

THE DEMOCRAT.

EDITED AND PUBLISHED BY
D. E. VAN VALKENBURGH.

Thursday, May 20, 1869.

THE AMENDMENT

We have no language to express our contempt for the dishonorable, villainous conduct of the radical members of the legislature, with reference to the 15th amendment: Every member who sanctioned the fraud (a full account of which we publish in another column) has written or registered himself a scoundrel or a fool.

Their action was as "unlawful as it was unjust," but the instigator of it, O. P. Morton, has pledged himself to see that the U. S. Senate accepts it, and therefore, to all intents and purposes, the voice of Indiana has been given in favor of negro suffrage.

The will of the people, the law, justice, the constitution of the United States, and of the several states, are all made subservient to the "necessities of the radical party. We have no government, and no rights are sacred.

How long the people will submit to this tyranny is for the future to determine. We hope the time will speedily come when the perpetrators of these outrages on the people will be brought to justice; if it does not, then we are unfit for free government, and, with all our boasting, are the most degenerate, cowardly and imbecile race on the civilized globe.

We publish this week a communication from Mr. Reeve, and from a member of the old board of trustees. We have no comment to make on either. Our columns are open to all communications, of a proper character, which we think will prove of interest to our readers. We wish to merely remark that we think Mr. Reeve can hardly accuse us of unfairly stating his position last week in our quotations, as his whole article exactly as he wrote it, immediately preceded our comments. We think the matter had already consumed more space than its importance demands, but as we have opened the door we cannot consistently refuse any party interested a fair hearing.

TO THE PEOPLE OF MARSHALL COUNTY.

You are doubtless all familiar with the course pursued by the democratic members of the legislature at the regular session of this year, to defeat the ratification of the proposed negro amendment; of their unanimous re-election; the convening of the extra session; the pledge made by republican members that the consideration of said amendment should be postponed and made the special order for May 11, at 2 o'clock, and a further pledge that it should be again postponed until May 14, at 2:30 o'clock. Upon these pledges the democratic members qualified and took their seats. A large amount of business was transacted, and everything went on in order, until the forenoon of May 11, when a portion of the republican members made an unsuccessful attempt to take up the amendment. From the character of the speeches made in favor of it at that time it was evident that further legislation was at an end, and the democratic members to the number of 15 handed in their resignations at noon; two members were sick and one absent, leaving but thirty-two senators—two less than a quorum. When the senate convened at 2 o'clock the doors were ordered to be closed. The joint resolution ratifying the amendment was then taken up and voted upon—27 to 1, and the resigning members entered as "present and not voting." Two of them were not even in the senate chamber at the time—Mr. Deubo and Smith. The amendment was declared ratified on the part of the senate, and so the farce ended.

When the house assembled, after several ineffectual motions to proceed to the consideration of the specific appropriation bill and the Morgan raid bill, it became apparent that nothing further could be done, and the resignations of all the democratic members but two were placed in the hands of the governor, leaving but 58 members in the house—9 less than a quorum. The house then adjourned until Friday morning, when a further adjournment was made to 2 o'clock. At 2:30 p.m. the amendment was taken up and passed—54 to 0. The two democratic members refusing to vote. And so the farce ended in the house. Of course it was not ratified, and the people of Indiana will decide the question for themselves in 1870; and it was that they might have the opportunity of doing so that we again resented. Hoping that I have represented the wishes of every democrat in the county, and also the thinking, candid portion of those who differ with me in political sentiment on other subjects, and thanking my democratic friends for twice electing me to represent them in the legislature, I am, respectfully, &c.,

D. MCDONALD.

PLYMOUTH, May 18, 1869.

EDITOR OF DEMOCRAT:

In your comments on my article of last week, you profess to quote all you said about me, and proceed to comment thereon. Will you correct an error in that statement by publishing this?

In your article to which my letter replied, in addition to your quotation of last week, you made the following remarks: After giving the names of the persons nominated on the citizens' ticket, including my own, you say "making the ticket consist, as the radicals claimed, of five democrats ('so-called') and three radicals."

In giving the causes of the defeat of the democratic ticket, you use the following language as one reason:

"We attribute the result * * * to the countenance and assistance given the radical ticket by the men whose names appeared on that ticket as democrats."

Again you say:

"We have no desire to do any of the parties concerned injustice, but this attempt to disorganize and weaken the democracy of our town and county, demands of us attention, and we propose to give it attention," &c., &c. (In these quotations the italics are mine.)

When you made these statements you knew from me that I had nothing to do with the nomination of the ticket. That I was not "out on election day except long enough to vote," was not at home when one convention was held, and was not present at either, and knew nothing of its proceedings at the time. Then, in your comments you left out the above quotations, in quoting what you said about me, while claiming to quote all you said. Please mark it. Speaking of me as a democrat "so-called," charging in any part to "disorganize and weaken the democracy of the town and county."

A man who has been politically honest, is sensitive when his political honor is questioned. No man is so poor but that he has friends. I have some as well as other men. Some of them are democrats. They will not believe you when you make these charges against me. Your making the same charges against the others inclusive will not cover it up, either. They will feel indignant. Some of their friends will sympathize with them; and the very result you condemn will be aided by your own act. If the design of the opposition was to create discord among them, they can but laugh to see how ready you are to aid them. If you expect to make the democracy believe I am an apostate or disorganizer, you will fail. If you wanted to drive a man over to the opposition, and his friends with him, you could not start out on a more certain course than to do as you have towards me, if he was weak enough to be affected by it.

If radicals had nominated me for office, my democratic friends had no right to ask me if I was their candidate. They owed it to themselves to get right up and repel such a charge if made, no matter who made it, without saying one word to me on the subject; and my course for the last twenty years entitled me to that defense.

The fact that my political friends ("so-called") preferred to question my political integrity, as you have done in a newspaper, because they found my name being used without my authority or sanction, is only another evidence of the correctness of my position when I declared so often that I wanted "no office in the gift of the people;" for a life time of political consistency is not enough to protect a man from being "slain in the house of his friends."

Now Mr. Editor, this letter is not intended to be "sharp" or censorious. It is intended simply to correct any erroneous impression that may exist from your quotations and comments last week, and to show that the course pursued by you is not making the impression you (perhaps) intended, and is not tending to produce good harmony among our active democrats. No matter who or what an editor is—as editor of our paper, he can do us good or harm, as he acts discreetly or otherwise. But we are only one democrat among us all and have no more rights than the rest of us. A wrong in the party "demands" no more "attention" from you than from the rest of us; and you are no more authorized to censure than any one or all of us. You occupy a position to be heard, which we do not, and in a large degree aid in forming a public opinion; and for that very reason you should be cautious when you put caustic in your ink, and whose name you use when you write from that ink. It is the good of the party I have at heart, and that of no one man or set of men; and when my judgement differs from some other mens' I am as likely to be right or wrong as they are, and no more so, and they have no right to disown me until I become corrupt and furnish the evidence beyond dispute.

C. H. REEVE.

MR. EDITOR:—As a member of the old board of trustees, I am willing to forgive C. H. Reeve for the part he took in counseling and encouraging certain radicals and others to resist the collection of taxes, under the plan of illegal assessment, more especially since Hon. Judge Osborne could not find time to examine a small cart load of papers presented by Mr. Reeve, showing up the illegality of the old board. This mortified the gallant attorney of the radical party so that he came home from LaPorte with his head and tail down like a whipped hound. I am willing to forgive him for the injury attempted on me, when acting in an official capacity, but never for allowing himself to be nominated by a radical convention and run on their ticket against a regular democratic ticket. Mr. Reeve may aspire to a seat in congress or on a radical board of trustees, or wherever he pleases, but the subscriber has registered a certain strong expression in a sacred place, never to vote for the late champion of Democracy, C. H. Reeve, for any office, and further, I shall take the liberty to give it attention," &c., &c. (In these quotations the italics are mine.)

Good.

"They are so mean that his Satanic Majesty would not shake hands with them through a mud fence with a pair of tongs."—C. H. Reeve.

Better.

"What constitutes a renegade democrat? Voting with, aiding in any way the opposition party. Who did any of these things?"—C. H. Reeve.

Best.

"Out of your own mouths shall ye be judged."—Scripture.

Any person who has heard C. H. Reeve make a speech will recognize the above couplets as his. Every man who is a democrat from principle, and who sincerely loves the ancient landmarks of true democracy, will despise the individual who from personal spite or any other motive whatever, would, Judas-like, betray his party into the hands of its enemies. This doctrine has been taught by the man who did the deed. Judas received thirty pieces of silver for betraying his best friend. Benedict Arnold received a commission in the royal horse guards, but C. H. Reeve does the job because of his great disinterested benevolence. He would excuse himself to the public or rather to the democratic party, for the radicals refuse to recognize him now that they have got the lower and fishes of the town. He knew nothing of his nomination. Prominent radicals declare that he was consulted and gave his consent to use his name on their ticket. But stronger evidence, if needed confronts him, in his refusing to denounce the attempt at using his name in such connection.

"Often times exceeding a fault

Both make the fault worse by the excuse. As patches set upon a little breach, Discredit more in hiding of the fault. Than did the fault before it was so patched."

The causes of complaint against the old board were hatched and brought to light in the base passions of a very mean set of radicals, whose chief delight consists in slandering and misrepresenting the acts of democratic office holders. They have neither the ability nor inclination to discharge the duties of any public position of general utility. Being thus debared by nature from the benefits of public patronage, they seek to distinguish themselves by their ignorant interference in the affairs of others. With this class of persons Mr. Reeve was found acting long before the corporation election was held. He, with this class of men, refused to pay taxes, and organized for the purpose of resisting their collection.

Mr. Johnston, of Montgomery—You

are still in full blast, with the largest stock in Plymouth, at the lowest prices.

\$4,000 worth of Dress Goods,

Poplins, Alpacas, Merinoes, Plain

Mr. Coffroth and Mr. Davis declined to vote regarding the proceeding in violation of the statute constitution, which prescribes that 67 members would constitute a quorum.

The speaker said that on that question there was a diversity of opinion.

Sixty-seven members were necessary for legislative business of an ordinary character, but on the question of ratifying the amendment there was doubt enough to warrant the chair in holding that it could not be settled but by holding that the joint resolution of the senate is in order.

Mr. Coffroth appealed from the decision of the chair, and submitted it in writing, which was laid on the table by year 53, nays 25.

The roll-call having been completed, the lieutenant governor said 35 senators answered to their names.

Mr. Lasalle—Mr. Smith has informed me that he has resigned.

Mr. Green and several senators—He

is in the chamber.

Mr. Lasalle continuing, was not heard at the reporter's desk distinctly but was understood to say that he desired to see senators act in good faith.

The senator from Orange, Mr. Sherrod, tells me that he has resigned, and the senator from Allen, Mr. Carson, has told me that he is no longer a senator.

Mr. Church—I would like to have him put down as present and not voting.

The lieutenant governor—Call the roll through we will fix that all right.

Mr. Gray—According to the roll-call, a while ago, there was a quorum in the chamber, and senators now say they are no longer senators on this floor.

The lieutenant governor—We will dispose of this question when we get through with the roll.

When Mr. Lee's name was called, Mr. Church said: "Present, but not voting."

When Mr. Sherrod's name was called, that gentleman said: "I have already announced my resignation."

The remainder of the sentence was not heard, because of cries of "Order," and "Object."

When Mr. Smith's name was called, Mr. Robinson, of Madison, said: "Present, but not voting."

The roll-call having been completed, the lieutenant governor said:

"The secretary reports the following facts: 27 ayes, 1 nay and 10 present but not voting." [Applause, cheers and shouts.]

Mr. Stein—I offer the following resolution:

"Resolved, That it be entered on the journal of the senate, that upon the call of the yeas and nays upon the passage of the joint resolution ratifying the fifteenth amendment to the United States constitution, the following senators were present but declined voting, viz.:

"Messrs. Carson, Gifford, Henderson, Lasalle, Lee, Morgan, Sherrod, Smith, Deubo, and Johnston."

Mr. Sherrod—I enter my solemn protest against my name being counted when I am not a senator in the state of Indiana.

Mr. Gifford—I want the journal to show that I was present, but announced to the senate that my resignation was handed in and accepted.

Mr. Church—Mr. President, has the senator resigned, he has no business talking here.

Mr. Johnston, of Montgomery—

They have resigned, and consequently you have no right to put their names there at all.

The names reported as present but not voting should be called

so we may know whether they have resigned or not.

Mr. Kintey—Mr. President, the senator from Franklin, Mr. Gifford, and

from Orange, Mr. Sherrod, both recog-

nized themselves as senators by speak-

ing on this floor, since the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. Cravens—Mr. President, I think

the pending resolution is perfectly

proper, and should be entered on the

INDIANA LEGISLATURE.
SECOND WHOLESALE RESIGNATION
OF THE DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., May 13.—The house bill to prevent the evasion of tax by the purchase of United States bonds a few days before the first of January, was passed.

A committee was appointed to investigate the street reports that the Morgan raid bill had been passed by corruption.

The house bill authorizing county auditors to correct their reports to the superintendent of public instruction relative to school funds was passed.

The bill to tax national banks for municipal purposes was indefinitely postponed, yes 26, nays 21—and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill to amend sections of the liquor law of March, 1859, so as to require a majority of the voters of the township to apply for a license to retail liquors, failed to pass, by yeas 22, nays 23. All the democratic senators and four republicans voted against it.

On the assembling of the afternoon session, the roll was called, which discovered 26 persons present. The door-keeper was ordered to bring in absentees, and the doors were ordered to be locked. In about half an hour, the president announced that there were 34 senators present, and the call was suspended.

Mr. Wolcott stated that a rumor was abroad that the democratic members of the house had resigned, while the democratic members of the senate had not.

Mr. Cravens said he had seen the resignation of eleven senators just handed into the governor's office—not enough to break a quorum.

Mr. Stein moved that the senate be called. Said he: "We want to make a record this afternoon."

The lieutenant governor having resumed the chair, directed the secretary to call the senate.

Mr. Hooper—Mr. President; now I move the adoption of the resolution I send up.

The lieutenant governor to the secretary.

The secretary read: A joint resolution accepting and ratifying a certain amendment to the constitution of the United States.

Mr. Wolcott—Let every senator determine this matter for himself.

Mr. Church, in his seat—I am afraid my wife will hear about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. Scott—If we are acting in earnest, there must be some reason for secrecy?

We are acting, as I understand it, in the ordinary manner, and there is nothing in the resolution throwing any light on my mind as to why this requires secrecy?

I would like to ask the senator from White, Mr. Wolcott, what is that requires secrecy?

Mr. Wolcott—Let every senator determine this matter for himself.

Mr. Church—I am afraid my wife will hear about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. Scott—If it is a joke, I enjoy it hugely; if it is earnest, I am not going to sit here and vote for proceeding of this kind without giving my objection.

What is the matter before this body? It is, or will be, the constitutional amendment. Will the senator say that this is a matter requiring secrecy?

Mr. Wolcott—Let every senator determine this matter for himself.

Mr. Church—I am afraid my wife will hear about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. Scott—If it is a joke, I enjoy it hugely; if it is earnest, I am not going to sit here and vote for proceeding of this kind without giving my objection.

What is the matter before