4

GOVERNOR HOADLY,

The Democratic Nominee for Re-election, Opens the Campaign at Hamilton.

A Masterly Arraignment of the Republican Party and Its Policy by the Eloquent Democratic Standard Bearer—Foraker Fully Answered.

HAMILTON, O., September 5.—Governor Hoadly made his first speech of the campaign this evening in Court House Square to an immense audience. Hon. James E. Campbell presided and introduced the speaker in a few well-termed remarks. The utmost enthusiasm prevailed, and the Governor's masterly arraignment of the Republican party and defense of the Democratic administration was loudly cheered. Following is the full text of Governor Hoadly's speech:

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF BUTLER COUNTY: Two years ago I opened in your midst the canvass which resulted in Democratic success. Surrounded now by the friends who gave me then the magnificent majority of 2,898 in this Gibraltar of Democracy, I ask for a renewed expression of confidence and an increased majority, which shall express with emphasis your opinion that Democratic success, as proved by results, means not only good government, means reform, union, personal liberty, economy, no fraud, no disguises, no concealments, open dealings and candid treatment of the public in affairs, State and National.

The Ohio election will express the opinion of the people upon my administration and that of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly. It is the first State election after the inauguration of Cleveland and Hendricks; it will therefore be regarded as the expression of popular judgment upon the policies of the President and his advisers. Of these I ask your approval, confident that Democratic success means good government, State and National, which ought not to be rebuked by defeat.

The leader of the Republicans of Ohio has carefully prepared the appeal of his party and sent it from the stump through the press to the country. He waves the bloody shirt; he indorses the policy of alienation and hate; he seeks to transplant and cultivate in this country the feelings of the English aristocracy towards the Irish, to array section against section, to govern the South from the North as Dublin Castle governs Ireland as a conquered province, and all this in the year of grace 1885, twenty years and more after the close of the war. The average life of an ordinary generation is thirty years. Owing to the casualties of war, which cost our country at least a million lives, the duration of the generation now passing away has been less than this. Twenty-five years have elapsed since Mr. Lincoln's election. Five-sixths, perhaps more, of the men who devised rebellion, the men who fought its battles and the men who overcame it, have passed away. The great civil and the great military leaders, Lincoln and Grant, both sleep in graves bedewed by the tears of the whole nation, South and North; for both died with words upon their lips and feelings in their heart of "charity to all, malice toward none." Seward and Sumner, Chase and Fessenden, Douglas and Stephens, Lee and Breckinridge, these are historic, not living names. Alone of the authors of rebellion Jeff Davis survives. Boys born when the war broke out have been voting for three years past. Boys born after the war will vote next year. Boys too young to bear arms are now mature men of thirty-five. There is a new South and a new North. A new generation, full of new life, is at work. A very large proportion of the people of the South have never seen a slave, and have lived under no other regime but that of universal suffrage. Is it not time for the Shermans and the Forakers to accept the results of the war and no longer to continue in battle? Eight million bales of cotton, the probable crop of this year, is in sight. There are no idlers in the South, why croak in the North? White men and black men are side by side at work. The South is developing new industries, weaving cotton cloth, digging coal and iron, forging steel. God and nature, religion and the human heart, are the forces against which Sherman and Foraker contend and Foster plots.

To the policy of alienation we oppose Union; for hate we substitute love; we welcome the new South and the old South, old men and boys, fathers and sons, not as allies merely in a crusade against the forces of nature, but as brothers in affection and blood. We bid them all, white and black, join us in the great march of union and liberty, to the peaceful conquests of the future.

"Let us have peace," said General Grant many years ago. His eyes at last saw it. "I have witnessed," said the dying voice, "since my sickness just what I have wished to see ever since the war—harmony and good feeling between the sections." And again, rejoicing in the present, he prophesied the future in words of glowing hope: "We may now look well forward to a perpetual peace at home, and a National strength that will screen us against any foreign complication."

Let us, then, banish these unmanly fears of Southern wrong-doing, and cease to exaggerate occasional personal conflicts into wars of races. Danville and Copiah are worn out. Turn out some new grist, O grinders of the outrage mill! Home rule, and as little application of the "eternal principle of regulation" as is consistent with the greatest liberty of all, will in time cure all the ills of State and Nation.

Mr. Sherman will fail in his efforts to stir the dying embers of sectional animosity. Ohio has not forgotten what General Garfield so well said:

"The man who attempts to get up a political excitement in this country on the old sectional issues will find himself without a party and without support. The man who wants to serve his country must put himself in the line of its leading thought and that is the restoration of business, trade, commerce, industry, sound political economy, hard money and honest payment of all obligations; and the man who can add anything in the direction of the accomplishment of any of these purposes is a public benefactor."

The Solid South! Have Senator Sherman and Judge Foraker forgotten that there was once a Republican Solid South, and what became of it, the South of Moses and Madison Wells, of Parson Brownlow and Warmouth, of Dennis, "the little giant of Alachua," who invented tissue ballots, of the strumpet Betty Higgins and the chaplain who joined efforts to debauch the Legislature and bankrupt the Treasury of Tennessee, the Solid South of Kellogg and Eliza Pinkston? But a few years ago every Southern State, except Kentucky, had a Republican Governor and Legislature. Where are they now? Some in exile and some in prison, and their party like Hans Breitmann's famous "barty," "all gone avay, in die Ewigkeit"—fled away, as marsh miasma evaporates before the sun.

Mr. Sherman is distressed because Lamar and Garland and Bayard, "two members of the Confederate Congress and one man who sympathized with them, are at the head of great departments of the Government." Oh, yes! it was well to put Mr. Key at the head of the Postoffice Department. One Confederate in the Cabinet was all right, but two, two are a lamentable concession to treason. No, not quite this even. Akerman was a proper Attorney General and Key a most becoming Postmaster General, but two at a time, two at a time, Garland and Lamar together, aye, there's the rub. The tears of crocodiles are freely shed as Sherman softly sings, "Insatiate archer, would not one suffice?"

Mosby, Madison Wells, Mahone and Chalmers, the guerrilla, the Returning Board, the repudiator and the Fort Pillow butcher, all these have had their garments washed, but Lawton and Jackson, Jonas and Lamar and Garland, the best and purest of the South, these to our Senator are the unregenerate children of the political Satan, unfit to serve the Republic.

And Bayard, too, is a bug-a-boo with which to frighten Republicans—Bayard who "sympathized" not quite so long, nor yet so furiously, as Logan, whose name it used to delight the New York *Tribune* to adorn with the prefix "d. w.," "dirty work John A. Logan," because he boasted of his delight in doing the "dirty work" of returning slaves to their masters.

And all this that John Sherman may be Senator, or, perhaps, President, with our beloved Foster for Senator, and that Foraker may be Governor.

What can an opposition Senator do for Ohio? A chronic negative, a continuing scold, a running sore of petty party complaint, is not what will best serve Ohio. Let us put an equally sound Democrat by the side of Henry B. Payne, to join him in generous support of Grover Cleveland, helping to settle the silver question, to settle the Mormon difficulty, to revise the tariff on the lines of principles stated in the Chicago Democratic platform, and to reform the civil service.

Against Senator Sherman's appeals for disunion we set the good work of the Democratic party, its President and Cabinet, and their declared aims and purposes. I ask for re-election, not for my own sake, but because it will be understood as Ohio's indorsement of these.

No doubt there are dissatisfied Democrats. Yes, and fortunately there are satisfied Republicans. How much better would either have felt had Blaine and Logan triumphed? In January, 1863, Mr. Lincoln said to my friend M. D. Conway: "Most of us here present have been nearly all our lives working in minorities, and may have got into a habit of being dissatisfied."

Speaking at the jollification meeting in this city last November, I pleaded for generous confidence in our newly-elected President, and that every Democrat, educated though he might have been for twenty-four years in opposition, should treat him with sympathy and guard against carping criticism. Leave that to Sherman and Foraker.

Now I ask for more. I solicit approval, not forbearance. Mr. Cleveland has held office six months. Congress has not been in session, yet much has been accomplished. The spirit of reform and economy has entered all the departments. Useless offices and expenses have been done away with, while the performance of duty, civil and military, has been enforced. The Government is not solicitous to provide soft places for pets, but to save money for the people, and to keep the faith pledged to the platform.

If the navy, which the Republican party destroyed, be restored, it is now certain that it will be honestly done. Under this Administration there will be no loose contracting, no jobs let at prices nominally low to be made high by extras, or by scamping the work.

The remnant of the National domain which Democratic Presidents, Jefferson and Monroe and Polk, added to our territory, the residue which Republican extravagance has not wasted on corporations and favorites, is saved from cattle kings and other plunderers for the benefit of the people.

No more assessments will be levied on the departments to carry elections; no more clerks will be dismissed because they refused to bulldoze the people at Congressional elections in the guise of Deputy Marshals; the Pension Bureau will never again be emptied of its officers to defeat a wounded Democratic soldier for Congress; there will be no more Star Route frauds; no more whisky rings; in short, a breath, a strong breeze, of economy and honesty is blowing through all branches of the public service.

No more wool will be pulled over the eyes of Ohio farmers by a tariff nominally high, but ingeniously leveled down at the custom houses by fraudulent invoicing.

Mr. Sherman has recently boasted that he has converted Senator Morrill, of Vermont, to the support of the wool tariff of 1867. But is Mr. Sherman sure of himself on this question? Is he certain that he will not again attempt its reduction, as he did in 1872? Is he sure that in his anxiety to secure other tariff reductions he will never again give the casting vote in favor of reducing the wool tariff, rather than lose the opportunity to cut down duties on other articles, as he did in 1883? Is he sure that if ever elected President he will not, as President Arthur did in 1882, recommend "a substantial reduction" in the duty "on wool?"

The three great Republican scare-crows have been taken in for good, and relegated to the rag-bag and dust-heap. There will be no payment of the rebel debt, no pensions to rebel soldiers, no freedmen reduced to slavery. The results of the war, which Hancock and Ward, Warner and Morgan, Ewing and Rice, and thousands of other Ohio Democrats, fought to secure, will be preserved intact.

Here in Butler County you have a memorable instance of the beauties of Republican professions. Except for a short time under Andrew Johnson there has not been a moment since the close of the war when Ferdinand Vanderveer, the hero of two wars, could be permitted to enter the civil service of his country. He was welcomed to fight in Mexico, was welcomed to fight the rebellion, honored, promoted, made a Brigadier General. He was invited to shed his Democratic blood for his twice imperiled country. Against foreign foes and domestic traitors he freely exposed his life, but under a Republican President he has not been good enough to be even a whisky gauger. Thank God, Grover Cleveland has destroyed all this! Democrats who for twenty years have only been considered fit to be enlisted as private soldiers at thirteen dollars a month, are now—at least occasionally—promoted from hard-tack and sow-belly to the oysters and champagne of official position. At last it has become possible for the majority of the American people—the majority, not in numbers merely, but in all that makes a nation great, in intelligence, virtue, sobriety, right thinking and right living—to see an office-holder—occasionally, at least—selected from their midst. Doubtless Mr. Cleveland seems to some to move too slowly; but remember he is the head of a Government, not of a machine for the distribution of spoils. Of one thing I am sure, and that is that while maintaining and executing in all their force, as is his duty, every law he finds upon the statute books, including the law for the reform of the civil service, he will in time fill every office involving political action by men believing in the Democratic Chicago platform of 1884, and in sympathy with Democratic progress. For twenty years the Republican party of Ohio and the nation has proved by its action that its single idea of the public service has been that no Democrat should hold any civil office whatever, business or political, and that every public place, great and small, should be filled by a partisan Republican, put there because, and only because he was a partisan Republican. All this is now reversed, and the "mourners go about the streets." It is sweet, it is delicious, brethren, to hear the Republican lamentation, as expressed by John Sherman, who worked the Treasury Department for all it was worth in 1880 to nominate himself for President, and who never recommended a Democrat for civil office in his life, that the impartial, non-partisan civil service of our country is in danger! Why, John, brother John, there is a beam in thine own eye. Do I say beam? Yes, a cord of wood, a whole forest. Go then and pluck it out, then come, and after we have done our share of official duty we will rub out our little motes and listen to your complaints. And while the reforms have been in progress the country has not gone to the "demnition bow-wows," as every Republican orator has prophesied for a dozen years past. If that great and wise leader of the Democratic party, Samuel J. Tilden, that clear-sighted reformer, before the electric light of whose penetrating vision fraud and waste shrunk and slunk into hiding-places and exile, or were driven to prison, were inaugurated, the country would be ruined—so prophesied our Republican Cassandras; therefore, Florida and Louisiana, the latter with Mr. Sherman's own personal connivance, were robbed of their votes, and the government for four years handed over to a usurper. If Hancock, the superb leader of the loyal legions in battle, were elected, dire calamity, the carnival of treason, would ensue, they said. But lo! the hour has come and the man. Democracy has effectually prevailed at last, and where is the calamity? What has become of the disaster? Business reviving, stocks advancing, are these the tokens of distress? True, times are still hard, made so by Republican misgovernment. Rome was not built in a day or a year. It is only six months since the Republicans lost power. It may be that the revivals of industry we read of are not the results of Democratic success. They are at any rate coincident. Republican prophecy is falsified, and Republican prophets silenced. Let us take heart, and with renewed faith in Democratic principles, and doubled courage, with generous confidence, continue our support of President Cleveland, sure and secure that his inflexible integrity, his invincible courage, his persistent labor, supported by the counsels and wise legislation of a Democratic House of Representatives this year, and a Democratic Senate and House in 1887, will richly reward his, their and our endeavors. The country will thus enter upon a career of prosperity such as has attended other Democratic triumphs, such as came in with Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, under whose administration all political opposition to the Democracy ceased, and who gave to the country Louisiana and Mississippi, the territory west of the Mississippi and Florida, or with Jackson, who paid the public debt, or with Polk, who added Texas and California to the National domain.

And at the election of 1888, Democrats and Republicans alike will have the satisfaction of voting for the man of their choice, unawed by ruffians drawn from the slums of distant States and Territories, armed with bull dog pistols, and led by Powell Clayton, Dudley, Rathbone and Lot Wright. Marshal Urner is a Democrat and a gentleman, and his deputies will be gentlemen, and they will repel, not actively aid the happy family of Republican colonizers who may be then enjoying the hospitality of Hogshead John.

Now as to State affairs. Of myself and my personal administration of the trust committed to me I have little to say. When I entered upon the office of Governor I made up my mind to permit no dishonesty and to discharge the duties of my office with all the wisdom I could command. How far I have been able to keep this pledge thus made to myself the people of Ohio must judge. It is not for me to say; so, leaving the further discussion of my official conduct to others, and to the judgment of the people of the State, I pass to the consideration of the action of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly, in both branches of which the Democratic party had a majority—in the Senate a majority of more than three-fifths and in the House three-fifths less three. Mr. Sherman says: "I know by general reputation that the Democratic majority of our last Legislature was a 'bad lot.' I leave others to furnish the bill of particulars." The Hon. Jacob A. Kohler, Republican candidate for Attorney General, was a member of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly, and in daily contact with the "bad lot" thus spoken of. I call upon Mr. Kohler to furnish this bill of particulars. I ask him to state publicly, and in his capacity of candidate for Attorney General, which bill passed by the Sixty-sixth General Assembly he would have advised Judge Foraker to have vetoed had Judge Foraker been so fortunate as to have been elected Governor in 1883 and possessed the veto power. I take it for granted that every act of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly—this "bad lot" which Mr. Kohler voted for, Mr. Sherman and Mr. Foraker will not repudiate. I invite scrutiny of the journals of the Senate and the House, and an examination of the acts which they passed. Let us know what they were—those evil measures which this "bad lot" passed. My own opinion of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly can be briefly stated. It is that, judged by the results of its action upon the statute books, it was one of the wisest, if not the very wisest body of legislators ever convened in Ohio for the making of the laws of our State. Let me read from a recent number of the Pittsburgh *Labor Tribune* what this Legislature did for the labor interests of the State:

"Several letters have been received of late asking what measures in the interests of labor were passed by the last Legislature. As this is a matter of importance, we would say that so far as we can now recollect, the following comprises the list of laws passed bearing directly upon labor: First—To allow co-operative enterprises to incorporate under the laws of the State. Second—To increase the number of mine inspectors from two to four. Third—To increase the penalties for the violation of the provisions of the mining law. The old law provided for a penalty of not more than $50; the new laws provide for fines to be not less than $50. Fourth—To invest mine inspectors with powers of sealers of weights and measures. Fifth—To create the office of 'Inspector of Work-shops and Factories,' with a force of three assistant inspectors to enforce laws for the proper ventilation of shops and factories. Sixth—To allow suits to be brought against corporations at any place where they do business, instead of at the headquarters of the company, as designated in their articles of incorporation. Seventh—To provide methods by which disputes between employers and employes may be arbitrated. Eighth—To provide seats for all females employed in stores, manufacturing and mechanical establishments. Ninth—To provide against the employment of minors under the age of twelve years in any workshop, factory or other establishments wherein goods of any kind are manufactured. Tenth—No minor under the age of eighteen years shall be employed in any manufacturing establishment more than ten hours per day, and in no case shall their hours exceed sixty per week. Eleventh—To compel companies, firms and corporations to pay the wages of labor in lawful money, and to prevent the issue of scrip. Twelfth—To abolish convict contract labor in the penitentiary of the State. Thirteenth—To regulate conditional sales of property on the installment plan. Fourteenth—To perfect the labor lien law, giving laborers a first claim upon the property of their employers for wages due.

"It will be seen by the above that if we have not secured all that we have desired in the past two years, we have at least secured more than we have done in all the previous history of legislation in this State. That we have secured so much is due to the fact that the workingmen agitated for and insisted upon such legislation in Ohio, and we are proud of the fact that the Ohio Miners' Association was the first to set the ball rolling in the right direction."

If these are the results of the labors of the "bad lot" in our General Assembly, we suspect that the workingmen of other States would be glad to have the Legislatures vaccinated with Ohio lymph. Besides this, however, at its first session it gave civil rights to colored men equal to those possessed by the whites. Perhaps this in Mr. Sherman's eyes is the bad job of a "bad lot." The Republican party had allowed thirty years of Republican power to pass without doing it. Moreover, it passed a registration law for Cleveland and Cincinnati—a severe registration law. Doubtless this was a bad job of a "bad lot," for in Tennessee the Republican party broke up the Legislature itself by absenting themselves, breaking a quorum, and thus preventing the passage of a registration law—a law which in Tennessee is considered in Republican parlance an obstruction to "a free ballot and a fair count." It submitted, the "bad lot" did, to popular vote an amendment to the constitution changing the time of holding elections in Ohio from October to November, and the Democratic platform calls upon the Democrats of Ohio to support this amendment. The Republican platform is wholly silent upon this point. The course of this silence we are not informed, but are left to infer that it was from one of three causes. First: they may have been so intent upon waving the bloody flag and supporting the "eternal principles of regulation and taxation" that they forgot it; or, secondly, they may have conceived it unwise to make a party plank in favor of any constitutional amendment for fear they might not have a sufficient excuse for refusing to tell whether they were in favor of or against prohibition, as it seems to be a cardinal Republican principle that that which is to be changed in the constitution ought never to be made a matter of party difference—only that which is to be changed in a statute; or, thirdly, it may, after all, have been a plan to keep Ohio as a pivotal State, so that Governor Foster's pathway to the Senate might be rendered easier by creating the necessity for John Sherman as a Presidential candidate in 1888.

The "bad lot" also provided by law for the erection of a gallows in the penitentiary so as to secure privacy of executions. They established a forestry bureau so as to preserve the forests of the State from indiscriminate destruction. They steadfastly refused to give away any part of the Ohio canals. Indeed, it may be said of this "bad lot" that they were satisfied with their own badness, and indulged in no steals or jobs whatever. So far as I am aware, none were even proposed by them. They also provided for the inspection of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Orphans' Home by women. But the good work of this General Assembly, and the most important, in my opinion, was the work of prison reform, which, I hope, has been left upon such a foundation that whoever may be elected Governor of this State the Legislature will never disturb it. I refer Senator Sherman to his neighbor, General Brinkerhoff, the most distinguished advocate of prison reform in the State, and to the Republican members of the Board of State Charities, together with the Republican Secretary of that board, as witnesses of the good work done in this direction by the Democratic Legislature and the Board of Managers appointed by me. The prison was left in the hands of the Democratic party, as one of the guards pithily said, with "nothing but the walls, the prisoners, and the vermin," no adequate supplies of food or clothing being on hand, and with both parties in the State pledged to the abolition of contract labor. The prison has been thoroughly cleansed; the men properly clothed, fed and worked, the incitement of hope has been added by setting apart a small portion of the wages of their labor as a reward for good conduct; while punishment has been made more severe for third-term prisoners, by requiring their detention even for life, unless they reform; cruel punishments have been abolished; education has been encouraged by the establishment of night schools which are attended by more than six hundred prisoners, and a beginning has been made in Mr. Sherman's own city of an intermediate penitentiary, which I am sure that he would be the last man in Ohio, "bad" though the lot be that started the scheme, to give up. That these reforms have cost money is true. The abolition of contract convict labor is an experiment, hopeful, but necessarily costly. To dispense with contract labor altogether means to spend at least $1,000,000 in the necessary building, tools and machinery to do the entire work of the prison on State account. There are four possibilities with regard to prison labor. First, and worst of all, is to leave the men in idleness. Secondly, and next worse, to let the men out to contractors. Thirdly, and what is better, to adopt what is known as the piece plan, by which the contractor pays for the product of the work instead of the work itself. The advantage of this plan is that it prevents the contractor from becoming a tyrant of the men in his desire to exact extreme results for his money. It keeps the men under the control of the State, and insures their being treated with humanity. Fourthly, to have the work of the prison done on State account. That this last is the best plan yet proposed I am convinced, but it will cost a large sum which the State can not advance without increased tax, except by installments from year to year. For this reason, therefore, the plan is adopted and will be steadily pursued, if my judgment is followed, of annually appropriating a moderate sum toward procuring the necessary plant, and thus increasing the amount of work to be done on State account, the residue being on the piece plan.

The General Assembly has also been generous, though not extravagant, in its appropriations for the support of the National Guard. The administration of the Adjutant-General's office has been, since I have been Governor, careful and economical. In 1883 the Republican Adjutant General's contract for coal was $2.29 per ton; in 1884—the first year of General Finley—it was $1.74, and the contract for the present year is $1.52. In 1883 Governor Foster's Adjutant-General contracted for the cost of uniforms at $9.22; in 1884 the contract was made at $8.98, and this year the price is $8.44. During the years of Governor Foster's administration the average annual expenditures for the National Guard, leaving out extra items, such as were caused by riot and the necessity for guarding the privacy of executions, were $73,137.12. During the first year of my administration this increased to $84,063.77, but if the encampments of 1884 had been limited to six days as in the four years previous, the expenditures would have only been $70,747.31. Again is to be remembered that during the years 1882 and 1883 the average attendance at the encampments was over 3,675, and the average cost of per diem, transportation and subsistence was $10.53 per capita for six days. During 1884 the number in attendance was 4,947, and the average cost for the same length of time was $10.27 per capita. That the increase of two days in the length of the encampment was wise, notwithstanding the correspondingly increased expenditures, I leave the public to determine, advised by the officers and men of the National Guard at whose instance it was done. For 1885 the appropriations for the Ohio National Guard have been increased to $111,459—an increase which, in my judgment, is extremely wise, if we are to encourage, as we ought to do, the military department of our service.

But there is a class of legislation against which Mr. Kohler voted, and which Messrs. Sherman and Foraker would rend in their wrath. Four bills were passed by the Sixty-sixth General Assembly in the nature of political municipal reorganizations. Two of these, viz.: the Springfield police bill and the Columbus "ripper," were declared unconstitutional by the very Supreme Court which Senator Sherman describes as having nullified the Scott law by a "partisan judicial decision." How this Court, so severely criticised by our experienced Senator, and which without being called a "bad lot" is evidently considered by him no unworthy associate of the "bad lot," could have arrived at such results, I leave it to him to answer. The Columbus "ripper" bill was in my opinion, although held unconstitutional, intended to right a grievous outrage and wrong, viz.: the fact that, taking advantage of an accidental majority in the City Council some years ago, the Republican Councilmen redistricted that city so that, however great the Democratic majority might be on the total vote cast, the Republicans would, nevertheless, retain control of the municipal Council. That such a wrong is an insult to the principles of popular government, and amounts to a crime against the majesty of the people, I need not argue. If Messrs. Sherman and Foraker think that the present distribution of the wards in the city of Columbus is such as ought to be maintained at the Capital City, I invite them to say so. A third act of this character was the act creating a Board of Aldermen in the city of Cleveland, which resulted in the election of seven out of nine Republican Aldermen—a sad mistake for a "bad lot" to make when engaged in partisan legislation, but a mistake, nevertheless, copied from a Republican model, for the Republican party themselves passed a law creating a Board of Aldermen in the city of Cincinnati many years ago, and have ever since maintained it in force in that city. The last act of this kind is the taking from the Mayor of the city of Cincinnati the power to appoint police, and conferring it on the Board of Public Works in that city, another act drawn from a Republican model, for it must never be forgotten in Ohio that when George W. C. Johnston was the Mayor of Cincinnati, and was possessed of this power of appointing police, the Republicans took it away from him and gave it to Commissioners appointed by Governor Rutherford B. Hayes. It must also not be forgotten that a Republican Supreme Court—not a partisan tribunal, for, of course, no Republican Supreme Court can ever render a "partisan judicial decision"—sustained the constitutionality of this law, as Mr. Sherman will find by referring to 29 Ohio State Reports, page 102—the case of the State on the relation of the Attorney-General vs. Samuel F. Covington et al. I had the pleasure of taking part personally in the argument of this case on the successful side; I have some knowledge, therefore, that that case was not tried before a partisan Court, and the decision in response to my argument was not a "partisan judicial decision." Perhaps Mr. Sherman's idea of a "partisan judicial decision is a decision made by a Democratic Court. It seems to be a Republican principle that whatever the Republicans do is right, but whatever the Democrats do, even if of the very same character, is wrong. Right to appoint Key and Akerman; wrong to appoint Garland and Lamar. Right to take the police power from a Democratic Mayor and give it to the appointees of a Republican Governor; wrong to take it from a Republican Mayor and give it to the choice of the Democratic people. Right to decide the Pond bill unconstitutional, and prevent the collection of a great amount of taxes from the public treasury as was done by that decision; wrong to decide the Scott law unconstitutional. Wrong in Ohio to take police power from the Republican Mayor of Cincinnati, but right to do so in Massachusetts only a few weeks after, as has been done by the Republican party in the Bay State since the Ohio Legislature adjourned. Oh, consistency! thou art a jewel! but perhaps the Republican party does not indulge in such luxuries.

But it is said that the expenses of the Democratic Administration have increased. Let us see. First, we reduced the state tax last year one-tenth of a mill. In the next place, the average annual expense of Governor Foster's administration for four years, after deducting all extraordinary appropriations of every kind, was $2,542,345.47½. The annual average expenses of my two years' administration, rejecting the extraordinary expenditures caused by flood, riot and the building of the Toledo Lunatic Asylum and the like, have been $2,513,251.98½, showing an annual saving under a Democratic administration of $29,093.48½. The comparison exhibits still more striking results when Governor Foster's last term is compared with my first term, for the average annual expenses of Governor Foster's last term, rejecting as before the cost of the Garfield statue, rebuilding the Imbecile Insane Asylum, the Toledo Lunatic Asylum and the Simon Kenton monument, were $2,633,661.29; while the average annual expenditures of my administration were $2,513,251.98½, making a saving of $120,409.30½. But it is said that the Sixty-sixth General Assembly was wasteful in permitting an increase of local indebtedness.

This statement is not borne out by the facts, which facts, however, are difficult to get at, for the reason that many of the statutes passed by the Republican Legislature before the Democratic triumph of 1883, failed to state the amounts authorized under them, so that, from the statute books alone without further information not easily accessible, a comparison can not fairly be made. Rejecting the refunding of the bonded debts of the city of Cincinnati, authorized in 1880 and again in 1885, the local debts permitted during the last six years are as follows:

1880	$2,564,853 02
1881	3,609,775 91
1882	3,289,735 00
1883	3,310,030 26
1884	2,638,869 48
1885	7,421,116 00

If, from the local indebtedness in the year 1885 there be rejected the amounts rendered necessary by the decision that the Scott law was unconstitutional, and by the Cincinnati repaving bill the sum will not vary materially from the amounts allowed by the General Assembly in previous years. These figures are taken from the face of the statutes. They include bonds issued to pay debts, and, except in the case of Cincinnati, to refund earlier bonds. Attorney-General Lawrence, who has been carefully over this ground, tells me that in the eighty-seven counties, exclusive of Hamilton, the additional local debt, or debt exclusive of refunding, permitted in Governor Foster's last two years, was $6,350,100, and for 1884 and 1885 $6,44[illegible],217. It must not be forgotten here, too, that this local indebtedness is not the result of party legislation, and while all good citizens deplore the increase of the public debt in any portion of the State, Senator Sherman and Judge Foraker must produce the statute and point out the particular act creating this local indebtedness, which the Governor ought to have vetoed had he possessed the power, or their mouths are closed against making any complaints on that score. As their candidate for Attorney-General did not see fit to make this fight in the General Assembly, they have no right to make it now, or at least they must point out some act he ought to have voted against. Is Mr. Sherman ready to go to Troy and complain of the law allowing the issue of bonds for their new Court house, or to come here to Hamilton on the same errand, or to go to St. Clairsville expressing a like complaint, or to Toledo or Findlay? Would he stop the water-works at Ravenna, or the rebuilding of the Hamilton County Court House, because such improvements necessitate an increase of local indebtedness?

Fellow citizens: Three candidates for Governor are presented for your suffrages; Dr. Leonard, who argues for Prohibition; your humble servant, who believes in license, and Judge Foraker, whose party is authoritatively stated to be not for and not against Prohibition, and who, by taking this position, is put into the place of the sandwich man of politics, and who is under obligation to carry (as other sandwich men do) a placard to be read over the Rhine in Cincinnati against Prohibition, and another behind to be read in Oberlin for Prohibition.

Mr. Sherman indicts the Supreme Court of Ohio for having nullified the Scott law by a "partisan judicial decision." "They promised the liquor dealers a decision refunding the tax collected, but got out of this by another partisan decision. * * * By their acts the Scott law is a dead letter, and according to their partisan judicial decisions there is no power in the Legislature to either prohibit or tax the sale of liquor."

And his astonishing and shameful remedy is to nullify these so-called "partisan judicial decisions" by the election of Republican Judges that will construe the constitution of the State on the side of "temperance and good order." There was once a Sherman in Ohio, and his name is dear to every lawyer in the State, who, adorning the bench of the Supreme Court of Ohio, would have scorned to have been chosen for the purpose of deciding in any particular direction, and who, if elected, would have refused to sit in a case in which he had expressed a previous opinion. This great and good man's son now unblushingly appeals for the election of a partisan judiciary and challenges the present Court for partisanship whose conduct is in the highest degree creditable to that dignified and impartial body, because it so scrupulously avoided the suspicion or appearance of partisanship. What did the Supreme Court of Ohio do? How did it treat the Scott law question? That question has been before it four times. First, in the case of King vs. Cappeller, it refused to decide because the question argued was not presented by the record. See 44 O. S. 218. Second, in the case of Butzman vs. Whitbeck, 41 O. S. 253, it decided that the Scott law was a license law so far as it provided for a lien on real estate, and unconstitutional to that extent, and refused to decide whether it was unconstitutional in any other respect, because the question argued was not presented by the record. Thirdly, in the case of the State vs. Sinks, 41 O. S. 345, the question being at last presented by the record, the Court held the Scott law wholly unconstitutional because, in legal effect, it was a license law, without deciding (because the law did not require it) whether any other law could be passed for the taxation of the traffic in intoxicating liquors; and fourthly, the Court has decided in a case, which is still pending on a petition for rehearing, that the money paid under the Scott law can not be recovered back.

One of the ablest and purest men in Ohio, a member of the Supreme Court, who was largely concerned in these decisions, has since they were rendered, gone to his long account. I pause from the current of political debate to indulge for a moment in the sorrow I feel at the loss of one of the best lawyers of the present age; one of the truest friends, and one of the noblest gentlemen in Ohio—Judge John W. Okey.

On this record I claim for the Supreme Court of Ohio the indorsement of every just and right-thinking man in the State. It has proceeded with dignity and acted with prudence and wise judgment. It has rendered no "partisan judicial decision" whatever. It remains for the new Court, to be created by the people, if they indorse Mr. Sherman's speech, to indulge in what he prophesies will be the result of their action, viz: the construction of the Constitution of the State in favor of what he calls "temperance and good order;" whereas if the Democratic party succeed in electing their candidates for Judges, the Constitution will be construed in accordance with law, and not by any partisan rule whatever. The Constitution of the State of Ohio, requiring taxation to be upon property, according to its money value, forbids, by a strong implication, the arbitrary taxation of any of the functions of property. The taxation of the sale of liquor is just as constitutional, and just as unconstitutional, as the taxation of the sale of a farm or a railroad. The Supreme Court of the United States has twice decided that the taxation of the sale of property is a taxation of the property itself. Brown vs. Maryland, 12 Wheaton, 419; Welton vs. Missouri, 91 United States, 275.

It is familiar law, as every lawyer knows, that under the law of wills the gift of the income arising from property is a gift of the property itself. For these reasons it has always seemed clear to my mind that this taxation of the sale of liquor, as if it were an entity or substantial thing apart from the liquor itself, the power to levy, which was not supposed to exist in Ohio for more than thirty years after the adoption of the present constitution, can not be sustained without an amendment of the constitution.

The real question at issue is that of prohibition or license. The character of the Scott law as a license, in morals if not in law, would be at once visible if it were proposed to tax every house of ill-fame or gambling house $200 or any other arbitrary sum; and that the Scott law as a temperance measure was ineffectual, was shown by its results. It did not diminish the amount of drinking in the State. It repealed the Democratic legislation of 1854, and by permitting the sale of liquor to be drank on the premises, it had the effect, as Allen O. Myers well said in Toledo in 1883, "of chartering every man who was willing to pay $200 for the privilege of manufacturing drunkards." The good point of the Scott law, if it has one at all, is its character as a revenue measure—not that it promotes morality, for it does not promote morality except "for revenue only." Considering the real question in Ohio, then, as being between prohibition and license, whether that license be in the form of a Scott law or permitted by an amendment to the Constitution, the Democratic principle is plainly stated in the platform of our party.

We are opposed to sumptuary legislation and in favor of licensing the traffic in intoxicating liquors. We believe in self-control, and that the true remedy against the temptations of liquor-drinking is to make happy homes; and that personal liberty should not be destroyed by law, except where its exercise is always wrong. No man seeks to license houses of ill-fame or gambling-houses simply because the wrong in such cases is in the use and not in the abuse; but the traffic in intoxicating liquors is the legitimate subject of license, because the use is beneficial and only the abuse injurious and destructive. That which Christ and St. Paul encouraged and Mohammed discouraged; that which the great Popes and the great reformers—the Leos and Gregories, Luther and Calvin—indulged in; that which Shakspere and Goethe and Cerventes used, and Burns defended in song, the wine of Ohio which Longfellow has celebrated in immortal verse, wine which has been in common use by the most sober of nations, and has furnished a daily drink to the most civilized of people, which Kaiser Wilhelm and many other ancients in health and life, is not always an evil even as a beverage. But it is liable to abuse and therefore we propose to regulate it by license, to give it the sanction and protection of law, subject to conditions requiring the venders engaged in this traffic to behave themselves, to keep decent houses, and to keep them in proper neighborhoods, and we propose to charge the traffic a fee for the privilege of carrying on the same, graded in proportion to the amount of business done, as a compensation for the burdens and injuries of its abuse. The Sixty-sixth General Assembly would have submitted to the popular vote a license system but for the application of the great Republican principle that whatever a Republican proposes is right, but when suggested by a Democrat is necessarily wrong, which prevented three Republican members of the Lower House from voting for the amendment when enough Democrats were present to give it the necessary three-fifths votes, because the Democratic party would get the glory.

Three Republicans, Burnett and Hawley, of Cleveland, and Peet, of Cincinnati, voted for the license amendment, when not enough Democrats were present to pass it. They were loud-mouthed advocates of license then. But when every Democrat was in his seat and the full tale of sixty votes were recorded in the affirmative, sixty-three being needed for its passage, these three Representatives being present refused to vote. The Republican caucus dictated this evil course, and they followed in blind slavery to the party behests.

Fellow-citizens of Butler County, if the Democratic party succeed in this election and secure the necessary three-fifths majority of the Ohio Legislature, a constitutional amendment, permitting the license of this traffic—the most salutary and wisest scheme ever devised for its regulation—will be submitted for the popular vote in 1887. If the Republican party succeed in securing a Republican Legislature, which Mr. Sherman tells us will give us "wise temperance laws," and Republican judges are elected who will construe the Constitution of the State, not in accordance with its meaning and intent, but upon what Mr. Sherman calls the side of temperance and good order," the result will, no doubt, be reached either to reverse the decision of the Supreme Court against the Scott law, and collect the uncollected taxes of 1883 and 1884, or to pass another law, of which the Scott law is a sample, and submit another prohibition amendment for which the action of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly gives us the precedent. Between these alternatives, as between Scylla and Charybdis, the Republican party hope to secure the emoluments of office within the State of Ohio, thankful for so little now that the nation has been lost to them.

Judged by its results so far as ascertained, prohibition seems to be a failure. In Maine, where it has been on trial the longest time, the reports of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue show that the number of persons paying special taxes as retail and wholesale dealers in spirits and malt liquors in all for the year ending April 30, 1881, was 916; year ending April 30, 1882, was 1,036; year ending April 30, 1883, was 1,098; year ending April 30, 1884, was 1,095. In Iowa, in 1881, 4,797; in 1882, 4,534; in 1883, 5,437; in 1884, 4,322. And in Kansas, the State of St. John, where, if anywhere, virtue ought to be enforced by law, in 1881, 1,227; in 1882, 1,546; in 1883, 1,998; in 1884, 2,071. Prohibition may be enforced, doubtless, to the extent of destroying the manufacturing establishments in Ohio. Every brewer, distiller and malster may be compelled to emigrate to Kentucky or Indiana. The grain, rye and wheat out of which whisky and beer are made, may be produced in other States. The hoops, staves, glassware and other necessities of the traffic, may be furnished in other lands, but trafficking will continue in Ohio as long as the citizens of Ohio crave drink, and that they will crave drink as long as human nature continues under its present conditions, is absolutely certain.

But, say our distinguished adversaries, license has been twice defeated. Yes; by small majorities. In 1851 by a majority of 8,952. In 1874 by a majority of 7,286. On this theory, however, what becomes of the "eternal principles of taxation and regulation?" The scheme of the "regulation and taxation of the liquor traffic" was submitted to the people under that name in 1883, and received less than 100,000 out of a total vote of 721,000 votes. Since 1883 taxation and regulation has been dubbed "the eternal principle," on the same theory, I suppose, that it is said, "hope springs eternal in the human breast," because the small vote given for it in 1883 indicates an eternal clamor for its adoption without success. The real question, as I said before, is prohibition or license, and the party who is not for or against prohibition is the party of the Laodiceans, of whom St. John wrote:

"And unto the angel of the Church of the Laodiceans write: These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God:

"I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So, then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth."

Fellow-citizens of Butler County, one further thought and I shall retire: The last General Assembly submitted for adoption by the people a constitutional amendment, which if it prevail will result in holding our future annual State elections in November. The Democratic State Convention adopted a resolution in favor of this project. According to the present constitution every vote which is silent upon this subject, or which is both in the negative and the affirmative is counted as a negative vote. This renders it extremely difficult to adopt any amendment to the constitution of Ohio. The importance of the amendment is seen and recognized by all. Ohio was the corruption ground of the last Presidential election. To save the State from a repetition of such disasters, the intelligent attention of every voter to the form of his ticket is necessary to carry this amendment. Do not forget to record your vote in the affirmative, so that Ohio may cease to be a pivotal State, and our suffrage may be relieved from the pressure which all felt in 1884.

I have thus at length submitted my reasons for asking for a renewed expression of your confidence. Believing that the Democratic party is the party of progress, reform, good government, an independent and unbiased judiciary, with the greatest possible liberty of action consistent with good government, wise economy and wholesale reform, I invoke your suffrages in behalf of our candidates.

POLITICAL NOTES.

——Mr. J. B. Foraker seems to be in favor of passing another unconstitutional law and fixing the Supreme Court to support it.—*Cleveland Plain Dealer.*

——John Sherman's keynote of the Ohio campaign is still echoing over the country in lively competition with some last century funeral dirges.—*Philadelphia Times.*

——The Republican leaders and newspapers in Ohio are worried terribly over the fact that many Republicans, tired of the double-dealing of their party on the temperance question, have determined to vote the Prohibition ticket this fall.—*Woodsfield Spirit of Democracy.*

——John Sherman was so busy belaboring the ghost of twenty years ago in his speech that he forgot the Republican position or his own on the silver question. Governor Hoadly, on the contrary, speaks right out on this question, as on that of license.—*Boston Post.*

——The Republican candidate for Governor of Ohio has been very properly dubbed "Little Breeches" Foraker. He is so impoverished intellectually that he still clings with a death-grip to the "doctrine" of the bloody shirt, and finds comfort in nothing else.—*Vincennes (Ind.) Sun.*

——The Republicans of Ohio put the temperance issue into the present campaign as a strong card, but Foraker, their candidate for Governor, now wants to withdraw it. Hoadly, however, says board the play, the game must go on, and appears to hold all the trump cards.—*Buffalo Times.*

——Judge McIlvaine, who has on no previous occasion declined a nomination to the Ohio Supreme Court, has now stepped down from the Republican State ticket. In the first thrill of excitement over the speeches of Messrs. Sherman and Foraker the Judge was unable to distinguish between enthusiasm and goose flesh.—*Philadelphia Record.*

——The laws passed by the last Legislature need no defense. They are wholesome and have the merit to benefit the poor as well as the rich. The laboring classes who have been neglected by Ohio law-makers in the past, have had wise and judicious measures passed directly in their interests. The late Democratic Legislature passed no laws that needs an apology.—*Cleveland Plain Dealer.*

——If the state of things at the South is one-tenth as bad as Senator Sherman makes it out to be, and to have been for years and years, what have the Senator and his Republican friends been doing ever since the era of reconstruction? They had the President, Congress, the State Governments, the army, the courts—and yet they did not protect the negro. Why was this thus?—*Philadelphia Record.*

——Congressman McKinley, in a speech delivered a few days ago, tries to read the Democrats a lecture on Civil Service reform, and sneeringly charges the Democrats with being after the spoils. Now, what are the Republicans after? What did Bill McKinley ever do to "reform the Civil Service?" He has been in politics and in Congress for a long time. How many Democrats has he ever recommended for office?—*Cincinnati Enquirer.*

——The Republican leaders of Ohio can not see an inch beyond their noses, it appears, and fail to perceive the weak point of their adversaries and the chance to raise a live issue in the commercial power and political corruptions of the corporations. They have therefore commenced threshing over old straw on the subject of the bloody shirt and the war issues which were *res adjudicata* five years ago.—*Pittsburgh Dispatch.*

CANDLEMAS DAY.

The Literature of the Weather Superstition Associated with the Ground Hog.

February 2, or Candlemas Day, a religious holiday known in the Church calendar as the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin, is also known as "ground-hog day," and is generally known throughout the United States as the day which forecasts the weather for the succeeding spring. The origin of the weather superstition and of its connection with Candlemas is difficult of explanation. A popular belief, says Prof. W. P. Jones, to the origin of which the memory of man can not reach, objects to sunshine on this day. The Latins said:

Si Sol splendescat Maria purificante
Major erit glacis post fictum quan fuit ante.

The Scotchman of to-day says:

If Candlemas is fair and clear
There'll be twa winters in the year.

The French have a rhyme of similar import, and so have the Germans, and no doubt the people of other European countries. It is quite impossible to say in how many countries our old friend, the ground-hog, or some of his kind, performs on this day. We all know of his programme how he wakes up and comes out of his winter bed to look around the world again. If he can not see his shadow he plays about, knowing that his winter sleep is done, for spring is near at hand; if, on the contrary, his shadow is visible, he crawls back again into his hole and covers himself up for another six-weeks' nap. In Germany it is the badger who goes through these gymnastics; in France and Switzerland it is the marmot; in England the hedge-hog. The Scandinavian fables the bear waking up in like manner, and seeing the sun shining into his den, whereupon he turns over and goes to sleep again, knowing the winter is only half gone. There are no persons who believe in the ground-hog superstition more than the negroes of the Southern States, who seem to have brought the fable, with their tales of "B'rer Rabbit" from the shores of Africa. It is a curious custom how a natural history fable like this could appear simultaneously in three continents, and repeat itself interminably through the ages. It is not because it has a foundation in exact truth, as one may easily prove by noting absolute weather conditions on this and succeeding days for a few seasons. And yet people go on believing in the fable, and repeating old saws about it, such as "The farmer would rather see a wolf in his barn than the sun on Candlemas Day;" "As far as the sun shines in on the 2d of February, so far the snow will drift in on the 2d of May," and so on. The only real foundation for this popular belief seems to be the general truth that pleasant weather in February in temperate latitudes is apt to be followed by a change and a chilly spring. Such an occurrence rouses the canny Scotchman even to some not overpious utterances, for he says:

Of a' the months in the year,
Curse a fair Februeer.

And his cousin of Wales is even more emphatic in the matter, saying:

The Welshman would rather see his wife on her bier,
Than a fair Februeer.

—*St. Louis Globe-Democrat.*

ABNORMAL ANIMALS.

Some of the Interesting Specimens Lately Discovered.

The expedition undertaken by Mr. Caldwell (who was aided in his equipment by funds from the Government Grant Committee of the Royal Society) is perhaps the most interesting, because the animals which he has gone to study are of large size and already more or less familiar. The Ornithorhynchus and the Echidna are hairy quadrupeds (mammals) peculiar to Australasia, which differ from all other hairy quadrupeds in having, like birds, but a single aperture to the exterior for the intestine and the urine genital canals, and in having the skeleton of the shoulder-girdle and some other features of structure similar to those of reptiles. Like those of reptiles, their bodies are comparatively cold, instead of being kept to a definite "blood-heat" (100° Fahr.) as are those of all other mammals. It had often been reported, and some kind of evidence had been given to support the statement, that these strange beasts lay their eggs like birds and reptiles, instead of retaining the egg-like structure within the body and allowing it there to develop to a certain condition of maturity as do all other hairy quadrupeds. One of Mr. Caldwell's objects was definitely to ascertain whether these animals lay eggs or not, and, of more importance than that, to examine minutely the whole history of the growth in the egg, and to compare it on the one hand with the corresponding development of birds and reptiles, on the other with that of ordinary hairy quadrupeds or mammals.

Mr. Caldwell has found out all about the eggs of these animals and collected them in quantities. The Echidna lays a single egg, which she then carries about with her in a pouch formed by a fold of skin on the ventral surface of the body, similar to the kangaroo's pouch.

The duck-mole, on the other hand, lays two eggs at a time and does not carry them about, but deposits them in her nest, an underground burrow like that of the mole. Naturalists are awaiting with great interest Mr. Caldwell's account of what goes on inside these eggs while the young one is growing there; that is to say, an account of the differences and resemblances between the structures which gradually arise in these mammals' eggs and those which are familiar to us as occurring in the case of the common fowl.—*E. Ray Lankester, in Popular Science Monthly.*

THE MARKETS.

CINCINNATI, September 14, 1885.

LIVE STOCK—Cattle—Common	$1 50	@ 2 50
Choice Butchers	4 00	@ 4 75
HOGS—Common	3 65	@ 4 00
Good packers	4 10	@ 4 40
SHEEP—Good to choice	3 00	@ 3 50
FLOUR—Family	4 00	@ 4 15
GRAIN—Wheat—Longberry red	90	@ 91
No. 2 red		@ 90
Corn—No. 2 mixed		@ 45¼
Oats—No. 2 mixed		@ 27
Rye—No. 2		@ 58½
HAY—Timothy No. 1	12 00	@12 50
TOBACCO—Common Lugs	8 25	@ 9 60
Good Mediums	10 00	@14 75
PROVISIONS—Pork—Mess	9 75	@ 9 87½
Lard—Prime steam	6⅞	@ 7
BUTTER—Fancy Dairy	15	@ 18
Ohio Creamery	24	@ 25
APPLES—Prime	1 25	@ 1 50
POTATOES—per barrel	1 40	@ 1 50
NEW YORK.		
FLOUR—State and Western	$3 40	@ 3 75
GRAIN—Wheat—No. 2 Chicago		@ 85¼
No. 2 red	92¼	@ 92¾
Corn—No. 2 mixed	48	@ 50
Oats—mixed	26	@ 43
PORK—Mess	10 00	@10 50
LARD—Western steam		@ 6 47½
CHICAGO.		
FLOUR—State and Western	$4 50	@ 5 00
GRAIN—Wheat—No. 2 red	83	@ 83¼
No. 2 Chicago Spring	79½	@ 79⅝
Corn—No. 2		@ 43½
Oats—No. 2	25¼	@ 26
Rye		@ 56
PORK—Mess	8 80	@ 8 90
LARD—Steam	6 22½	@ 6 2[illegible]
BALTIMORE.		
FLOUR—Family	$4 50	@ 5 00
GRAIN—Wheat—No. 2	85½	@ 86¾
Corn—mixed	48	@ 48⅜
Oats—mixed	28	@ 29
PROVISIONS—Pork—Mess		@10 75
Lard—Refined		@ 7¾
CATTLE—Medium	3 50	@ 4 00
HOGS	6	@ 6⅞
INDIANAPOLIS.		
Wheat—No. 2 red		@ 88
Corn—mixed		@ 38
Oats—mixed		@ 24½
LOUISVILLE.		
Flour—A No. 1	$4 15	@ 4 35
GRAIN—Wheat—No. 2 red		@ 89
Corn—mixed		@ 46½
Oats—mixed		@ 29½
PORK—mess		@10 [illegible]
LARD—steam		@ [illegible]

SIBERIA.

Family Life in the Russian Convict Settlement.

My village-chief was silent, and shook his head doubtfully. The fact was, the nearest village was ten miles away. The man was satisfied with himself and his family, satisfied with his live-stock and his crops, and satisfied with his taxes, and over-population was apparently the only thing which he and his peers conceived needed to be set right. On this point we should remember that not nearly all the land is yet taken up, and that many of the farms are as large as, and sometimes larger than, the most extensive German manors. Even a spoiled American farmer would be satisfied with such an area. In the midst of these extensive estates, stands the spacious log-house, surrounded with barns and sheds, which, possibly, are not large enough. Hardly anything is large enough for the Siberian. I have made personal confirmation of this greed for extension and space in the towns, where it is often carried to excess; thus I have seen parlors where the mirrors and sofas could be counted by the dozen. In bright contrast with the stereotyped complaints of the farmers concerning the too thick population is the fact that they are all proud of having a numerous progeny. The farmer loves his land, his cattle, his summer and fall, but he loves above everything a large family, while, notwithstanding his prejudice against strangers, he lives in the perfect conviction that the country needs men, and he governs his conduct accordingly. In every other country in the world there are foundling-hospitals; in Russia they are numerous, but in Siberia there are none. If a mother is not able to take care of her child, she will offer it to the nearest farmer, and he will be as glad to have such an increase in his family as if it were a fine colt foaled to him.—*Dr. Alfred Brehm, in Popular Science Monthly.*

—S. B. Barger, of Brownsville, Ore., has on exhibition at the post-office of that city a curiosity in the shape of a natural bow that has elicited the examination of the people in that vicinity. It is a vine maple about eight feet in length, has the curves of an ordinary Indian bow, and, strange to say, is already strung with a slender limb that grows out of one end into the other so perfectly that at first sight it would be quite difficult for one to detect at which end the limb began. The bow is about three inches thick and the string part is about one-fifth of that thickness, and is strong enough to shoot an arrow 200 yards.—*San Francisco Examiner.*

—The *Courier Journal* says the sales of tobacco in Louisville will this year foot up between 120,000 and 130,000 hogsheads, and Louisville now controls more than half the leaf tobacco produced in the West.

IT is reported that female dentists are gaining ground in Germany. They seem to be taking root in this country.—*Oil City Derrick.*

SUPERLATIVE goodness must be very hard on the hair, for, you know, the good generally die young.—*Judge.*

THE inventor of a flying machine, if he doesn't soar very high, has the satisfaction of being sore when he drops.

"GOOD gracious," said the hen, when she discovered the porcelain egg in her nest, "I shall be a bricklayer next."

PORCELAIN finger-rings are the latest fashion. They are probably intended for China-wear.

AT what age does a man get bald. That depends altogether on the nature of his wife.—*Kentucky State Journal.*

A BROOKLYN lady now calls her pet cat "Sheolen" instead of Helen.—*Brooklyn Eagle.*