

The Sentinel.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 22.

The Sentinel has not published the speech delivered by Mr. Voorhees on Wednesday, urging his own claims on the senatorship, simply because the only portions of it relating to general politics have been given at least twice in these columns during the past summer.

Professor Bonamy Price is at Washington, and he was very much amazed by Kelley's views on finance. He at once pronounced the champion of pig iron a lunatic. Had Prof. Price been a little more familiar with our congressional history he would have known that Kelley is very much more of a knave than a fool.

Hurlbut, of Illinois, is coming to the front with a bill for a government railroad from Washington through Cincinnati to St. Louis. The Sentinel don't believe in government railroads, but if they are to be built at all, let them end in a respectable city, for heaven's sake. Who wants to go to Washington with freight?

The trial of Mr. Morton, at LaFayette, for alleged attempt to bribe the Chicago grain inspectors is acquiring some notoriety in the state. A statement of the legal points in the case by the LaFayette Journal is given elsewhere. Judge Vinton, of the Tippecanoe Circuit Court, held that the attempt to bribe is a crime under the law of this state, making the culprit subject to extradition under a requisition from another state. But as Morton's counsel appealed to the Supreme Court, Gov. Hendricks has suspended compliance with the requisition from the Illinois governor until the Supreme Court shall have rendered a decision on the construction of the words "other crimes," on which this case hinges.

The physicians of Nashville have had a discussion in regard to the cholera epidemic of 1873. Dr. McClellan, of the United States army, having investigated the matter, declared his belief that the disease passed from New Orleans to Vicksburg, thence to Shreveport, and Memphis and was from those points scattered throughout the country. The infection was conveyed in emigrant's clothing from infected ports. The doctor in fact considered common carriers, such as railroad lines, the great agents in distributing epidemics. This theory is a new one so far as cholera is concerned, since the common opinion within the last few years has been that this epidemic spread by means of local causes acting in connection with atmospheric conditions. It has not been considered in any sense a contagious disease such as small pox is.

It is said that the lightning never strikes twice in the same place, but there is little truth in the adage if it be applied to the recurrence of every variety of misfortune. For instance, Mill river has been the scene of another disaster, exactly resembling that which occurred last May in all things save the destruction of human life. The telegraph gives a full account of the disaster, from which it appears that Hayden, Geer & Co., the owners of the brass works destroyed in the spring, had put up a new dam to replace one of those swept away. This dam was very substantially built of the best material, and yet the water swept it away like rubbish, and destroyed the new brass works, which were partially built on the old site. It is fortunate that no calamity like that of May last ensued. The dam that has just broken away is not probably the reservoir dam, but one of those lower down the river.

It would appear by advices from Washington that the judiciary committee of the House has actually modified the civil rights bill so as to make it conform to the Indiana law as expounded by the Supreme Court of this state. The republican majority actually propose separate schools and the pro rata division of the school moneys to provide for them. How these men blench from the maintenance of their principles at the first sign of defeat! Now the Sentinel, moved to plain speaking by the curious style of criticism adopted in regard to the opinion of Judge Baskirk, called for a single republican paper in any part of the country to come out boldly and declare itself the advocate of mixed schools. Not one of them has thus far dared to accept the challenge. Let us have a little honest talking on this subject. What paper speaks first?

There is one element of value in great abundance in Indiana which is rarely mentioned and practically neglected. That is peat. But little is said or thought about it, which is not strange in a country where fuel from wood and coal is so very abundant as in this state. But the peat beds are as abundant and rich as the coal beds almost, and had we not the coal nor the timber, this resource of peat would not be so undervalued. It is stated by a writer in the St. Joseph Register that there is one manufactory in Lake county which is successfully preparing a good article of fuel from the raw peat about New Ross Station. But the same correspondent adds that the gentlemen who own the machine have it patented. There is the real obstacle in the way of peat manufacture thus far. It is in the patent machines. There is more profit in starting up a process and selling out the right to some company who generally drop the business than in doing steady work of any sort. No doubt these men in Lake county are only working with a view to sell their patent for a pocket full of currency, and be off. This is the explanation which has been given of all the failures to do a steady business thus far. The supply of peat in various parts of this state, especially in the northern portions, is almost inexhaustible. It is claimed by the machine sellers, and this part of their story is probably true, that peat coal can be made much cheaper than any other fuel can be sold. But the trouble thus far seems to be that, like the gifted Col. Sellers, they figure

out such enormous profits that the result makes reasonable gains contemptible, and hence the whole idea is abandoned.

Some of the republican papers in the east are resorting to a very curious trick to get up a little political capital. They are putting on airs of much humility and calling upon the democrats to assemble in Congress next March in order to save the country at the earliest possible moment. The natural time for the meeting of the next Congress is a year from the present month, but these political hypocrites affect to think that the country can not wait for the reforms which the democracy are prepared to give it. Of course, the design is to secure an early meeting of congress in the hope that the democrats may quarrel over the currency question, or commit some act of folly that will cost them the elections next fall. These papers know perfectly well that the opposition will only control one house, and that it will be absolutely powerless to carry a single measure. But even the failure to do anything may be set down to the discredit of the democracy, though caused by the active antagonism of a republican Senate and executive. Really the anxiety of these public spirited journals to give the democrats a chance is extremely affecting, but unless their willingness to throw the cares of government entirely upon the hands of their opponents extends so far as to yield them the control of the Senate, this twaddle might as well cease. The democracy can neither save nor ruin the nation until after the election of 1876. It can only hereafter prevent the administration from doing either the one or the other piece of work. In the mean time it would be well for the Evening Post and all those other newspapers that are so anxious to see the country saved to turn their attention to the present congress. The republican party now has control of the executive, the Senate, the House and the Supreme Court. It has about three months of absolute sway before it, and may, in that time, redeem its past errors and secure the nation for the future. Upon the party in power, therefore, lies the great responsibility, and it is cowardly and contemptible for its organs to endeavor to shirk the burden.

Work and Pay.

What are you getting? This is the prime question which all employed men talk about, dream about, and make themselves happy or discontented over, as the case may be. If one will stop and consider a moment, it will be evident that in these avaricious times there is altogether too much importance attached to this idea of money compensation. To a certain extent it is all important. Until the necessities and reasonable demands of existence are supplied, that object stands at the front and takes precedence of everything else. But that man who measures the rewards of his life and labor by the number of dollars he receives in compensation for service, degrades himself and his work to the level of a menial servitude. There can be no true inspiration of labor which is performed merely for a material reward. Yet it seems as if almost everything was narrowed down to this base conception of life. The true reward of work ought to consist primarily in the consciousness of achievements, of having performed a part of that service which must be rendered by somebody to meet the demands of society. When at the end of a week, a man can say truthfully, I have fulfilled, according to my ability, the duties of my post; I have not been negligent nor evasive in the duty which was before me, I have done all I could in the best manner I could, true to myself and to my obligations, he answers the vital questions which involve the idea of success. He can not know failure. It is of much consequence, no doubt, that he be paid, and adequately paid for faithful service. His personal necessities, the comfort of others may be dependent on this, but it is a bad measure of life's results. Suppose a man does efficient service and don't get paid for it. Shall he count the labor lost? Not if he is a wise philosopher. The simple fact that he has done good service invests him with the dignity of manhood. He is not a drone, a parasite, a load for somebody else to carry, but a self supporter and a helper to the rest. And this true view is independent of the distinctions of labor. It looks not at what a man does, but how he does it. There is a choice of positions and a choice of labor, but there is no choice so undesirable to a man as no work at all. No matter whether rich or poor, the idea of personal achievement is absolutely essential to true manly dignity. Separate the notion of cash reward from work and all labor becomes ennobled, the humblest employment, as a part of what must be done, is honorable duty. These are exceedingly old, and, it may be, trite principles. They have been announced thousands of years ago, yet to-day they are foreign from the thoughts of the mass of men apparently. Hence so much poor service, so few successful men in service. The idea of large pay for small work is very enchanting, but only to superficial, low and groveling minds. There is no good philosophy in it. When a man's enthusiasm is aroused to do good work, with that idea in the lead he rises instantly to a true nobility, and, in fact, gets upon the right road for the collateral successes of large compensation. But it is pretty sickening to hear so much wrangling about high salaries. Everybody talks about that. It may be safely alleged that in a large majority of cases, the high salary men derive no actual advantage therefrom. "All paid in, and all paid out," is a very simple but very unprofitable sort of a business report. Take ten men in this city to-day, whose salaries are \$1,500 per annum, raise their pay to \$2,000, and nine of them will instantly expand their current expenses in greater ratio than the increase of their income and be no better, perhaps worse off at the end of next year than now. You will hear men boast of their high pay, and talk

about how much so and so gets at such and such a place. Ask them to show their bank account. Have they got rich? have they any ready cash? do they lay up anything? Where are the fruits of their labor? They may have turned more seed leaf into ashes, filtered more alcohol through their skins, and that is all your blowing men can show for their incomes. It is so common to tell what people are getting, so rare to see what they have. What we want is an inspiration to do good work, and to use its legitimate proceeds in a way that will look creditably on the details and result are shown on paper, reported and audited by judgment and good morals. But that is just what we have but little of. At least it looks so.

Proposed New State House.

The Sentinel has abstained from any discussion of the new state house question, preferring that an expression should first be made of public sentiment outside the city. That there is some little jealousy of capitals, and the expenditures which governments are required to make for their own accommodation, is well known. But there is as little, perhaps, in Indiana as in any other state, and for obvious reasons. Indianapolis is not only the capital, but is the chief city, the geographical and commercial center, and in direct communication with all parts of the state by its magnificent railroad advantages. But more important still, it is the child of the state, originally laid out for the capital, and built up for the prosperity of the whole state. There are but few of our people, therefore, who do not rejoice in the prosperity of this city.

During the last month the county papers, as well as those of our larger cities, have spoken out on this subject, and generally in advocacy of the project. Some of them are urgent, and demand a state house as a necessity, taking precedence of all other local questions; others admit the necessity, but propose a new insane asylum as of more pressing importance, while but few oppose the movement, and none deny the need. The reasons in favor of the immediate action of the legislature may be briefly summed up as follows: 1. The present building is totally inadequate to the needs of the state. The judicial and executive departments have been crowded out entirely, and now occupy an inconvenient and frail structure, where all the valuable records of the state may be destroyed by fire in an hour. Even the legislature has not half room enough, and every session rooms have to be rented for committees, which, because they are scattered, require a greater number of clerks and janitors; and the expenses thus incurred call for thousands of dollars per year; 2. The present building is dilapidated, inconvenient and even dangerous. Built in the infancy of the state, of cheap material, it has survived its usefulness. The stone is crumbling, the columns in constant danger of being undermined, and the plastering inside and out constantly falling off. The annual bill of repairs, to keep it at all tenable, amounts to thousands of dollars per year; 3. The plan, arrangement and condition are such as to render it unwholesome. Every member of the legislature knows this, and those who have spent sessions there know that the want of proper arrangements for heating and ventilating are the principal sources of colds and fevers. Hardly a session passes that does not sow the seeds of disease and death among the members. A Greek temple may be a good thing in Greece, but in our changeable, chilly climate, it is simply an absurdity; 4. As to the looks of the building, that is an inferior matter. If it had the great essential features of capacity, security and healthfulness, mere appearances might be endured. Of course, in the erection of a new house the people will demand that it shall be of pleasing exterior, but impressive from its simple grandeur, and free from all meretricious ornament.

The Sentinel is aware that the last general assembly appointed a committee to procure plans; that this committee has faithfully and industriously endeavored to discharge its important duty, and that it will be prepared to report to the next session. The city editors, with all their anxiety for news, have desired to leave the committee unembarrassed by public discussion of its doings, and have remained content with simple announcements of its meetings. Assurances are given that the committee are in the possession of plans which can be built within the limits of two millions of dollars, and which will be perfectly satisfactory when executed, and the matter may be left with them until they report to the general assembly. Then their action will become public property, and a legitimate matter for criticism.

For those who may doubt the wisdom of action by the next general assembly in this matter, there are three observations to be made: 1. The special friends of a new state house concede the precedence of an insane asylum, and will support that measure; 2. It will be demonstrated that the tax for state purposes can be largely reduced, and that a levy of five cents on the hundred dollars will be sufficient for both buildings, within the time that will be required to build them; 3. The state has already committed itself to the work, and can not well go back on its action.

It seems pretty clear from all late developments that the republicans of Louisiana are engaged in a desperate conspiracy to repeat the outrage of 1872, this time defeating the will of the people by retaining the power which they then wrested from the hands of the lawfully elected state government. The mind of the Northern public is pretty clearly made up on the subject of the last election in Louisiana; and men who had doubts about the result two years ago have no difficulty in deciding in regard to the choice of the people in 1874. The victory of the conservatives in the face of every disadvantage was too complete, and was left too long unchallenged to allow of any reversal of the popular verdict now. Everybody understands well enough that if the republican party was in the majority it

would have no difficulty in winning with the federal government and its official power and patronage, and the state government and its influence all aiding and assisting. Everybody understands well enough that nothing but sheer popular strength could sustain the conservative party under the disadvantages against which they struggle. The people of the United States have made up their minds on the subject, and Kellogg's subordinates may count in their friends if they like, but the wrong simply seals the doom of their party, and insures not merely its death but its dishonor. A few desperate politicians doubtless consider that the series of outrages committed in Louisiana is such as require another piece of tyranny to complete the chain and secure the results of violence and fraud. They think that the acknowledgment of the late defeat would be more than the confession of present weakness. It would be proof of past wrong, and would ensure punishment for its commission. Under this impression they are willing to resort to any act of infamy for the sake of present security. With a glimmering sense of the danger of the outrage they are contemplating these men have been hesitating for some time to set aside the verdict of the people as rendered last November. In their troubles, they fly, as usual, to the federal government for aid. Kellogg himself appeals piteously to the president to hasten the departure of an investigating committee to New Orleans, so that, in the presence of a few members of Congress, the political adventurers who control a state in the interests of a party hostile to it may once more bid defiance to the community by the vote of which they profess to hold office. Was ever such a farce played in politics before? Listen to the voice of the man who is supposed to have been chosen governor of Louisiana by the votes of its people:

I respectfully ask that you will use your influence to secure the early departure for Louisiana of the select committee appointed yesterday. I am confident that an investigation, thorough and complete, will vindicate the policy of your administration, will strengthen the republican party, and will place the state government of Louisiana in a more just light before the country. The presence of the committee here at this juncture will also go far to secure order, and, I hope, contribute to some degree to bring about a solution of our difficulties.

It is not enough to make gods and men laugh to see such a contemptible piece of specimen of governor for a great state appealing to the interests of the administration and the party against those of his own commonwealth?

Mr. Voorhees and the Platform.

The Hon. D. W. Voorhees, who retired to the sanctity of private life last spring when there were no spoils of victory in view, is now making an active canvass of the state, after a manner hitherto unknown in our politics, to urge his own claims on the senatorship, and he is in the habit, it is said, of reading on all occasions, and holding up to the execration of the faithful, an editorial from the Sentinel repudiating the financial part of the platform adopted by the democracy last July. He is especially severe upon this paper for the stand it has taken against the repeal of the gold law of March, 1869. The best thanks of the Sentinel are due to him for the pains he is taking to spread its opinions, and lest the copy of the paper which he carries should become worn out from constant use it may be well to supply him in the present number with a reiteration of the views he finds so obnoxious. The Sentinel holds that the gold law of 1869 was, at the time of its passage, either an unnecessary or a dishonest piece of legislation. If the bonds which it affected were then redeemable in gold, no declaratory law was needed. If they were not redeemable in gold the declaratory law was a piece of folly and dishonesty, which not even anxiety to preserve the public credit could excuse. This argument might have been used to prevent the passage of the law, but the law of 1869, when once enacted, carried the matter of the redemption of the bonds in gold out of controversy. The faith of the nation was pledged in the face of the world, through its own agents, and their action can not be set aside with honor. It is vain to attempt to make any distinction between the people and congress in the business: *Quae facit per alium facit per se.*

Now, it is not easy to understand why it is discreditable for the Sentinel to still maintain the folly of a declaration which it denounced six months ago. This paper has never acknowledged the platform of July to be the true touchstone for testing genuine democracy, and it has been engaged in an honest endeavor—made, if not wisely, at least according to the best of its ability—to lead the party to a more advanced and advantageous position. It has refused to be judged by the last state platform as an infallible standard. But Mr. Voorhees is seeking the highest of fees within the gift of the people of Indiana solely on the ground of his unswerving loyalty to that platform, and is denouncing all of his rivals who can not pledge the same faith to it as traitors. Therefore, it behooves him to see to it that he can maintain, without a flaw, his allegiance to the political gospel which he is preaching. Let us apply the touchstone to his own character.

The platform demanded the repeal of the gold law of 1869 in express terms. Now it is easy for Mr. Voorhees to make promises in regard to carrying out that declaration, when he is aware that, even if he is chosen senator, he will be perfectly powerless to do anything toward the repeal of the law. Even if the next House should be so foolish as to pass an act repealing the gold bill, the Senate is a body which would not listen to such a proposition, and should such an act get through congress by any means, the president would veto it. It will be years before legislation can carry out that part of the state platform is possible, and, when it is possible, the bonds covered by the law will all have been converted. The whole matter is now no more a practical political question than the configuration of last year's clouds. Knowing this right well, Mr. Voorhees is ready with his promises. What did he do, however, when the issue of the redemption of the bonds was a vital one,

and absorbed the attention of the whole people? Let his present professions be judged in the light of his past actions. He was a member of the congress which adopted the gold bill of 1869, and was in Washington when the resolution was passed. The names of Holman, Niblack, Kerr and other Indiana representatives are on the record against that law, but that of the Hon. D. W. Voorhees is not to be found. The Sentinel will not say that he shirked the vote from corrupt motives, the favorite style of argument on the other side, but it does say that he was so grossly careless of the interests of his constituents that he failed to throw his moral power against the law. He now harangues the people of Indiana to show how many hundreds of millions the nation lost by that enactment, and yet he didn't think it of importance enough to vote against it. He now asserts that no map is fit to be senator, who will not fight to repeal a law which he would not vote to defeat. What a miserable pretense all this must be! Verily it is hard to conceive of a more complete repudiation of the platform in regard to the gold law than the conduct of Mr. Voorhees himself.

In another very essential particular, however, Mr. Voorhees has proved himself antagonistic to the platform of the democracy adopted last July. Let the readers of the Sentinel peruse the following extracts from that declaration of principles carefully, noting that a repeated condemnation of increased and retroactive salaries scattered through them:

The republican party must be held responsible for these acts of the administration if placed in power, and for the Credit Mobilier frauds, the enormous increase of salaries, and the Southern contracts; while as the oppressor of the white people of the South and as the origin of the corruption that weighs like an incubus upon this country it deserves the severest condemnation.

Therefore, this convention asks the people to agitate the democratic party with the administration of the state and country upon the following principles: A strict construction of the constitution of the United States and its amendments, and an impartial enforcement of all laws; a tariff for revenue; a condemnation of all official gratuities in the form of retroactive salaries, state or national; a condemnation of the attempt of the last Congress to muzzle the press; securing to every citizen of the country the equal protection of the law without violating the principles of local self government, or interfering with the social customs of the people.

Opposition to high fees and salaries, either in the state of Indiana or in the United States; and we demand a reduction of salaries, state and national.

Now, the act chiefly aimed at here is the celebrated salary grab law, which has been denounced from one end of the Union to the other by men of all parties. It has brought more ignominy on the administration than anything else it has done. Mr. Voorhees was a member of the committee which originally reported the law in the House. Out of ten test votes, by means of which Butler skirminched the measure through congress, he voted for the grab seven times and failed to vote three times. To cap the climax he was one of the retiring members of congress, whose object in voting for the bill was to secure back pay rather than an increase of wages for the future. And yet Mr. Voorhees has the face to go around the state of Indiana proclaiming his special loyalty to a platform containing the above denunciation of his official conduct. Nay, more; he has gone so far as to defend, in his speech at Washington, the very salary-grab law which the platform has so specifically condemned. Really, if any man in Indiana should shrink from invoking the declarations of the last democratic state convention to substantiate his claims for office, the Hon. D. W. Voorhees is that man.

The Sentinel has let that gentleman severely alone since the beginning of the senatorial canvass, preferring to have the legislature do its own work, but his course in attacking others and challenging an impeachment of his record calls for some attention. He can now appreciate how his own conduct appears measured by the standard which he has applied so persistently to that of other people. From this narrow method of examination the Sentinel will proceed, accepting his own challenge, to examine his public career and the justification of it which he has made in his last speech, according to the higher standards of right and expediency. The people of Indiana ought to accept his declaration at Washington on Wednesday last literally: "If in a long service in Congress I have committed a single act of personal dishonesty or corruption, no man should ever again extend to me his confidence or support. If I have done what honorable men could not do, and have not done throughout the history of our government, then let the executioner advance and let my head roll from the block."

As an illustration of the changes of personal fortune in this country, the Chicago Times tells the following story: "Detroit readily disposed of \$75,000 in thirty-year 7 per cent. water bonds, there being but two purchasers, each of whom paid a premium of 1 per cent. J. H. Beach, who took \$50,000, went to Detroit in 1847 with the present governor of Michigan, Bagley. He had \$6 in cash. Bagley found employment in a tobacco house, Beach in a bank. The latter's employment was not a proving permanent one, and he went to Cincinnati, where he fell in business. Desiring to go to St. Louis, he had no other means of reaching there than such as nature provided, and to raise money wrote to Bagley asking for \$25. Bagley, now a millionaire, was just able to remit the amount. Beach reached St. Louis, and now, with a ready cash capital of \$600,000, is investing in the bonds of a city where once he hadn't a maravedi to bless himself with."

A special to the Chicago Tribune from Hobart, the 16th inst., says: "An accident occurred here to-day, which has caused the greatest excitement and sympathy among the people. Moses Frank, a promising young man of 23, son of William Frank, one of the oldest citizens of this place, accompanied by a younger brother, who was going out to shoot at a mark in the field, was shot by the death shortly. The brother and father are almost crazed with grief. The brother has to be watched to keep him from self-destruction."

M. Clermont Ganneau, who has spent a year in archaeological research in Jerusalem, is on his way home with a great quantity of unpublished notes and discoveries, chiefly bearing on the controversy of the site,

OUR NEXT SENATOR.

SPIRIT OF THE INDIANA PRESS. COMMENTS FROM ALL PARTS OF THE STATE—M'DONALD THE FAVORITE.

[From the Lebanon Pioneer.] If the Hon. George W. Julian should become a candidate for the United States Senate from Indiana he would have the undivided support of the ladies.

[From the Logansport Star.] The fight goes bravely on between Voorhees and McDonald, with Niblack putting in his car. It wouldn't be surprising if the two main contestants should fall, and Niblack or Kerr win the race.

[From the Indianapolis Sunday Herald.] Only seventeen of the 185 salary grabbers in the present Congress have been re-elected. But the chiefest among ten thousand of them, and one altogether auburn and abominable, expects to be elected to the United States Senate.

[From the Seymour Democrat.] Voorhees voted for the salary grab; voted to double the president's salary and give the congressmen \$5,000 back pay, took the money and retired to private life. Now, let him stay retired. The democratic party would be well rid of him.

[From the Seymour Democrat.] The Banner estimates men's souls by an inflation, or greenback standard. That is the reason it admires Voorhees. We estimate men by their self worth, or by the specific standard, and that is why we differ as to senator. It is for a sham statesman, we for a real one.

[From the Goshen Democrat.] We think our next United States senator will be chosen from one of three able democratic statesmen—McDonald, Holman and Kerr. We unhesitatingly say we prefer the last first, the second next, and the first last, but will be contented and happy over the choice of either.

[From the Brownstown Banner.] The Booneville Enquirer, which at first advocated Voorhees' claims to the Senate, retreats and says it can not support any man who voted for the salary grab. When it gave its support to Voorhees, the editor had forgotten that the Tall Sycamore of the Wabash not only took the back pay but voted and worked for the passage of the salary grab law. Brother Swin's democracy is as true as steel.

[From the Brownstown Banner.] It is not because he voted for the salary bill that Daniel W. Voorhees is so bitterly denounced by bondholder and bondholders' pimps. The whole opposition to him arises from the fact of his brave, outspoken and righteous position upon the finance question. He stands squarely upon the democratic state platform, and favors a sufficient increase of the currency to afford relief to the depressed business interests of the country. The defeat of Voorhees would be a victory for Wall street. Let the other hand, his success will be a victory for the farmers, mechanics and laboring men of Indiana.

[From the Seymour Democrat.] If Terre Haute must have the senator, let it bring out the Hon. A. B. Carlton, Voorhees' partner, one of the ablest men in the state. He is superior to Voorhees in everything except in the latter's ability to mix metaphors, and string together long sentences that sound well but signify nothing. Judge Carlton is not only an able man, but he is a sound democrat and an honest man. He is a good lawyer, and one of the best scholars of the state. He is a true friend, and possesses those qualities of head and heart that would make him a safe, reliable senator; one who would honor the state, and be of great service to the people. Let the Terre Hauteans drop Voorhees and take up Carlton. They might elect him; they can never touch bottom with Voorhees.

[From the Brazil Manufacturer and Miner.] The editor of the Herald is trying to defend Dan. Voorhees as a salary grabber; or, in other words, he admits the crime, but says he was acting with the republican party, they being in a majority—consequently he is not responsible. According to the Herald's doctrine all that a democrat has to do when he wants to steal is to vote with the republican party, take his ill-begotten gain, come back to the democratic party and he is all right. If Daniel comes to the front, he will be elected, and he will be of great service to the people. Let the people, why in heaven's name do you want to send him to the United States Senate? Have you any assurance that he will not help them again to do the same thing. If he went to them once, gave them aid and comfort, he will be most likely, if he is sent to the Senate, to go and do likewise.

[From the Hancock Democrat.] To the democratic party and to the people generally it is a matter of minor importance who among the many honest, able and distinguished democrats of this state may be elected to the United States Senate for the next six years; nor is it important whether he is a candidate, or whether he shall be chosen without any effort on his part, or that of his friends to make him prominent by newspaper advocacy or otherwise. But it is of the first and most vital importance that whoever he may be, not only his honesty, integrity and ability shall be good, but he must be known to stand fairly, squarely, unequivocally and openly against the repeal of the national banking law. He must oppose a further contraction of the currency, and in favor of legislation in the interest of labor, and for the restraint of the monopolists in their unreasonable and unjust exactions. On these issues let the candidate be committed in writing, and irrevocably committed. The people must not be cheated out of the legitimate fruits of their victory over the radical party.

[From the Crawford County Democrat.] As between the Hon. D. W. Voorhees and Judge J. E. McDonald, this question is now what you might call exceedingly warm. The friends of both these gentlemen are sanguine of their success and are working hard for the prize. Let us, gentlemen, and give the legislature a chance for their white ally, as no doubt they feel confident of their ability to make their own selection. The Hon. D. W. Voorhees took the "salary grab" and helped to enact the law creating it. That settles his hash on this question, in our opinion. Judge Joseph E. McDonald, if reports be true, proposes to "go back" on the recent state platform, and if this is the case send him to the left. Our idea is that the legislature will select a man free from the taint of the "salary grab," and one who will pledge himself to the support of all the planks in the platform. The principles which gained us the victory. If they don't do this, defeat is certain at the next election. The above gentlemen are good democrats, and worthy of high position in the party, but unless they come up to the positive requirements of the platform, they have no claim on the party. The day has arrived when men shall be selected to represent principles, not principles to represent men.