

port from our consul general at Havana,
under date of July 30, last:

"During the first half of the year 1891
Havana received 140,000 bags of flour from
Spain and the other ports of the island
about an equal amount, or, approxi-
mately, 280,112 bags. During the same

7

Dick J. Morgan,
Tore Haute,
Indiana.

July 12, 1887.

Only little more than a cen-
tury has elapsed since
the Congress of the Unit-
ed Colonies declared
the American Colonies to be
free and independent
States.

The birth of the United States
of America - the Government
of which we are all
Citizens, and which we
all love so dearly, may
be traced to that formal
Declaration of Independence
for the support of which,
under the protection of
Divine Providence, ^{our Fathers} pledged
their lives, their fortunes
and sacred honor.

This act only infuriated
the British Lion - George
III with increased vigor

and tyranny prosecuted
the war already made
holy by the blood of the
patriots of Lexington
and Bunker Hill. For
eight long years our fathers
fought for Independence.
Freely they in compliance
with their mutual pledge
did they sacrifice their
fortunes, on many fields
they gave up their lives,
but true to their pledge,
never did they sacrifice
their honor!

Finally Victory came,
Cornwallis surrendered
to Gen. Washington and
Great Britain acknowldg-
ed American Independ-
ence.

Marvellous as this
Victory, as the achiev-

ment of Independence,
there was a greater
task to perform.

The yoke of England
had been thrown off.
The Colonies had re-
pudiated the government
of Kings, but a greater
achievement was now
before them; - that of
establishing a free govern-
ment.

With dangers of every
kind around them, with
difficulties rolling moun-
tain high before them,
with the gravest, most
solemn, and sacred work
ever committed to the care
of mortal man our fathers
began the work of founding
a government based on
the sacred will of the people.

4.

Our fathers under the Guidance
of Almighty God, were equal
to the great emergency before
them.

Animated by an undying
love for liberty, and
an eternal hatred for
tyranny, devoted as martyrs
to the cause of the People,
inspired with the su-
preme love for free-
dom, our fathers
created the Federal
Constitution to preserve
and perpetuate freedom,
the priceless boons
of Liberty and Inde-
pendence.

The government crea-
ted by this Constitution
was founded on the
principles set forth

in the Declaration of
Independence.

The first enumerated
was that all men are
created equal. Second,
that life, liberty, and the
pursuit of happiness are
the unalienable rights
of man. - Third, to se-
cure these rights, Govern-
ments are instituted
among men. - Fourth,
that Governments derive
their just powers from
the consent of the govern-
ed.

6.

The Constitution was the
work of the people, and
they were recognized
as the true source of
all political power.
Self-Government was
to have a fair trial,
recognized as the true prin-
ciple.

The crowned-heads of Eu-
rope laughed at the
idea of self-government,
denied that the people
were the true source of
all political power, and
still maintained that they
were crowns let down
from by a golden
chains from heaven
on their heads.

These haughty mon-
archs predicted the
speedy downfall of

the free government of
America, and the enemies
of freedom, looked for-
ward to the day when the
Government of the people, for
the people, and by the people
should perish from the
earth.

Divine Providence permitted
many of those who were
early patriots in resisting
British tyranny, and who
faced the dangers of battle
and the hardships of war to
achieve our independence
to assist in organizing,
and adjusting, and con-
trolling the New Government.

By this means the new
Government

These men knew what
their free Constitution
had cost. In its de-

feuse, for its preservation they
were willing to offer their
fortunes and their lives.

We may judge of their
love of Country by their
acts, and their written
testimony handed down to
us, in their speeches and
writings.

Go read the Farewell
address of Gen. Washington;
peruse the writings of
Thomas Jefferson; Study
the speeches of John Adams;
Examine the works of Ham-
ilton & Madison - ponder
over the words from the
pens and lips of hundreds
of men whose strong arms,
clear heads, and patriotic
hearts did so much for the
Cause of humanity and
you will find that

their ^{own} great inspiration, their
unisonal prayer, was that
this Country might remain
free, happy, prosperous, and
happily united.

By a free country they
meant - free institutions -
free thought - free speech -
free press - free religion,
free Education.

Then men prayed for
the prosperity of the coun-
try - that America might
grow rich, strong and
influential, and in the
broadest sense of the term,
she might become the
greatest Nation on the
Globe. More than this,
the people individually,
should prosper, the
toiling Millions should
have more to eat, more

to wear, more to read,
More of them should own
their own homes, and
these homes should be
finer, and better furnished,
and the occupants more
independent, than ~~the~~
any other people in
the world: That the people
should be happy in the
enjoyment of all the
glorious and sacred
privileges of free citizen-
ship: - That the people
should be united - uni-
ted in the support of all
our free institutions - united
in their hatred to oppression
and in their love for liberty,
united in their unswerving
attachment to the Consti-
tution, united in their
determination to main-

tain order, and enforce
the laws, united in that
glorious sentiment, voiced
by the immortal Webster -
"Liberty and Union, now
and forever, one and
inseparable"!!

Such were the sentiments,
the desires, and hopes
of the founders of this
government, ~~and that~~
shall these hopes be
realized? The people must
answer this question. They
must answer it at the
polls. The people are
the true sovereigns, but
this sovereignty must
speak in the exercise
of the ballot.
Next November

We will all be called
upon to exercise that
sovereignty, and as we
cherish the rich heritage
of liberty, independence
and free institutions,
so we should deposit
~~there~~ our ballots with an
eye single to their preser-
vation.

Which one of the two
great political parties
shall be supported?
Every political party
like the denomination
of the Christian Church
has its creed to which
individual members
subscribe. A political
party is an association
of individuals for the
advancement of certain
principles of civil

will defined
government, some public
policy, or some public
measure.

Let us then carefully
examine the Democratic
 Creed, and see what
principles a man endorses
when he votes the demo-
cratic ticket.

One of the first great
questions that attracted
the attention of the states
men and the people
was the relation be-
tween the Federal
~~Government~~ and the
state governments.

What powers had the
Federal Government
and from what source
came these powers? Did
they come from the
states, as such, or
from the people?

From the discussion
of these questions origi-
nated the term - "State
Sovereignty". With this
term boldly inscribed
on their banner, the dem-
ocratic party entered the
political arena.

What does State Sovereignty
Mean?

It means that each state is a free and independent government. That there are 38 sovereignties in this nation instead of one. - That we are 38 nations instead of one. - That the people in 1787, did not ordain a constitution creating one Government, that the Constitution was merely articles of Confederation of a compact entered into by the States; that States rights are inconsistent with national authority, that national authority is inconsistent with state rights.

16.

That the states are distinct, separate, and independent nations, That all the powers of the Federal Government emanated from the states and these powers were loaned to the National Government for a certain specific purpose, and could be demanded at any time; - That the United States of America was the mere agent of the State Legislatures; The agent of 38 principals, bound to obey the will of each one.

St. Matthew.

Ch. 5 - 29. If thy right eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: For it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not thy whole body be cast into hell,

And if thy right hand causeth thee to stumble cut it off.

Ch. 6 - 24.

"No man can serve two masters," - will one and love the other, or will hold to one and despise other

"Ye can not serve God and mammon."

Ch. 7. -

Do men gather grapes
of thorns or figs of
thistles?

Every tree that bringeth
not forth good fruit
is hewn down and
cast into the fire.

By their fruits ye
shall know them,

Many will say unto me
in that day, Lord,
Lord, did we not
prophecy in thy name
and by thy name
cast out devils, and
by thy name do many
mighty works?

And then will I profess
unto them I never
knew you.

Depart from me ye
that work iniquity.

A servant is not
above his lord.

The Stone which the
Builders rejected,
The same was made
the head of the corner

Ye Blind guides which
strain out the gnat and
swallow the camel,

Woe, unto you scribes,
Pharisees, hypocrites!
for ye are like unto
whited sepulchers which
outwardly appear beau-
tiful but inwardly
are full of dead

men's bones and all
uncleanliness

Even so ye also out-
wardly appear righteous
unto men but inwardly
ye are full of hypocrisy
and iniquity.

W. H. English at
State Conv. Tenn;
What shall we
do to be saved?

But, notwithstanding this most creditable showing, there stands the discouraging, undisputed and indisputable fact that although it was the largest Democratic vote ever polled in the State, it was still less than a majority, and although we have occasionally succeeded at elections before that by a plurality vote, yet we have not had a majority at any general election since 1872, and then only by a few hundred votes on Governor. Under this state of facts, if I did not clearly see an avenue leading to success, I might be tempted to ask, "Men and brethren, what must we do to be saved?" We want to do something more than count over the same Democratic vote with the same result. We don't want to hold an election for fun—there is no fun in it, as I can testify. We want to win, and to win we want more votes than we have had at previous elections. Thinking, practical men will pause and earnestly consider where the additional votes are to come from, and whether they can be had without the sacrifice of any essential Democratic principles.

READ THEM TOGETHER.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM,
August 2, 1882.

The Democratic party is now, as it has always been, opposed to all sumptuary legislation, and it is especially opposed to the proposed amendment to the constitution of Indiana, known as the prohibitory amendment, and we are in favor of the submission of said proposed amendment as well as other proposed amendments, to the people, according to the provisions of the constitution for its own amendment, and the people have the right to oppose or favor the adoption of any or all the amendments at all stages of their consideration, and any submission of constitutional amendment to a vote of the people should be at a time and under circumstances most favorable to a full vote, and, therefore, should be at a general election.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM,
August 9, 1882.

That reposing trust in the people as the fountain of power, we demand that the pending amendments to the constitution shall be agreed to and submitted by the next Legislature to the voters of the State, for their decision thereon. These amendments were not partisan in their origin, and are not so in character, and should not be made so in voting upon them. Recognizing the fact that the people are divided in sentiment in regard to the propriety of their adoption or rejection, and cherishing the right of private judgment, we favor the submission of these amendments at a special election, so that there may be an intelligent decision thereon uninfluenced by partisan issues.

The Democrats object to Prohibition;

1st they say it interferes with a man's personal liberty, his inherent and inalienable right.

2nd That the Prohibition will close the saloons, but men will still drink all they want at home and will drink more,

These answer each other.

The law we now have made by Democrats - prohibits in a measure.

The traffic has been
unrestrained for
hundreds of years.

2nd They say, Because
a thing is abused, you
should not abolish
marriage may be
abused.

Democratic authority
in favor of Prohibition.

(Back of Book)

1st. They say we dodge
the Prohibition issue.

Poison contained in
distilled liquors.

A man is not allowed the personal liberty of selling unwholesome or tainted meat, and yet the liquor man raises a great hue and cry against you because you wish to decide, even, whether he shall promiscuously sell, make, and issue out intoxicating liquors to our citizens, mixed, nearly always, with the following, and many other, deadly poisons, viz: strychnine, stramonium, belladonna, calculous, tobacco, aquafortis, prussic acid, oil vitriol, bitter almonds, poppy seed, worm seed, alum, copperas, sugar of lead, nightshade, fusil oil, cockroaches, fishberries,

buckeye bark, buckeyes, sulphuric acid, caustic, potash, brucine, nux vomica and blue vitriol. It does look like a hardship on the liquor man, doesn't it? And yet it is going to be voted on by the people, and at a special election, and don't you forget it.

Democrats who Voted for the Prohibition Amendment.

[In the General Assembly of 1881.]

SENATORS.—Brown, of Jackson and Jennings; Coffey, of Brown, Bartholomew and Monroe; Davidson, of Marshall and Fulton; Davis, of Parke and Vermillion; Heffron, of Daviess and Greene, and Marvin, of Boone and Clinton.

REPRESENTATIVES.—Messrs. Aiken, of Sullivan; Bryant, of Clinton; Buskirk, of Monroe; Cummins, of Wells; Kain, of Adams, Wells and Jay; Mitchell, of Washington; Moody, of DeKalb; Shields, of Jackson; Sumner, of Marshall; Teter, of Clay, and Weaver, of Carroll.

Prohibition Not a Party Test.

Speech of Hon. Benjamin Harrison.

The charge that the Republican State platform declares in favor of prohibition is untrue, whoever makes it. * * * It is expressly declared that the issue is not a party one, and is not to be made such. The right of private judgment upon the question is left wholly unimpaired. The most violent anti-prohibitionist or anti-suffragist in the State can stand on that platform, provided, only, he is willing to have a popular vote on the questions, and to let the majority rule.

No Man's Party Standing Involved.

Senator Harrison's Speech, August 12, 1882.

We recognize freely that there are prohibitionists and anti-prohibitionists who are Republicans; that there are suffragists and anti-suffragists who are Republicans, and we don't intend that any man's standing in this party shall be in the least impaired whatever his views on these great questions may be.

Fundamental Principles.

Article 1, Section 1, Constitution of Indiana.

"All power is inherent in the people; and all free governments are, and of right ought to be, founded on their authority, and instituted for their peace, safety and well-being. For the advancement of these ends, the people have at all times an indefeasible right to alter and reform their government."

Article 1, Section 31, Constitution of Indiana.

"The inhabitants of the State" shall not be restrained "from instructing their representatives."

Article 16, Section 1, Constitution of Indiana.

"If in the General Assembly so next chosen, such proposed amendment or amendments shall be agreed to by a majority of all the members elected to each house, then it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to submit such amendment or amendments to the electors of the State."

Article 16, Section 2, Constitution of Indiana.

"If two or more amendments shall be submitted at the same time they shall be submitted in such manner that the electors shall vote for or against each of such amendments separately."

[Hon. Robert Dale Owen, in Constitutional Convention.]

"A law shall not be submitted to the people, but the Legislature shall take the responsibility of their own acts. But in the organic law it is a very different matter. We do not propose that the organic law shall be in the power of the Legislature."

*Democratic Authority
on Rights of People*

Douglas' "Popular Sovereignty"

Hendricks'

delivered at Hartford City, Blackford county, March 17, 1869, said:

"I had expected to return to my private and professional pursuits; but when asked to come before the people to take my place beside the brave and honorable men who recently resigned their seats in the Legislature that they might vindicate the doctrine of our institutions—the right of the people to be heard on any great proposition of changing their government—I could not resist the call."

The call was so imperative, the danger threatening this high right of the people was so imminent, it seems, that he could not refuse to champion "the right of the people to be heard on any great proposition of changing their government." It was not enough, in 1869, that the Legislature should attend to this important duty, and with righteous indignation he exclaimed:

"Who are these one hundred and fifty men at Indianapolis (the Legislature) who, without your approval and sanction, will undertake to change the form of government, and deny that you, citizens, shall have a voice upon the question? Who are they? Are they titled lords or kings, who hold the rights of the people in the hollow of their hands? Is this the condition in which we find ourselves to-day? No, indeed! They are your agents—your delegated servants—to do what you want done, and not what they may want done, except so far as it is in accordance with the will of the people. In Indiana there are 300,000 voters, and it is claimed that all the wisdom, virtue and intelligence of our glorious State is concentrated in the one hundred and fifty men at Indianapolis. [Laughter.]

What right have they to say. "This is a new proposition, and if we submit it to the people it will be lost by 50,000, and therefore, we will fasten it upon you without submitting it to the people?" Where did they get that right? Kings claim to rule by the grace of God; but here, in America, men hold office and exercise power by the permission of the people. He who undertakes to exercise power against the will of the people is a tyrant and a usurper, whether he be in Congress or in the Legislature." [Applause.]

dom does. He said, on the occasion referred to above:

"I say it is ~~revolution~~ to tear up the foundations of our government against the will of the people, and without giving them a chance to express their views."

The Sentinel, in 1869, took much the same ground as did Mr. Hendricks and other prominent Democrats. In an editorial on the 29th of March of that year, it said:

"Believing that great and fundamental changes should only be made in our institutions by the consent of the people, at a fair and open election, the Democratic party of Indiana will stand by their principles, no matter at what cost."

anxiety the Indianapolis Sentinel, of March 11, of that year, cries out:

"Are the people dogs, that they should permit Legislatures and congressmen to fix the politics and make the laws of the people?"

That is exactly what Democracy would like to see prevail in 1882. The Sentinel was strengthened in its position in 1869 by Hon. Joseph E. McDonald, who took the same view, and by the following dispatch sent from Washington immediately after the Democratic legislative bolt to defeat the Fifteenth amendment:

"It is the highest right of the people to vote upon every proposition to change their constitution or to revolutionize their domestic policy."

(Signed) "T. A. HENDRICKS.
"W. E. NIBLACK.
"WM. S. HOLMAN.
"M. C. KERR."

Four days later a dispatch was received by the Sentinel from Daniel W. Voorhees, saying that he wrote the above message, had signed his name to it, and forwarded it himself. So Mr. Voorhees was of the same opinion in 1869. It is Republican doctrine that

a special election. On the 6th of March, 1869, in an editorial defending the Democratic bolt against the fifteenth amendment, the Sentinel said:

"And now they (Republicans) will attempt to evade the great, overshadowing and direct issue, by talking of expenses; and commence by saying that it will cost \$1,000 in each county to hold the special election."

This is in the nature of a reciprocal prophecy. By changing the word in the parenthesis it reads well in 1882:

"And now they (Democrats) will attempt to evade the great, overshadowing and direct issue, by talking of expenses; and commence by saying that it will cost \$1,000 in each county to hold the special election."

There can not be a
fair decision under
present position;

Because

1st Four amendments
One Rep. can represent
my views on all,

2nd Ratio of Representation
is different.

2. Under the present apportionment law there can be no expression of the will of the people of the State in the choice of members of the General Assembly in either house. The ratio of representation in the House of Representatives is 4,510, and in the Senate 9,020, yet there are representative districts where less than 2,000 voters elect a member; and others where 7,000 and more elect but one. Again, there are senatorial districts where less than 6,030 voters elect a senator; and others where twice that number elect but one. A voter in many districts has twice the weight in the House of Representatives as he has in many others; in several others, three times the weight of others, and in still others, four times the weight of his fellow-citizens in others. There is one set of eleven districts with an aggregate voting population which entitles them to seven members of the House only, and yet they are allowed eleven; while there is another set of eleven districts with an aggregate voting population that entitles them to fourteen members, and yet they have only eleven. In these twenty-two districts alone, there is a disparity in the voters of over thirty thousand; and yet they are equal on the floor of the House! In these twenty-two districts alone, the amendments may be carried or defeated with thirty thousand majority in favor of the losing side. It is fit that a party which has given 1,536 voters in Sullivan, Knox and Greene counties a right to elect a representative, and denied the right to 4,140 in Jay, should insist to-day that the fate of the amendments shall be settled finally in the House of Representatives.

There can not be a
fair decision under
present position;

Because

1st Four amendments
One Rep. can represent
my views on all,

2nd Ratio of Representa-
tion is different.

2. Under the present apportionment law there can be no expression of the will of the people of the State in the choice of members of the General Assembly in either house. The ratio of representation in the House of Representatives is 4,510, and in the Senate 9,020, yet there are representative districts where less than 2,000 voters elect a member; and others where 7,000 and more elect but one. Again, there are senatorial districts where less than 6,030 voters elect a senator; and others where twice that number elect but one. A voter in many districts has twice the weight in the House of Representatives as he has in many others; in several others, three times the weight of others, and in still others, four times the weight of his fellow-citizens in others. There is one set of eleven districts with an aggregate voting population which entitles them to seven members of the House only, and yet they are allowed eleven; while there is another set of eleven districts with an aggregate voting population that entitles them to fourteen members, and yet they have only eleven. In these twenty-two districts alone, there is a disparity in the voters of over thirty thousand; and yet they are equal on the floor of the House! In these twenty-two districts alone, the amendments may be carried or defeated with thirty thousand majority in favor of the losing side. It is fit that a party which has given 1,536 voters in Sullivan, Knox and Greene counties a right to elect a representative, and denied the right to 4,140 in Jay, should insist to-day that the fate of the amendments shall be settled finally in the House of Representatives.

is fit and becoming that a party that
could give 1,330 electors the right to
choose one representative in the counties
of Ripley, Dearbon and Franklin, and
allow only one to Laporte. Cass, Putnam,
Jefferson and Randolph each, with a voting pop-
ulation in every one of them of more than six
thousand, and in Laporte and Cass of more than
seven thousand, should now clamor for the right
of these local constituencies to prevent an ex-
pression of the voice of the people upon the
amendment. It is fit that such a party should
then style itself the Democratic party. Why,
democracy means the power of the people. A
democratic government is one where the power
of the government is simply the power of the
people. A democratic party is one that is sim-
ply the organ of the popular will; that seeks to
find that will on all occasions, and to follow it
implicitly under all circumstances, in so far as it
may touch the affairs of the government. But
this Democratic party seeks to steer clear of the
people; to prevent the fair expression of their will;
to keep public measures from them altogether;
and in every possible way thwarts their wishes,
distrusts their honesty, and disparages their cap-
acity to determine questions that belong only
to them. Such a party is not democratic, what-
ever else it may be. The pretense it makes to
democracy is a false pretense and a sham. It is
a Judas Iscariot to real, genuine democracy,
which it betrays, abuses, crowns with thorns,
and sacrifices. When it talks of submitting the
amendments to the people in the election of
members of the General Assembly, it knows that
it has already forestalled and made such pre-
tended submission a delusion and a snare by its
apportionment of representation in both houses
of that body. Under that apportionment the
amendments may be carried, or defeated, with
more than sixty thousand majority in the State
against the successful side. The election of
members will, therefore, be no expression of the
will of the people of the State. It will
represent only inequality of electors, un-
constitutionality, and Democratic fraud.
The people must, therefore, look to
the election of the Republican State
ticket for an instruction that, like the hand-writ-
ing on the wall of the palace of the ancient ty-
rant of Babylon, will bring fear to the heart and
trembling to the limbs and souls of the sham De-
mocracy—this modern Belshazzar of parties that
sits drunken with harlots of parties that
denies and moralities of that age, and speaking
great lies, and blaspheming the name of the
Most High God.

3rd Takes from the
People their rights
under the Constitution.

4th Betrays lack of
confidence in the
people.

