals outline the vastness of the resources of the Commonwealth and the magnitude of the enterprises which distinguish its people. It may be well to state that until 1801 Indiana was included in Ohio; that it was constituted a Territory in 1800 and admitted into the Union December 11, 1816. The State lies between latitude 37 deg. 40 min. and 41 deg. 40 min. north and longitude 84 deg. 40 min. and 87 deg. 4 min. west, extending 275 miles in length from north to south, having an average breadth of 135 miles. It contains an area of 36,350 square miles, or 23,204,000 acres. It is to be interesting to know the growth of Indiana in population from the year 1800 to 1880. The census returns are as follows:

1800—Territory... 5,641,184... 98,416

1810—Territory... 24,320,969... 1,339,428

1820—Territory... 147,178,270... 1,631,653

1830—Territory... 189,000,000... 1,927,501

1840... 683,896

Assuming the growth in population since 1840 has been equal to the per cent. of increase from 1870 to 1880, the population of Indiana to-day is about 2,100,000.

Indiana is pre-eminently an agricultural State. Agriculture is her commanding industry, her great source of wealth. The State lies, for the most part, within the fertile region designated as the "region of cereals" and in 1880 there were within the State 194,013 farms, of which 64,030 were of 50 and under 100 acres, 72,03 were of 100 and under 500 acres, 1,320 were of 500 and under 1,000 acres, and 275 were of 1,000 acres and over. To these farms therefore we owe the agricultural wealth of the State, and their products in the aggregate at once become a matter of vast importance. Figures showing the steady increase of agricultural products for a number of years would be interesting, but our readers must be content with facts near the present, showing what the farmers of Indiana are doing now to increase the wealth and prosperity of the State. Taking the estimates for the years 1830, '81 and '82, we have the following totals of the cereals named:

	Estimated Value
Wheat	\$1,646,650
Millet	18,815
Corn	303,861,885
Oats	49,577,563
Eyes	1,009,732
Bailey	2,416,232
Totals	\$29,146,265

Here we have a yearly average of about \$10,000,000 of money added to the wealth of the State from five of the principal crops produced from an annual average of 7,027,901 acres, less than one-third of the average area of the State. But in estimating the agricultural products of the State, we are required to include the product of meadows, orchards and the dairy, live stock, tobacco, potatoes, etc. The estimate for 1882 is as follows:

Number	Estimated Value
Bushels	\$34,634,650
Milk	18,815
Cattle	1,110,623
Hogs	3,721,646
Sheep	1,092,701
Head	5,467,366
Totals	\$87,504,812

According to official estimates there were produced in the State of Indiana during the year 1882, 13,606,403 pounds of tobacco, worth say five cents per pound or \$630,324. There was also produced in the year 1882, 7,364,838 bushels of potatoes, worth, say fifty cent per bushel, or \$362,415. During the same year it is safe to estimate

the value of the buckwheat and flaxseed produced at \$600,000, the orchard product at \$3,000,000, and the garden products at \$500,000. During the year 1880 there were made 22,905,385 pounds of butter, 233,807 pounds of cheese, 1,332,632 pounds of maple sugar, 227,380 gallons of maple molasses, 365,278 pounds of honey. The wool clipped during the year was 5,629,023 pounds, and assuming the State was as productive of these articles in 1882 as in 1880, their value may be set down at \$4,500,000, and including poultry and eggs at \$5,000,000. As a result we have as the product of the farms of Indiana for the year 1882, the sum total of \$128,112,341. It is this we add the value of slaughtered animals, say \$40,000,000, we have as the result of one year's farming operations \$168,112,341.

In the production of wheat, Indiana, considering area, is at the head of the list of wheat producing States, and in all matters pertaining to farming she occupies a position in the front rank; and that, too, at a time when not more than one-half the area available for farming is under cultivation, and when thousands of those who till the soil are oblivious of that knowledge which compels the earth to yield its most bountiful contributions to the wealth of the State. But a new era is dawning in agriculture. Farmers are beginning to properly estimate the dignity of their profession. Science offers its aid and ignorance is yielding to its beneficent proposals. The future promises triumphs in agricultural pursuits in Indiana which in their grandeur will dwarf past and even present achievements to insignificant proportions. We are to have in the near future students of soils and seeds and manures. Where one blade of grass is now grown a dozen are to spring forth to tell of the triumphs of the educated farmer. Science and common sense are to go hand in hand. Agricultural Fairs will grow in importance and the farmer, equipped with such knowledge as nature approves, applauds and rewards, will stand up and stand forth as the representative man of the times. The bearded wheat and the tasseled corn will own his sway. Improved herds will herald his triumphs and Indiana will proclaim him her benefactor.

DEMOCRATS AND THE NEXT CONGRESS.

The Democratic party stands pledged to advocate the lowest taxation practicable, consistent with the revenue wants of the Government. In every campaign the shibboleth motto of the Democratic party has been "low taxes." The Republican battle cry has been "high taxes." In the coming campaign of 1884 there is not the slightest probability that the policy of the Democratic party will be changed. The cry will be low taxes—economy—retrenchment. It will be supreme folly for any man, no matter how brilliant or profound he may be, to anticipate the position of leader in the Democratic party if, in the matter of taxation, he does not proclaim himself unequivocally hostile to high taxation. Upon this one proposition the Democratic party plants itself, and by an unwavering adherence to it, will win the fight. The people are tired, disgusted and indignant. They have been taxed and swindled to build up colossal fortunes for individual and corporate monopolies, and, while thus outraged and burdened, they have been told it was for the good of the country and for the benefit of the Government. Early in December, seven months hence, the Forty-eighth Congress will assemble. The House of Representatives will be largely Democratic. The fact is proof that the country is opposed to the Republican policy of high taxation, opposed to prodigacy made possible by a system of taxation by which a vast surplus revenue has been collected and squandered. This surplus has been extorted from the people by a policy flagrantly at war with their interests. It is to be supposed for an instant that, when the Forty-eighth Congress assembles, the Democratic members will commit as their first act, political suicide, by electing as speaker, a man known to be the champion of high protective taxation?

Such a proceeding would be something more than folly; it would be a crime. It would be throwing away the victory achieved in 1882 upon a platform demanding a reduction of taxation. It would be the most shameful stultification that ever disgraced any party. It would be the basest treason to every profession of the Democratic party and of every pledge the party made to the tax-burdened and tax-cursed people. To assume that the Democratic majority in the Forty-eighth Congress will be guilty of such treachery is too preposterous to warrant contradiction. The St. Louis Republican, in discussing upon the "coming trial of Democracy," remarks "that in the action of the next House of Representatives the country will look for the Democratic National platform of 1884, and in the action of the Senate it will look for the opposite platform." With regard to the "practical questions of the day" the Republican thinks they are "few and simple"—so few that they may be disposed of in a single bill." "There is," says the Republican, "no dispute about the currency; no dispute about Indians, pensions or foreign policy; happily, there is not a single Constitutional issue before the country." The question to be settled relates to "the large excess of revenue annually pouring into the Treasury. This surplus for the current fiscal year is estimated at \$120,000,000, and for the next fiscal year is \$110,000,000 and the actual surplus will exceed the estimate in both cases—and that, too, after paying off \$50,000 for interest and \$102,000 in pensions each year." This surplus revenue, says the Republican, "must be reduced; and to reduce it taxes must be taken off the people." How? Right here is where the two parties differ, and the Republican says:

The Democrats believe in large reductions of the revenue, and insist that these reductions should be made so as to bring the largest measure of relief to the whole people. The Republicans, on the other hand, will not make any reductions they can possibly avoid, and in making them will attempt to give the relief to favored classes. In the new tariff and revenue bill passed by the late Congress, the Republicans took off about \$45,000,000 taxes—from whom? Banks, bank depositors, matchmakers, the manufacturers of patent medicines and cosmetics, and tobacco consumers. They do not think any further reductions ought to be made in the next Congress, and they will oppose them if proposed, but if the reductions must be made, they will endeavor to

limit them to the consumers of spirits, beer and tobacco, leaving the masses of the people still subject to the oppressive taxes of a war tariff on the materials of their industry and the necessities of life.

The Democrats in the Forty-eighth Congress particularly of Paris, is such to create uneasiness. The Government is now engaged in devising means whereby work and wages may be provided for the laboring classes. This is called succumbing to communism, "or at least to that phase of it which seeks to put the whole machinery of business into the hands of the State for the benefit of the people at large." The indications are that France anticipates trouble from her laboring population in the large cities, and hence the necessity of some of his positions and propositions.

The condition of the working classes of France particularly of Paris, is such to create uneasiness. The Government is now engaged in devising means whereby work and wages may be provided for the laboring classes. This is called succumbing to communism, "or at least to that phase of it which seeks to put the whole machinery of business into the hands of the State for the benefit of the people at large." The indications are that France anticipates trouble from her laboring population in the large cities, and hence the necessity of some of his positions and propositions.

"A draft Convention has been drawn up between the State and the Credit Foncier for the loan necessary to the execution of these enterprises. The Credit Foncier agrees to lend 20,000,000 of francs to those who wish to build for themselves houses, worth say from 3,000 to 9,000 francs. The loan is to extend to three-fourths of the value of the property, to be guaranteed by the State and redeemed by the borrower at the expiration of twenty years. The Credit Foncier also agrees to lend any amount for seventy-five years to the extent of 65 per cent. for the building of houses, one-half of the habitable surface of which must be constructed for lodgings to rent for 150 to 300 francs a year, which houses are to be free from all taxes for twenty years. A Committee of the Paris Municipal Council has also reported in favor of guaranteeing 50,000,000 for a like purpose." France has vast wealth, and the French people are among the most frugal in the world. Hence, it may be assumed that when French laborers are restless the means of living have been reduced to an extent that borders upon starvation. France has learned to her cost that her laboring people will not starve in sight of boundless luxury. When the policy of a Government is to legislate for the rich and in opposition to the laboring masses, trouble will come eventually, and as inevitably as that flint and steel when brought in violent contact will produce fire. Standing armies, which eat up the substance of the people, may postpone the shock for a while only to make the disaster more terrible when it does come. It will not do for a Government to create monopolies and tax the people to support them, and a Government which puts in operation such a policy will be compelled sooner or later to

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

Howgate was a jolly good fellow, stole money constantly, expended it lavishly, and invested some of it in real estate in Washington City. Howgate was, all things considered, a mean thief than Dorsey or any other Star Route thief. He had little, if any, circumspection in his methods. Red tape was discarded. He just took the money he wanted, and when he was discovered, he had the audacity to say, "I'm not a thief."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

Howgate was a jolly good fellow, stole money constantly, expended it lavishly, and invested some of it in real estate in Washington City. Howgate was, all things considered, a mean thief than Dorsey or any other Star Route thief. He had little, if any, circumspection in his methods. Red tape was discarded. He just took the money he wanted, and when he was discovered, he had the audacity to say, "I'm not a thief."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

Howgate was a jolly good fellow, stole money constantly, expended it lavishly, and invested some of it in real estate in Washington City. Howgate was, all things considered, a mean thief than Dorsey or any other Star Route thief. He had little, if any, circumspection in his methods. Red tape was discarded. He just took the money he wanted, and when he was discovered, he had the audacity to say, "I'm not a thief."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

Howgate was a jolly good fellow, stole money constantly, expended it lavishly, and invested some of it in real estate in Washington City. Howgate was, all things considered, a mean thief than Dorsey or any other Star Route thief. He had little, if any, circumspection in his methods. Red tape was discarded. He just took the money he wanted, and when he was discovered, he had the audacity to say, "I'm not a thief."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

Howgate was a jolly good fellow, stole money constantly, expended it lavishly, and invested some of it in real estate in Washington City. Howgate was, all things considered, a mean thief than Dorsey or any other Star Route thief. He had little, if any, circumspection in his methods. Red tape was discarded. He just took the money he wanted, and when he was discovered, he had the audacity to say, "I'm not a thief."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

Howgate was a jolly good fellow, stole money constantly, expended it lavishly, and invested some of it in real estate in Washington City. Howgate was, all things considered, a mean thief than Dorsey or any other Star Route thief. He had little, if any, circumspection in his methods. Red tape was discarded. He just took the money he wanted, and when he was discovered, he had the audacity to say, "I'm not a thief."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

Howgate was a jolly good fellow, stole money constantly, expended it lavishly, and invested some of it in real estate in Washington City. Howgate was, all things considered, a mean thief than Dorsey or any other Star Route thief. He had little, if any, circumspection in his methods. Red tape was discarded. He just took the money he wanted, and when he was discovered, he had the audacity to say, "I'm not a thief."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

Howgate was a jolly good fellow, stole money constantly, expended it lavishly, and invested some of it in real estate in Washington City. Howgate was, all things considered, a mean thief than Dorsey or any other Star Route thief. He had little, if any, circumspection in his methods. Red tape was discarded. He just took the money he wanted, and when he was discovered, he had the audacity to say, "I'm not a thief."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

Howgate was a jolly good fellow, stole money constantly, expended it lavishly, and invested some of it in real estate in Washington City. Howgate was, all things considered, a mean thief than Dorsey or any other Star Route thief. He had little, if any, circumspection in his methods. Red tape was discarded. He just took the money he wanted, and when he was discovered, he had the audacity to say, "I'm not a thief."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

hardening is demonstrated by the heartlessness of some of his positions and propositions.

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P. Fishback would put it, a "high official."

SC. H. HOWGATE was at one time a distinguished Republican boss; in fact, as Mr. W. P.