

## INDIANA STATE SENTINEL.

Entered at the Postoffice at Indianapolis as second-class matter.

## TERMS PER YEAR:

Single copy, \$1.00

Weak democrats to bear in mind and select their own state paper when they come to take subscriptions and make up clubs.

Agents making up clubs send for any information desired. Address INDIANAPOLIS SENTINEL, Indianapolis, Ind.

WEDNESDAY, FEB. 13.

## Woods and the "Red-Eyed Law."

The *News*, which has pronounced WILLIAM WADE DUDLEY "an honest and much-maligned man," is now engaged in the congressional task of defending DUDLEY's judicial protector, WILLIAM A. WOODS. In order to make a plausible showing for Woods the *News* finds it necessary to ignore the fact that he reversed his instructions to the grand jury, when by such action alone DUDLEY's indictment could be prevented, and to make the false assertion that his construction of the law is sustained "with one voice by good lawyers." The *News* has repeatedly testified to the legal ability and the personal integrity of ex-Senator McDONALD and Judge CLAYPOOL. Both of them say very emphatically that Woods did not construe the law correctly in his revised instructions to the grand jury, and the former goes so far as to characterize these instructions as "preposterous." If Judge Woods declared only the "red-eyed law" when he closed the doors against DUDLEY's indictment, Mr. McDONALD, Judge CLAYPOOL, Senator VOORHEES and many other lawyers of far higher rank than he has ever held, or ever will hold, clearly do not know the "red-eyed law" when they see it.

But if it is the "red-eyed law" that Woods declared in his second charge, what was it declared in his first charge? In the latter he told the grand jury emphatically and without any qualification whatsoever, that advising bribery was a crime. He never intimated that it was necessary that such advice should be acted upon in order to make it a crime. He gave the jury plainly to understand that its duty was to indict any one whom it believed to have been guilty of advising bribery, whether it had reason to believe that such advice was acted upon or not. He said that there "was some wisdom in the provision" making the mere advising of bribery a felony, and he concluded his charge with the statement that his interpretation of the law covered every charge that had been made or was likely to be made, as to offenses against it. The second instruction was in direct conflict with the first instruction.

Now if the "red-eyed law" was so plain why did not Judge Woods lay it down in his first charge instead of waiting until DUDLEY's indictment was imminent? Why was the "red-eyed law" withheld from the grand jury through weeks of a laborious investigation, conducted under the instructions first given? Why was the "red-eyed law" not proclaimed until QUAY and BATEMAN had visited Indianapolis and conferred with Gen. HARRISON? Why was not WALTER Q. GRESHAM, Woods' immediate judicial superior, not consulted in the premises? Why did Woods not wait until both sides could be heard upon a motion to quash the indictment, before passing upon this question, instead of making an ex parte decision, and thrusting it between his political and personal friend and a prosecution for bribery?

These questions the *News* will not answer; it will not attempt to answer them, and for the simple reason that they can not be answered without impeaching WILLIAM A. WOODS' judicial integrity, and presenting him in the character of a defender of crime and an ally of criminals.

## A Boom For King Corn.

Baron von HUMBOLDT having asserted very positively that maize could not be made into a palatable food for human beings, was convinced of his error by the Hon. JOSEPH A. WRIGHT of this state when U. S. minister at Berlin by an object lesson which proved as agreeable as instructive to the distinguished traveler and savant. The baron, being entertained by Minister WRIGHT, found himself growing enthusiastic over certain toothsome dishes prepared by Mrs. WRIGHT, which were made out of the very grain he had so stoutly condemned as unfit for human consumption.

The preudge of which Baron von HUMBOLDT was thus relieved is still shared by a great majority of Europeans. Comparatively few of them have become maize-eaters, and the toiling millions on the continent continue to eat their bitter black bread, or spend more than they can afford for wheaten loaves, while the value and palatability of corn remain almost unknown to them.

Our exports of wheat and wheat flour range from 25 to 30 per cent. of our whole crop, while we export, in the form of corn or cornmeal, only 2 or 3 per cent. of our corn crop. The following statistics are given in a recent publication:

The school book trust lobby is getting in some very fine work these days. Quite a number of legislators who came to Indianapolis full of fight against the trust are now as quiet as the grave. Others who were going to "smash the trust" in short order are now advocating its cause with great zeal. Gov. HOVEY's influence is being exerted in behalf of the trust schemes, and the rest of the republican state officials, headed by State Supt. LAFOLLETTE, and aided by divers and sundry county superintendents, professors, school trustees, etc., from various parts of the state, are laboring with might and main to prevent any anti-trust legislation. The subsidized organ of the trust is filling its columns with denunciation of everything and everybody that threatens to interfere with the trust's operations. One or two newspapers that were very fierce against the trust a few weeks ago have been silenced, and desperate attempts have been made to silence THE SENTINEL. Who says there are any flies on the school book lobby?

Next to the question of election reform this school book question is by far the most important matter before the legislature. It has only two sides. The interests of the trust and the interests of the people are in direct conflict. Those who are in favor of the trust are opposed to the people; and vice versa. There is no middle ground.

We advise the people of Indiana to scan

the proceedings of the legislature closely on this question. THE SENTINEL will print the roll calls on the test votes, and they should be filed away for future reference. Those who vote for the trust may safely be set down as venal or incompetent legislators, and their constituents should see to it that they are retired to private life on the first opportunity.

## A Meritorious Measure.

One of the bills now pending in the lower house is worthy of especial attention. We refer to the bill granting to towns of 20,000 inhabitants the right to spend \$15,000 for the establishment of homes for orphan children.

These unfortunates are to be found in every county in the state. To gather them into homes where they will receive good moral training and acquire habits of industry is to make of them good citizens and thus to benefit the state. To allow them to grow up amid the demoralizing influences which characterize our poor-houses is to insure a crop of paupers and criminals to maintain in the future. We are assured that there is in the state one county that for thirty years had not a girl in its poor-house who did not return one or more times, leaving an illegitimate child to take her place. Had these girls been in homes where they would have been cared for and instructed properly, they would doubtless have become respectable women, doing their part of the world's work, a blessing instead of a curse to the community.

Laying aside the humane and philanthropic phase of this question and considering it only from the standpoint of economy, the measure is a wise one. It is cheaper to prevent than to punish crime. Most of the inmates of our prisons and poor-houses are the untutored, neglected children of the past. We trust our legislators will consider this question, both from the humane and economic standpoints, and pass this bill in which so many are deeply interested.

THAT fine old Pennsylvania democrat, RICHARD VAUX—hale, hearty and seventy-three—was talking politics the other day, and in reply to the question whether Mr. RANDALL was to be the future leader of the democratic party, said: "I have a profound regard personally for SAMUEL J. RANDALL, but I don't take much stock in his politics. Mr. RANDALL, unless I mistake the temper of the times, is very much in the minority in his own party. A more thoroughly equipped parliamentarian cannot be found than the member from the Third district, but his doctrines are too close to those of Mr. BLAINE of Maine to challenge my admiration. Mr. RANDALL must first convert his own party to his especial views in favor of a high protective tariff before he can safely set up as a leader of that party which gave up to him.

The Scotch-Irish have played an important part on the stage of modern life, and, as Col. McCLEURE says, their impress upon American institutions has been especially strong. Among the notable American representatives of the stock were ANDREW JACKSON, A. T. STEWART, ROBERT FULTON, HORACE GREELEY and ROBERT BONNER.

Columbia, where the congress will be held, is a pleasant and attractive little city, in central Tennessee. It is easily accessible by railroads, and situated as it is in a section that is largely inhabited by people of Scotch-Irish blood, is a peculiarly appropriate place for such a gathering. Mr. A. C. FLOYD of Columbia, the secretary, writes THE SENTINEL that "all members of the race are invited to attend, and correspondence is solicited with those who desire to be present themselves or will furnish the names of prominent members of the race who would be likely to attend."

## A Bugaboo of the Lobby.

We find the following choice morsel in the sub-organized organ of the trust:

The republicans in the senate Saturday took advantage of the absence of several democratic senators to strike out of the election bill the provision for the destruction of the ballots at the conclusion of the canvass. This is one of the wisest and most salutary provisions in the bill. It closes the election against a certain class of election frauds from which the people have suffered greatly—the post-election tampering with ballots. The New York law—which is admitted to be the most perfect statute in this country so far as relates to the canvass and certification of the vote—contains this provision, and it has operated to the satisfaction of all honest men of every party in that state. When the count has been completed and the tally-sheets filled out, there can be no legitimate objection in preserving the ballots, excepting such as are protested, and the senate bill enjoins preservation of these. The action of the republicans in striking out this clause of the bill is another evidence of the insincerity of their professed zeal for election reform. The democrats ought to restore this provision before sending the bill to engrossment.

THE Washington Post concludes a trenchant and vigorous editorial on the Moore defalcation in these words:

Moore is now a fugitive—disgraced, disgraced but safe from the retribution that he richly deserves. He has gone to the bounds of refuge from which the traitor now returns. The law opposed no barrier to his exit. Justice was not invoked to stay his departing footsteps. The moral sense of the country is shocked. The insults, but not of all the Confederacy, Missouri, but of all the South, thousands of children in Indiana, reading simultaneously from the same reader, and performing the same arithmetical problems on the thousands of blackboards! If variety is the spice of life, juvenile Hoosierdom is likely to go without mental stimulants while that remarkable law remains in force.

There is not school-book lobbyist in this town who will not discourse just as eloquently, "between the sherry and the champagne," about the dangers of uniformity of text-books as the subsidized organ does in the foregoing. And yet this very uniformity now prevails in Indiana, the leading firm in the trust—VAN ANTWERP, BRAGG & Co.—supplying eighty out of the ninety-two counties with most of their text-books. And the bill introduced in the legislature in behalf of the trust, and advocated by the *Journal*, provides for absolute uniformity of text-books throughout the state, the said books to be purchased, of course, of the school-book ring, instead of being printed by contract.

It thus appears that the school-book lobby and its organ do not object to uniformity of text-books so long as the text-books are supplied by the trust. It is only when the school-books are not furnished by the trust that uniformity becomes such a bugaboo.

The School Book Trust.

The school book trust lobby is getting in some very fine work these days. Quite a number of legislators who came to Indianapolis full of fight against the trust are now as quiet as the grave. Others who were going to "smash the trust" in short order are now advocating its cause with great zeal. Gov. HOVEY's influence is being exerted in behalf of the trust schemes, and the rest of the republican state officials, headed by State Supt. LAFOLLETTE, and aided by divers and sundry county superintendents, professors, school trustees, etc., from various parts of the state, are laboring with might and main to prevent any anti-trust legislation. The subsidized organ of the trust is filling its columns with denunciation of everything and everybody that threatens to interfere with the trust's operations. One or two newspapers that were very fierce against the trust a few weeks ago have been silenced, and desperate attempts have been made to silence THE SENTINEL. Who says there are any flies on the school book lobby?

Next to the question of election reform this school book question is by far the most important matter before the legislature. It has only two sides. The interests of the trust and the interests of the people are in direct conflict. Those who are in favor of the trust are opposed to the people; and vice versa. There is no middle ground.

We advise the people of Indiana to scan

the proceedings of the legislature closely on this question. THE SENTINEL will print the roll calls on the test votes, and they should be filed away for future reference. Those who vote for the trust may safely be set down as venal or incompetent legislators, and their constituents should see to it that they are retired to private life on the first opportunity.

## APPLYING the "deadly parallel column"

to Judge WOODS and the Indianapolis News we have the following startling result:

Woods and the "Red-Eyed Law."

One of the bills now pending in the lower house is worthy of especial attention. We refer to the bill granting to towns of 20,000 inhabitants the right to spend \$15,000 for the establishment of homes for orphan children.

These unfortunates are to be found in

every county in the state. To gather them into homes where they will receive good moral training and acquire habits of industry is to make of them good citizens and thus to benefit the state. To allow them to grow up amid the demoralizing influences which characterize our poor-houses is to insure a crop of paupers and criminals to maintain in the future. We are assured that there is in the state one county that for thirty years had not a girl in its poor-house who did not return one or more times, leaving an illegitimate child to take her place. Had these girls been in homes where they would have been cared for and instructed properly, they would doubtless have become respectable women, doing their part of the world's work, a blessing instead of a curse to the community.

Laying aside the humane and philanthropic phase of this question and considering it only from the standpoint of economy, the measure is a wise one. It is cheaper to prevent than to punish crime. Most of the inmates of our prisons and poor-houses are the untutored, neglected children of the past. We trust our legislators will consider this question, both from the humane and economic standpoints, and pass this bill in which so many are deeply interested.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.

As to the election bill, the *Journal* suggests (1) that bystanders should not be allowed nearer than one hundred feet of the polls, instead of fifty, as now provided; (2) that the counting of the ballots should begin several hours before the close of the polls; and (3) that additional safeguards should be provided for the custody of the tally-sheets and the final canvass of the returns. These suggestions, and especially the last, are to be found in the *Journal*.