

Plymouth Democrat.

THURSDAY, AUG. 13, 1868.

JOINT REPRESENTATIVE CONVENTION.

A mass convention of the democrats of St. Joseph and Marshall counties will meet at Lakeville, Saturday, August 15th, to select a candidate for joint representative.

PLAIN TALK WITH PLAIN PEOPLE.

The position of the democratic party on the financial question, if thoroughly understood, cannot fail to command itself to the approbation of the people. A prominent feature of that position is, that every species of property shall pay its due proportion of the taxes levied upon the people. It has ever been the policy of the party now opposed to the democratic party to legislate for the benefit of certain sections of the country, and certain classes of men, thus pursuing a course inimical to the interests of the country as a whole. This kind of legislation has had the effect to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer. A high protective tariff has ever been a favorite policy with them—a policy which fetches from the hard earnings of the consumer, and puts them into the pockets of a few wealthy manufacturers and speculators. The impolicy of class legislation had been so clearly demonstrated before the late war, that its advocates were unable to make a respectable showing before the people, except in certain sections whose prominent citizens expected to be benefited by it.

At the breaking out of the war, the republican party being in the ascendancy in the government of the country, and the leaders of that party being old-time protectionists, an unexpected opportunity occurred which enabled the wealthy few to further enrich themselves at the expense of the poor many. Money being necessary for the prosecution of the war, and the monied resources of the government failing to meet the expenses, bonds of the government were issued at different times during the continuance of the war. In the issuing of these bonds the Shylocks of the republican party saw a chance of replenishing their monied resources at the expense of the people. The law authorizing the issue of these bonds stipulated that they should be free from taxation, and that the interest on them should be paid in coin. The effect of this provision of the law was to convert over two thousand millions of tax-paying capital into non-tax-paying capital. The result was that the bonds were purchased and held by the rich, who had money to invest in anything that promised the greatest return; while poor people were compelled to use their money in connection with their own labor, in order to support themselves and families.

As an illustration of the working of the exemption of bonds from taxation, we will suppose that two wealthy citizens of our town, whom we will name Democrat and Republican, had each \$100,000 invested in various business pursuits, at the time the government bonds were issued. Mr. Republican withdrew his money from business channels, and invested it in bonds, on which he pays no taxes, while Mr. Democrat did not change his investment, but permitted it to remain where it was, subject to taxation for all purposes, just as the property or money of poor men, or men of small means, is taxed. The working of this republican legislation is, that, according to the rate of taxation in this town and township, Mr. Democrat pays, on his \$100,000, for state purposes, \$200.

Mr. Republican pays nothing.

For county purposes, Mr. Democrat pays \$500.

Mr. Republican pays nothing.

For sinking fund purposes, Mr. Democrat pays \$200.

Mr. Republican pays nothing.

For school, special school and corporation school tax, Mr. Democrat pays \$700.

Mr. Republican pays nothing.

For township purposes, Mr. Democrat pays \$100.

Mr. Republican pays nothing.

For road purposes, Mr. Democrat pays \$200.

Mr. Republican pays nothing.

For public buildings, Mr. Democrat pays \$200.

Mr. Republican pays nothing.

For corporation purposes, Mr. Democrat pays \$500.

Mr. Republican pays nothing.

So we see that for the support of our state government,—our deaf and dumb, insane and blind asylums,—the expenses of our county organization,—the support of the poor,—the building of school houses,—the support of schools,—the erection of public buildings,—for opening, repairing, and keeping in a passable condition the public roads and highways,—for the expense of keeping up a town corporation,—the expense of a fire department for his own protection as well as that of his neighbor;—we say for all these expenses, which are adjudged by the law-making power, and by the consent of the people, to be right and just, Mr. Republican bondholders pay not one cent of taxes; while Mr. Democrat, or non-bondholder, possessing the same amount of wealth, pays \$2,500. And it is for the perpetuation of this public and private wrong,—this detestable system of class legislation, whereby an aristocratic few can accumulate millions of treasure at the expense of the energies and business resources of the nu-

GRANT AND COLFAX VS. JEWS AND FOREIGNERS.

ART. II. Which is the party of ratonal liberty and progress?

Within a few years past the question of secession has been discussed by various journalists, but with a meanness common to subjects with which the masses concur. The south, it is true, maintained the right to secede. The north denied them that right, and the result is well known to every one. Neither has it been forgotten how the republicans in the north called democrats rebels, secessionists, and many other epithets. The democrats, however, were not thus stigmatized for their doctrine, because they never advocated that the south had a right to secede, but so far as the unity of the states was concerned, they concurred with the republican party, that the union must be maintained, one and indivisible; that the doctrine of secession was a heresy that could not receive their sanction in any sense whatever. But now the subject has received other advocates, as we find republicans advocating the heresy and maintaining that the states in rebellion were "out of the union territorially and politically." Thus Mr. M. frankly advocates a doctrine which had, as the democrats thought, been settled by the war. The south admitted secession a failure; he declares it a success, and for that success congress has the right to impose upon the southern people any act whatsoever as will mostly conduce to their reconstruction into the union. Now if those states were out of the union at the close of the war they were out at the beginning. Their ordinances of secession were not null and void as Lincoln in his inaugural address declared, but valid to all purposes and intents. Then it follows also that the constitution or compact between those states was not permanent but temporary, not unconditional in its requirements but conditional. That it was void from the beginning: He who admits the right of a state to secede, must admit that the constitution never had any binding force whatever. He must also admit that a compact which can be dissolved at the option of one of the parties without the consent of the others is null and void and that the constitution as a compact was null and void because it could be so dissolved and was dissolved and became powerless by the ordinances of secession. He must also admit that a void contract cannot be enforced against the party violating. Then the south in the exercise of their rights did not make themselves amenable to any offense because the contract to which they were a party could be dissolved at their pleasure, and if they had a right to secede, they committed no crime in the exercise of their right. Courts of justice will not enforce a contract which they know to be void, then it was wrong to attempt the enforcement of the constitution upon the southern people. It was in violation of justice to wage war against them for the purpose of coercing them to submit to it wrong. The position, then taken by M. makes the war a heinous crime for which the republicans are guilty. It shows that they waged the war for purposes of subjugation. It was impossible to wage it for the purpose of preventing secession, as they acknowledge that right. But if those states were out of the union what right have you, Mr. M., to enforce them to submit to a thing which you know to be wrong? If they had a right to secede had they not a right to remain out of the union? In what manner have you changed the compact so as to make them amenable? How can you make these states territorial property of the United States? Do you think it right to deprive these citizens of all their personal and real property? Certainly you would deprive them of everything, not because you think you have a right to do so, but that "rational republicanism" in its aristocratic glory might share the name conqueror, in which you pride yourself so much. You have expended millions of money and slain thousands of men, for what? You waged war four long years to acknowledge the right of secession, and now that you acknowledge it you have no motive for your military despotism but selfishness. You exercise nothing in legislating for the southern people than animal revenge. The intellectual man has not yet pierced through animal selfishness that he might frame laws for those people based upon intelligence and justice. You have never assigned any reason for the reconstruction act than revenge. You cherish an antipathy against those people, and that antipathy you endeavor to allay by keeping a spirit of revenge upon those states in rebellion. Is revenge a proper expedient to resort to in order to correct a wrong? Is tyrannical legislation an expedient to ameliorate hatred and create friendship and unity? Mr. Hoffman said that the democratic party was the father of the national debt, that they brought on the war, and consequently incurred the debt. This cannot be true according to Mr. M. for several reasons, for he says that the war was a legitimate event, caused by the denial of the Dred Scott decision, also if the states had a right to secede the war was not necessary, consequently in either case the republican party must bear the burden. But this doctrine of secession we earnestly deny, and do not believe that any shadow of evidence can be adduced to prove the right. The true maxim of interpretation of every act, and of every treaty is to be made according to certain rules proper to

determine the sense of them, such as the parties concerned must have naturally understood, when the act was prepared and accepted. Then that we may know whether the constitution was regarded as a perpetual compact between the states it is essential that we learn the design of the parties concerned. To this end we must refer our readers to the several state conventions called to ratify the constitution, also to the discussions in the federal convention. When we refer to those discussions we are no longer left in doubt as to the true purpose each colony had when it became a member of the compact. The citizens of three of these colonies discussed, before ratifying the constitution, the propriety of reserving the right to withdraw from the union at pleasure, but no such right was conceded; and from the necessity of the case could not be admitted. Alexander Hamilton, on the part of New York, in a letter to James Madison, suggested the propriety of New York ratifying the constitution with "the reservation of a right to secede," if certain amendments to the constitution, proposed by New York, were not adopted within a given period. Mr. Madison, the father of the constitution, replied that the constitution required an "adoption in toto and forever." "It has," he adds, "been so adopted by other states." Thus we see that no power of the nature argued by M. was conceded to any of the states. We also learn that the constitution was made a perpetual compact between those and not temporary as republicans claim, that it was unconditional and not conditional, and that the only manner in which it could be recinded was by all the states acting jointly. Then secession was wrong, no state having that right, then did Lincoln speak truly when he denounced the ordinance of secession as null and void. He never could concede to them the right to withdraw from the union at their own pleasure. Neither could the democrats. When the south learned that the north would not acknowledge their claim to secede they made war and determined to go out of the union by force. In this the north did not sit quiet and see them go out of the union by force, but concluded that they could not get out of the union in that manner unless they (the north) proved themselves incompetent to coerce them. The war, then, was a struggle on the one side to go out of the union, on the other to prevent them from going out of the union. The party claiming that they had a right to dissolve the compact was forced to admit that it still was supreme, and that it failed to create the severance. Had the south been victorious then would the compact have been rescinded by force, but so long as they were obliged to submit to the north so long did the compact remain good. The war, it is true, prevented the execution of its requirements in those states, but that could not prevent an amendment of its principles. Then, war did not take those states out of the union, and to-day they are just as much in the union as Indiana, and are entitled to the same rights and privileges. Mr. M. would say that this doctrine would have maintained slavery in the states, but the war itself proved the destructive element—it could not exist with the war, and thus perished when the war perished. It follows, then, that inasmuch as those states never were out of the union that congress has no right to impose any act upon them which it cannot impose upon us. The constitution requires that all laws shall be uniform and effect all people alike; but congress no longer recognizes uniformity, but contents itself with sectional legislation. We do contend that the reconstruction acts are unconstitutional, and that the supreme court will so decide whenever the opportunity affords it to do so. Mr. M. says that history has been tortured too much. Now I dare Mr. M. to point out one single misrepresentation made by me. I hold myself in readiness to point to the pages of history referred to and there prove every historical fact as referred to in my articles. He says don't you know that those persons admitted to Roman citizenship were not Roman citizens? He speaks this in a style to make us believe that he knows all about it; that Gibbons is but a poor scribe in comparison to his loquacious mind. But suppose they were nothing but barbarians, such as knew nothing about government but roved the winds in hordes, were they more competent to exercise the right of citizenship than our southern people? Were they more wise or more civilized? It certainly appears that the voice of reason would be in favor of the south. Do you not think so Mr. M.? Again he (M.) asks: "Do you think no one but yourself has ever read history?" O no, Mr. M., democrats are all readers of history, they study facts, and in reading history they learn to know how to arrive at true generalizations. In this they are unlike the republicans, who listen to such as you and Hoffman, who love perversions. Your talk will be quoted by them as history, and this is about the extent of the historical knowledge of your party. I could, if necessary, cite you ten democrats to one republican in this town who are profound students of general history, both ancient and modern. I think when you make a proper survey of historical readers in this

town that you will coincide with me. Do you not think so? Please accept my compliments. Mr. M., and excuse me for the omission of this article in last week's paper.

VERO.

CHICAGO CORRESPONDENCE.

CHICAGO, Aug. 10, '68.

The wool exposition last week was a decided success in all its departments, to a greater extent than was anticipated even by the most sanguine for this the first exhibition under the auspices of the northwestern woolen manufacturer's association. The next will no doubt be far more complete in all respects, especially in the particulars of fine goods and machinery, in which the exhibition was rather weak. The coarse cloths, carpets, blankets, shawls, damasks, and articles of under wear were admirably represented. Altogether there were over twelve hundred entries on the exhibition lists.

Another of the prominent features of the present season, which commenced last week, and still continues, is the American scientific congress, a convocation of savans gathered together to discuss a fine assortment of subjects which possess not the slightest interest for anybody but themselves. They utterly taboo all the short words and the value of a paper or communication is governed by the impracticability of any body understanding it with a dictionary at the elbow for constant reference. Most of what they say is equally intelligible when read backwards as when it is read forwards.

Mr. Rev. Bishop Duggan returned yesterday from his trip to Europe, and was received with the highest honors in the power of the faithful to offer. High mass was said in St. Mary's church, where he preached a short sermon, and in the afternoon a great procession, composed of every Catholic society and organization in the city, with banners, badges and bands of music, all in gorgeous array, turned out, marched through the principal streets and past the Bishop's residence, on Michigan avenue where he addressed them in very paternal terms.

One of the new charitable institutions of our city, just opened, is the Jewish hospital. It has been built, as its name indicates, by the Israelites of Chicago, and is intended mainly for the relief of the suffering and needy of their own brethren; though it is understood that Christians in want of hospitalities will not be excluded if there is room for them. The institution will accommodate sixty patients. The land upon which it has been erected, was purchased a couple of years since for \$8,000, and is now worth \$25,000. The building cost \$30,000 and at its opening is entirely out of debt.

Symons, the pedestrian, was taken sick the other day while attempting his walk of fifty miles in eleven hours, and failed. He will make an effort again in a few days, and has no doubt of his success.

Cooley and Bushaw, the two most celebrated horses in the west, were to trot tomorrow over the Dexter Park course, but Cooley has been disabled by a swollen leg and his owner has had to pay forfeit.

Another "mysterious disappearance" occurred the other evening. A Frenchman who came here with a considerable sum of money in gold, in his pockets. Of course the papers suggest murder and robbery, but the man was married, and as a general rule there is no sure thing that a man who has a wife may not leave her without a moment's notice.

For several days past we have had decidedly cool weather, and to day, while rainy and rainy, is more like November than August.

Speaking of approaching winter, the season of overcoats and stoves, one of the most admirable inventions for comfort lately brought into the market is the "Solar-type" wood stove, most agreeable, economical and in all respects perfect, of wood burners. It quite overcomes the great objections hitherto existant against this kind of stoves, the impossibility of maintaining uniform heat, the frequent need of replenishing the fire and the extravagant consumption of fuel. This stove consumes but one-third as much wood as any other of the same size, radiates an even heat, consumes all the wood gases, and will keep fire, without replenishing, as much as twenty-four hours. Another great improvement in stove manufacture is the "Olive Branch" cooking stove, which burns either wood or coal equally well, is simple, strong and durable; perfect in its uses for all the operations of cooking, and remarkably economical in its consumption of fuel. For these magnificient stoves Messrs. Austin & Boal, of Nos. 221 & 223 South Water, Chicago, are the western agents. This firm took the first prize at the Illinois state fair for the best assortment of stoves exhibited, and those which I have just noticed are the best of their stock.

The body of a woman was found in the park here the other day and was generally supposed to be that of one of the victims of the Sea Bird disaster. It proved however to be the body of a poor woman, named Fanny Woodruff, a victim of her own beauty, who, after an adventurous life in which three husbands were minor incidents, sought oblivion in suicide. She drowned herself last winter, and her body was not found until last week.

Mark Smith's season of legitimate comedy at McVicker's is drawing a constant succession of crowded houses. C.

The correspondent of the Republican writing on the subject of the Jews, foreigners, etc., subscribing himself "M." is growing too disgustingly silly to merit further attention. "There is no fool like an old fool," "my boy."

SHERIFF'S SALE.

By virtue of a commission and order of sale issued by the clerk of the Marshall Circuit court, I will offer for sale to the highest bidder at public auction, at the court house door in Plymouth, Marshall county, Indiana, on

Saturday, August 23, 1868, between the hours of 10 o'clock a. m. and 4 o'clock p. m. of said day, the rents and profits for a term not exceeding seven years of the following described real estate situated in Marshall county, Indiana (to wit):

the northeast quarter of section ten (10) township thirty-four (34) north of range one (1), containing 40 acres, bounded on the west by the rail road to the section line, thence north by the rail road to the section line, thence east by the section line, thence south by the section line to the half mile stake, thence north with the dividing line of said section to the rail road, thence north with the town plot to the place of beginning, containing ten acres more or less in Marshall county, Indiana.

Also the undivided half of that part of land comprising the northeast quarter of section ten (10) township number thirty-four (34) north of range number four (4), containing forty acres more or less, situated in Marshall county, Indiana, on

Saturday, August 23, 1868, between the hours of 10 o'clock a. m. and 4 o'clock p. m. of said day, the rents and profits for a term not exceeding seven years of the following described real estate situated in Marshall county, Indiana (to wit):

the north half of the west half of the northeast quarter of section number nineteen (19) in township number thirty-two (32), north of range number four (4), containing forty acres more or less, situated in Marshall county, Indiana.

And in case the rents and profits fail to sell for a sum sufficient to pay the amount demanded by said commissioners and other expenses of sale, at the same time and place, and in like manner, I will offer for sale to the highest bidder at public auction, for the sum simple, or the entire right, title, interest and estate of Francis M. Tyner and Catherine L. Tyner in and to the above described real estate, to pay said demand with interest and costs in favor of Samuel W. Miller and against Francis M. Tyner and Catherine L. Tyner. Said sale to be made without regard to appraisement.

DAVID HOW, Sheriff.

SHERIFF'S SALE.

By virtue of a commission and order of sale issued by the clerk of the Marshall Common Pleas court, I will offer for sale to the highest bidder at public auction, at the court house door in Plymouth, Marshall county, Indiana, on

Saturday, August 23, 1868, between the hours of 10 o'clock a. m. and 4 o'clock p. m. of said day, the rents and profits for a term not exceeding seven years of the following described real estate situated in Marshall county, Indiana (to wit):

the north half of the west half of the northeast quarter of section number nineteen (19) in township number thirty-two (32), north of range number four (4), containing forty acres more or less, situated in Marshall county, Indiana.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned will, at the September term, 1868, of the commissioners' court of Marshall county, Indiana, apply for a license to retail viands, malt and spirituous liquors in less quantities than a quart. The location on which we propose to sell is Lot No. 60, in the northeast quarter of the original plot of the town of Plymouth, Marshall county, Indiana.

49 VANVALKENBURG & SAKES.

APPLICATION FOR LICENSE.

The Chicago Times says:

In consideration of Grant's difficulty in finding words to express himself, and his constitutional objection to anything like exertion, radical newspapers are in the habit of inventing choice little paragraphs and impressive platitudes, and attributing them to their candidate. On the whole, it would be better for Grant if he would openly disavow these questionable offspring. Radical wit, as shown in its public journals, is not keen enough even to do Grant credit.

The late of these newspaper inventions comes from St. Louis where a speech is said to have walked away unhappy because Grant is reported to have said that "The real way democrats are as much opposed to rebellion as they are during the war, and will vote, as they fought to sustain the government and the laws."

While this is true of all democrats, it is absurd to say that Grant ever made such a remark. He is scarcely weak enough to damage his own cause by such an assertion.

If democrats vote as they fought, which they will, whether Grant said so or not, they will vote for the union, for the constitution, for prosperity, and for Seymour. They will vote against radical centralization of power, against the exclusion of any states from the union, against the infamy of reconstruction, against renewed rebellion, and against Grant.

They will Cure You.

Against malaria, fever and ague, and all diseases arising from a torpid state of the liver, there is no medicine so highly recommended as Roback's stomach bitters. For sale by Brown Bros.

As a Preventive.

Against malaria, fever and ague, and all diseases arising from a torpid state of the liver, there is