9-1877

Mount Vernon Democratic Banner Supplement September 21, 1877

THE CAMPAIGN.

SPEECH

—OF—

Judge A. G. Thurman,

Delivered at Marion, Ohio,

Saturday Afternoon, September 22, 1877.

Speech of Hon. A. G. Thurman.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: This is the first time that I have appeared on the stump this year, and as it is somewhat late in the campaign, this fact has occasioned some remarks in the Republican press.

JUDGE THURMAN WAS NOT SMOKED OUT.

Very shortly after my announcement to speak here to-day, a leading Republican paper of the State contained a short paragraph, saying that Senator Thurman had at length been smoked out, implying that the Senator was unwilling to take the stump, and that it was necessary to treat him as you would an old coon—smoke him out [laughter]; about the same time there appeared in the letter of a Republican correspondent at Washington City another statement, and that was that Senator Thurman was kept off the stump by a conspiracy among certain prominent Democratic leaders in the State, who wished to keep the Senator as much in the shade as possible. You see that these were statements utterly contradictory, the one implying that he didn't want to speak and had to be smoked out, and the other that he was extremely anxious to speak, but was not permitted to do so. Now I have only to say, in reply, neither statement has the least foundation in fact. There is no man in this State more desirous to see Democratic success than I am, and no one is more willing to work for its success than I am wherever and whenever I see that any labors are necessary. But I have not thought that it was very necessary for me to be in a hurry to take the stump this year. If there were no other reason for it, it would be sufficient to say that there are a multitude of speakers already in the field, young, able-bodied, able-minded and vigorous men; and the people are quite likely to hear from them as much talk as the people desire to hear.

TRIUMPH OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

But again, I have a notion that this year the people have pretty much made up their minds to do their own thinking, and whether there shall be much or whether there shall be little stump-speaking, and indeed had there been none at all, the result would be precisely the same. That result will be, as I believe, the complete triumph of the Democratic party this fall. [Great applause.]

CONGRESSMEN NEED THEIR VACATION.

Now, while I am on this subject, it might be as well to say further, as this matter has been made somewhat personal to myself, that Ohio and Indiana are the only States that I know of in which it is expected a Senator in Congress, after having labored for months in the discharge of his official duties at Washington, shall spend the remaining months in the still more exhausting labors of the stump. In other States it is supposed that when a Senator has discharged his duty in a session of Congress as he ought to do that at the end of that session he needs rest; that he needs also some little time to attend to his private affairs and that he needs some time for study, that he may be prepared to resume his public duties at the succeeding session of Congress. That is the idea every-where except in Ohio and Indiana. For some years past it seems to be taken for granted that a member of Congress needs no rest, that he needs no time to attend to his private affairs, and that God will give him all the information he needs, whether he studies or not. [Laughter.] Now, my friends, I have not found it so. I have found that at the end of a long session of Congress, and measurably so at the end of a short session, I did need rest; that I did need time to devote to my private affairs; and I have found that I did need time for study, for I have never yet been able to obtain knowledge except by hard labor—that is, by hard study. I don't know but I owe you an apology for speaking of this matter at all, but I assure you that I have done so with reluctance, for I am not accustomed to speak about myself. It is the last subject about which I desire to speak; and were it not that it seems necessary to prevent misapprehension—a misapprehension that might exist without the explanation I have made—it is for this reason alone that I have said what I have said in regard to myself; and having said that, I dismiss that matter.

I come to speak to you to-day, my friends, in a very plain manner without any attempt whatever at rhetoric. I care nothing for words as mere words. I care nothing for language except as it clearly and forcibly expresses ideas and states facts; and it is because I have some ideas that I wish to express to you, and some facts that I wish to state, that I am here at all to speak. And first of all I desire to say something of

THE LATE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

Not of the Convention at St. Louis to which my friend, the Chairman, was pleased to allude, for I have no tears to shed over that, but of the late Presidential election and of the result of that election.

Now, I take it for granted that the most of you believe, I feel certain that a large majority of the people of the United States believe, I know that I believe that Samuel Tilden was elected President of the United States at the last election. [Applause.] But we all know that he was not inaugurated. We all know that his competitor, General Hayes, was inaugurated, and we all know, more or less, some more and some less, the means by which Mr. Tilden came to lose his inauguration and by which General Hayes gained it. But now, if a Democratic speaker alludes to the subject, he is forthwith assailed by Republican orators and the Republican press with a great show of affected indignation. They say that he is attempting to spoil the Judiciary and bring the Judiciary into disrepute. As if the Electoral Commission was a part of the Judiciary of the United States! and as if these men, who had no language too severe when they were condemning a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States for the Dred Scott decision, and attributed to the Judges the basest motives that could influence the human heart, and kept up that denunciation for many long years, and kept it up at the risk of the peace of the country and the very union of the States! I say it comes with poor grace from them to talk about injuring the fame and standing of the Judiciary. But there is no trouble in that charge. The Electoral Commission was bound to act judicially, I admit; but it was no part of the Judiciary of the United States.

Again, they say: But you bring the Presidential office into disrepute. Well, my friends, if the Presidential office is brought into disrepute by the Presidential chair being obtained through usurpation and fraud, I can not help it, and you can not help it; if that chair does not appear as high and noble an object of ambition as it was when Washington and Jackson occupied it it is not our fault, my Democratic friends.

HAYES' TITLE TO THE PRESIDENCY.

Now, in respect to the title of General Hayes to the Presidency, I admit, every one admits, that we are bound to recognize him as the President of the United States. He has been declared President in a mode—that is to say, by the Congress of the United States—which I believe to be constitutional. He is, therefore, to be considered President of the United States. But does that seal our mouths as to the means by which he became President? A decision of a Court may bind every body, but if that decision was erroneous are we not at liberty to point out its errors? If a decision was obtained by fraud, are you not at liberty to condemn the fraud? Nay, is it not a duty to condemn it? And if President Hayes, however pure he may be; however well-meaning he may be; however perfect his title to the Presidency must now be considered—if he has obtained that high office by usurpation and by fraud of Canvassing Boards, then, as good citizens; then, as friends of our free institutions; then, as lovers of truth and justice, we are bound to condemn the means by which that result was achieved. And now,

WHAT WERE THOSE MEANS?

Why, they were in the first place, the most glaring usurpations and frauds in Louisiana and Florida that ever disgraced any country that had an election system. And in the second place they were the refusal of the Electoral Commission to go behind fraudulent certificates of the Returning officers and look into their usurpations and into their frauds.

To explain this—and I must do it briefly, for I want to be brief in what I have to say to-day:

First, look at Louisiana. How were the votes of the election counted? They were counted first by the Judges of the Election, just as they are counted in Ohio by your Judges of Election. Then the returns were sent to county officers called the Supervisors of Registration, by whom they were sent to New Orleans to a Returning Board, and that Returning Board then canvassed those returns and declared the result.

Now the law of Louisiana provided—and I shall not stop here to inquire whether it was a constitutional law or not, though I am perfectly convinced it was not—the law provided that the Judges of Election or the Supervisors of Registration should send up with the returns a certificate that a fair election could not be held in a particular precinct, or in a particular parish (as they are called there, which is the same as our county), if such were the fact, and that this certificate be fortified by the oaths of two respectable citizens of the precinct or parish; that then the Returning Board might proceed to investigate whether there was a fair election in that precinct or parish.

They were to hear testimony on the subject, and if convinced that a fair election was prevented by fraud or violence or the like, the vote of that precinct might be cast out. Now mark it, that Returning Board had no more power to cast out the vote of a precinct, or a parish, unless these certificates came up from the county or precinct officials, than you had to cast it out. The sole jurisdiction to cast it out depended upon these coming with the returns, the certificate of the precinct officers, supported by the affidavits of two respectable citizens, certifying that a fair and peaceable election had been prevented. Without that certificate the Returning Board had no more authority or right to throw out the vote of a single precinct, than you, in the State of Ohio, had to interfere and throw out the vote of a precinct or county in Louisiana. And yet, what did that Returning Board last fall do? Without a single one of those certificates, which the law required in order to give them any jurisdiction whatever; without a single one of them sent up with the election returns, they threw out the votes of county after county, precinct after precinct, until they threw out from six to ten thousand votes that had been cast for the Tilden Electors, and by that means created an apparent majority for the Hayes Electors, and gave the Hayes Electors an election certificate. Not only did they do that, but they cast out precincts all over the State in order to give the Republicans a majority in the Legislature. Now, it was by that usurpation and fraud that that Returning Board disfranchised the people of the State of Louisiana, deprived the majority of the people of that State of their choice for President, and gave the certificates to men who were defeated by from six thousand to ten thousand votes. And then when the proof, the most abundant proof, was offered at Washington before the Electoral Commission, which sat there to try the case, that Commission, by a vote of eight to seven, declared that they would not look into the testimony at all. Wouldn't you think it strange if the Court that occupies this bench should call a case for trial and begin the trial by announcing that it would not hear any evidence? Wouldn't you think that was a strange mode of judicial procedure in a Court? Wouldn't that Judge hear some notes of condemnation in this goodly county of Marion? I fancy he would—notes that he would not forget for a lifetime. And yet that, in substance, is precisely what took place at Washington last February, when the amplest proof of the usurpation and frauds of these Returning Boards was offered to be brought before the Electoral Commission, and the door was shut in the face of the proof, and those who offered it were told by the Commissioners, "We won't look behind the certificates of the Returning Boards"—of those men who had been guilty of these frauds and this usurpation.

But let us turn now to Florida. There was another Board, a Canvassing Board. The majority of the votes cast in Florida were for Tilden Electors. I never yet have seen a man who denied that fact. Then how could the vote of that State be thrown for Hayes? Why, because the Canvassing Board of that State did precisely what the Returning Board of Louisiana did, cast out enough Democratic votes to give the Hayes Electors a majority. Had they any right to do that? Why the Supreme Court of that State, composed entirely, I believe, of Republican judges, certainly a majority of them, solemnly decided in the case of the Governor of that State who was elected at the same election, that the Canvassing Board had no authority whatever for casting out votes, that they were bound to count the votes that were given, and declare the result according to the votes that were given; and hence although that Canvassing Board gave a fraudulent certificate that the Republican candidate for Governor was elected, yet the Supreme Court compelled them to reverse that decision, and the Democratic candidate who was elected received the office, and just in the same way as the Democratic candidate for Governor was elected, so was the Democratic candidate for the office of President elected, and so the decision of the Supreme Court of that State, the highest Court in the State, that this Canvassing Board must count the vote for the Democratic candidate for Governor as would have compelled them to count in the Democratic Electors, but they paid no heed to that decision, but threw out enough Democratic votes to give the State to Hayes. Why? Because Hayes could not be declared elected without he got all the votes of Florida and all the votes of Louisiana. Without those States Mr. Tilden had 185 votes, and needed but one more. It was necessary then to give Hayes all the votes of Louisiana and all the votes of Florida, and they did it. And now, my friends, whether the Electoral Commission decided correctly or incorrectly in saying they would not go behind the returns, yet the fact remains that it was by the usurpation and fraud of the Returning Boards of those two States that Rutherford B. Hayes is seated in the Presidential chair to-day. And now I do say to any one who tells me that I ought not to

STIR UP THIS MATTER,

I say to him I will—so long as my feeble strength will enable me to do it—I will stir it up, for if the people of this country can condone such a thing as that; if they can forgive it, I ask any man of you when will you ever see a man inaugurated as President in a close election if fraud and usurpation of the subordinate officers of the States, the Canvassing Boards of the States, can prevent his being elected? Why, if that can be done in Louisiana and Florida, it can be done in Ohio. Who has the counting of the votes here in Ohio? The Secretary of State, in the presence of such Sheriffs as see fit to attend, yet the counting is done by the Secretary of State. Why, suppose that at the last election Mr. Bell, the Democratic Secretary of State at that time, and having the canvassing of those votes for President and Vice-President in Ohio, had seen fit to follow the same plan of the Returning Boards of Florida and Louisiana, and had thrown out enough Republican counties in Ohio to give the votes of the State to Tilden, would we ever have heard the last of it? Would we ever have heard the last of it? [Laughter.] Wouldn't the loudest voice of condemnation have gone out denouncing the man who had been guilty of that usurpation and fraud? And yet Mr. Bell had just as much right when he canvassed the vote of Ohio last fall for President and Vice-President to throw out Ashtabula and Geauga, and half a dozen more counties on the Western Reserve, and declare the Ohio vote for Tilden, as had those Returning Boards to throw out 6,000 or 10,000 votes in Louisiana and hundreds of votes in Florida and give the votes of those States to Hayes.

Now, my friends, if the people overlook these things, if they don't

CONDEMN THEM

In the only manner in which they can condemn them, by their votes; if they don't set the seal of their condemation upon them it will be in vain in the future to hope for an honest declaration of the Presidential election wherever the vote is at all close between the candidates. Therefore it is, my friends, that I consider it a matter of the first importance to call your attention to this to-day that you may bear it in mind, for unless you condemn this great injustice it will grow into a precedent, and will be followed hereafter, and, instead of the President being made by the votes of the people, he will be made by the frauds and usurpations of the servants of the people, whose duty it is to count the votes.

RASCALITY REWARDED.

But how does the Administration treat those who were guilty of those frauds and usurpations? I am very sorry to say that it treats them just exactly in the opposite manner in which they should be treated.

Who was the head and front of that Returning Board in Louisiana? A man named James Madison Wells—I am sorry his parents christened him with so good a name as James Madison. He was the head and front of it. What was he? Surveyor of the Port of New Orleans, one of the most lucrative of the Federal offices in the gift of the President within the State of Louisiana. Did he lose that office? Did his frauds and usurpations cause him to lose that office under this civil service reform Administration? Has it carried Civil Service Reform sufficiently far to take hold of this corrupt man and shake him out of that office that he holds by the commission of the President? Not the least bit of it. But Mr. James Madison Wells still holds that office, and, if report is true, not a few of his followers and hangers-on are also provided for.

Who is the next man? One Anderson—General Anderson, I think, he is called. He was a Confederate General, but that don't make any difference in these latter days, when the lion and the lamb lie down together in office. [Great laughter.]

How is it with him? Has he any influence with the Administration? Why, according to statements I have seen, and which I have never seen contradicted, and believe to be true, nearly all that man's family are in office in Louisiana.

How was it with those men in Florida—those bogus Hayes Electors, who took their title by the rascality I have mentioned and cast their vote for Hayes? Have they been frowned upon by this Civil Service Reform Administration? Not at all. But a few days since I saw an announcement in a New York paper that one of them had been appointed to an office of high trust and honor.

Well, now, if the Government does not condemn and frown upon men who employ such means, such frauds and usurpations as I have named, how much more necessary is it that the people should do it, and by their sovereign voice declare that such things shall take place no more?

TRIUMPH OF THE DEMOCRATIC PLAN.

Leaving this subject, I want to congratulate you, my Democratic friends, upon the success of Democracy and Democratic principles. We lost the Presidency by the means to which I referred, but although we lost the officers, the cause for which we contended has triumphed in the most remarkable manner. [Applause.]

What did we tell those Republicans for ten long years since the close of the war? What have I, in my humble way, from this very spot, speaking where I now speak, said to you year after year since 1865? Why, that if you wanted peace and prosperity and good-will between all the people, white and black, down South; if you wanted quiet and order down there; if you wanted that country to recover from its depressed and almost destitute condition, all you had to do was to let the Southern States govern themselves as the Northern States govern themselves, and it would all be right. What did we hear in answer to this? Ah, those Southern men can not be trusted. So, the first thing was to give the ballot to the negroes in order that the negroes, under the dictation of carpet-baggers and supported by the army of the United States, might govern the whites. And from that time forward, no matter how carpet-baggers plundered and consumed their substance, no matter how much the Republic and its institutions were brought into disrepute, there was but one cry on the part of Republican leaders in or out of Congress, "this is necessary, for the white men down there can not be trusted." We said to them: "Wherever they have been trusted, instantly there is law and order. When finally you trusted them in Virginia, Virginia became as orderly as the State of Ohio. When finally you trusted them in North Carolina, North Carolina became an orderly State; and if you will do by South Carolina and Florida and Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana what you have done by North Carolina and Virginia and Tennessee, you will have just as orderly governments down there, just as peaceable society down there, just as perfect protection of the rights of all men, white and black, down there as they have in North Carolinia, Virginia or Ohio itself. They wouldn't listen to us because the leaders of that party knew full well that it was not by peace and prosperity in the South that the Republican party was to flourish; they knew full well that the moment they were left to govern themselves, as you in Ohio govern yourselves, without the interference of the Federal Government, without the interference of Federal bayonets, that moment the intelligent portion of the people of the country would exercise their natural influence, and then there would be an end to carpet-bag governments in the Southern States, then there would be an end to the Republican party pretty much in the Southern States. That these men knew, and, therefore, they insisted upon the carpet-bag and bayonet governments throughout the South. And do you remember last year what was the staple of their speeches?

SWEET TALK BY RADICAL SPEAKERS.

Mr. President Hayes now refers to a resolution in the platform of the Cincinnati Convention, and to his letter of acceptance, as showing that he intended to be kind toward the people of the South. Did any body hear that kind of talk from Republicans here last fall when they were on the stump in Ohio? I think we might offer a reward for any man who heard that kind of sweet talk last year from a Radical speaker. Not a word of it. Nothing but denunciation of the South. We heard it said, if you leave the Southern people to govern themselves, and especially if the Democratic party succeed, they will inflict upon this country ten times as much evil as the war itself did; that they would pile upon the country the Confederate war debt and make the Government pay a pension to every Confederate soldier, and flood the Treasury with false claims.

Not only that, but that they would kill the negroes, put them down by the bayonet, and there would be no such thing as peace and security in the South any more. And not only were these things sounded abroad, but we saw the bloody shirt held up to the gaze of the people all over the continent; but not one word of this cooing of the turtle-dove that we now hear. [Great laughter.]

WHAT THEY GOT AND WHAT WE GOT.

That is the way it was. Very well. They succeeded in getting the Presidency, but we succeeded in getting our ideas of constitutional law and of good sense and of humanity so strongly into the minds of the people of this country that even the Radical President was compelled, as soon as he was seated—some people say before [laughter]; but as soon as he was seated he was compelled to turn right around and do all that Sam Tilden could have done if Sam had been inaugurated in his stead [Laughter, and a voice "Good." Well, now, I give him credit for doing it, and yet it is a little funny. Is it not strange to see the President sending down a set of fellows there

TO SEDUCE PACKARD'S NIGGERS

Away from his Legislature? [renewed laughter], and by that means ousting Packard from being Governor of Louisiana, when Packard got a thousand votes more than Hayes did? [Laughter.] Ain't that a little strange? and yet you have seen it. I have no doubt but Tilden would have done just the same thing in effect, but not in exactly the same way. Then what a howl there would have been! Then you would have heard that the Democrats had turned out the lawfully-elected Legislature and a lawfully elected Governor. Now, then, let me remark that I have no doubt there are a great many who think that that is

NOT EXACTLY THE FEAST

To which they were invited. [Laughter.] They don't understand it at all. And now Mr. Packard may pack back to the State of Maine with his carpet-bag, where he came from, and his *confrere*, Mr. Chamberlain, from the State of Massachusetts, who had carpet-bagged into South Carolina, and was running the machine down there, who was hustled out pretty much the same way, took his pack and went to New York City to practice law. [Laughter.] By the way, I expect that he will need about all the law that he can learn in a short time in his own case, if what report says is true. [Renewed laughter.] So there it is: Hampton is Governor of South Carolina, and Nicholls is Governor of Louisiana, and every body says there is peace and quiet down there. There has not been a nigger murdered or even scalped [laughter] in Louisiana or in South Carolina since Nicholls got to be Governor of the one and Wade Hampton of the other. All is lovely as this bright day that gladdens this assembly.

And yet it has been said, it was said, that if this thing took place—you were told last fall that if this thing took place, that the whole Southern country would fairly run red with blood. We told them it would not; we said, let those people govern themselves as we govern ourselves in Ohio, and all will be quiet down there. And now when this Administration, against the will of the majority of its party, and against the will of three-fourths of its leading men, as I verily believe, when it has taken this course, when it has adopted this Democratic policy, precisely the results we said would take place have taken place.

And now I give President Hayes credit for this Southern policy, although it is nothing new, but only what we Democrats have been contending for for the last ten years; yet I give him credit that he has seen that he might distinguish his administration—whatever his title to the Presidency might be—by doing a great service to the country, for which he will be remembered with gratitude as long as his name can be remembered. [Great applause.]

CORRUPT ADMINISTRATION.

Well now, my friends, there is another thing that we have been telling these Republicans for a long time—a great many years. I have done my share of it, I am sure; and I don't know how many speeches of mine are in print in which I dwelt upon it until I began to think it was no use to dwell upon it any more; it didn't seem to have any effect. But I was mistaken. Truth has to be repeated a great many times before it makes a lodgment in the human mind, but when we do repeat it and it does fairly lodge, it is like good seed in good soil; it is sure to spring up and bear good fruit.

We said there is corruption in the administration of the Government.

The money of the people is squandered on political favorites: the money of the people is squandered where no services are returned. There is need of a complete and thorough reformation in the Civil Service of the country. That is what we said. We went so far to effect that reform that we actually agreed—I want you to understand that I never agreed to the nomination, but supported the nominee after the nomination was made—we actually agreed to support Horace Greeley for President. That was about as strange a thing as I ever knew except Hayes' policy. [Laughter.] But the Government had become so corrupt, and as it was thought old Horace would make a tip-top reformer, and that he knew all about what was needed, we took his word and voted for him for President. On the other hand, our Republican friends said there was no need of reform. Governor Morton said in his speech at Athens in 1873, I believe it was, that we had the most honest Government on the face of the earth, and what he said there in that written speech I suppose he has repeated a hundred times since, or nearly so; and what he said, the file leader of the party, the ablest man, perhaps, of any of its public men—what he said was taken up and repeated by every body else of the party, that there was no necessity for reform.

"OUT OF THINE OWN MOUTH WILL I JUDGE THEE."

Now, my friends, I want to bring them down to the record. I want to quote, not Democratic testimony at all, but Republican testimony. I can not go into it at large, for I would have to speak for a week if I did that. [Laughter.] I am only going to give you a few specimen bricks, and they shall come out of a Republican hod. They shall not be Democratic bricks, but they shall come from the mouth of a Republican, and no less a Republican than the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States—my friend, John Sherman. I refer to his late speech at Mansfield, and by his own confession I will show that we are in the days of corruption, and that reform is necessary—a reform that will never be complete until the Democratic party gets into power. Now, what does Mr. Sherman admit? He admits that since he became Secretary of the Treasury he has turned 176 persons, employes, out of the New York Custom-house, and has thereby effected an annual saving to the Government of $255,020. Now why did he turn those 176 men out of the Custom-house? Why, because the Government had no use for them; because they did nothing in the God's world but draw their salaries; because they were just a set of hangers-on there—political dependents, fellows to manage Conventions, and ward politicians who were paid out of the Treasury. One hundred and seventy-six loafers of that sort [laughter] drawing nearly a quarter of a million of dollars of your money in a single year, in one single Custom-house. Here is the confession of the Secretary himself. Let us see what he says.

Speaking of the President's order with regard to Civil Service Reform he said in his Mansfield speech:

"Another question of administration promptly received the attention of Presidens Hayes.

"It has been the standing promise of both political parties for fifty years to secure

CIVIL SERVICE REFORM,

Without defining what was meant by this phrase: but old abuses grew and new abuses were devised by which the Civil Service of the Government was largely made an agency to control the action of parties, and to influence the rising or falling fortunes of politicians, while the public service was a secondary consideration. Upon this subject the President had clear and radical views, and has not hesitated, against the opposition of many in his own party, to enter upon the reform of these abuses.

"Whether true or not, it has been believed that the Custom-house in New York, the great agency for the collection of the duties on imported goods, was especially open to these abuses, and that the public interests were sacrificed to the advancement of the political and pecuniary interests of individuals. The President directed that a thorough investigation, free from political bias, should be made there by independent men of both parties, aimed, not at individuals, but at the system itself. It was in the progress of this investigation that he issued the order about which so much complaint has been made. Here it is:

'No officer should be required or permitted to take part in the management of political organizations, caucuses, conventions or election campaigns. Their right to vote and to express their views on public questions, either orally or through the press, is not denied, provided it does not interfere with the discharge of their official duties. No assessment for political purposes on officers or subordinates should be allowed.'

This order was promptly met with denunciation as an invasion of the rights of individuals, and its meaning and purpose grossly perverted.

IN THE WESTERN COUNTRY,

Where our political movements are more free from the influence of office-holders there has always been a strong popular feeling against the interposition of machine politicians. The people here are abundantly able, without the aid of office-holders, to manage their Conventions, caucuses and organizations, and it has always been a matter of complaint, even in our counties and cities whenever rings of office-holders are formed, who are offensively officious in controlling popular Conventions, and, as a rule, such things have not been tolerated. But in the great cities the office-holders are selected not only to be active at the election, or to influence the election, but to run the machinery by which nominations are made and caucuses held. They select Delegates to Conventions, pay their expenses, control their votes, appear as President, Secretary or guiding geniuses of the Convention, and thus the whole machinery of politics is an office-holding monopoly, offensive to the mass of the people, and tending to prevent the just control of political movements by free, unbiased popular opinion."

Aye, there it is.

GLARING ABUSES

Had grown up. Men had been employed because of their political influence, and to do party work and run the machine, and were potential men in the Republican party.

And now the President himself, as the Secretary tells you, sets about reforming that, and thereby incurs the displeasure of men of influence in his own party. But let us proceed. I have spoken only of the Custom-house at New York. What did he do at Baltimore? He turned out fifty-two from the Baltimore Custom-house with an annual saving to the Government of $47,297. Why did he do that? Because here were fifty-two hangers-on in Baltimore who did nothing except to draw this $47,297 every year from the Treasury and put it into their pockets. What did he do in New Orleans? He turned out eighty-nine. Does it not seem strange to you that there should be a single office—a Custom-house—in which there were eighty-nine men doing nothing but getting their pay, and the Secretary when he looks into it ever so slightly, finds there these eighty-nine idlers in a single office, and by their dismissal brings to the Government an annual saving of $95,455?

At San Francisco, he says, the reduction is not complete and he does not give the numbers, but says he has effected an annual saving there to the Government of $73,444, which they have been in the custom of giving away.

At Philadelphia, as he informs us, he has effected an annual saving to the Government of $56,750, and then in Boston an annual saving of $122,740.

So in these six Custom-houses he has turned out so many useless men as to effect an annual saving to the Government in the aggregate of $650,702. Why, my friends, is that the way your money has gone? That is the way it has gone, according to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, was there not a necessity for reform? How long has this thing been going on? The Republicans have been in power for more than sixteen years, ever since the 4th of March, 1861. During nearly all that time the Democrats in Congress were a meager and powerless minority, yet they have tried again and again to bring about reform. They, I know, pointed out frauds and demanded their suppression, but they met with nothing but opposition or evasion. When the New York Custom-house was investigated by a Committee of the Senate some years ago, and the two Democrats on the Committee, Senators Bayard and Cassidy, insisted that it was

A DEN OF CORRUPTION,

They were met by a majority of the Committee, all Republicans, with a white-washing report, the reading of which would make you think the officers of that Custom-house were all saints, and would be canonized as soon as they died. [Great laughter.]

And now the truth comes out, and if, in one single year, $601,000 of the people's money has been stolen, for that, to use a plain term, is pretty nearly the substance of the thing, how many millions have you lost in the sixteen years that the Republican party has been in power?

But, let us proceed. In other offices that he does not specify, forty-eight men were turned out, at an annual saving of $47,154. And then he has dismissed eight appraisers, for whom there was no use, at a saving of $23,500, making a total saving in these few Custom-houses, for remember they are very few of all the Custom-houses of the United States, of $725,356, or nearly three-quarters of a million a year.

Now, let us go right into the Treasury building, itself, at Washington. In that Treasury building there is what is called a Bureau of Engraving and Printing, in which they print the greenbacks, with which so many Democrats are in love, and the graybacks with which our Republican friends are so much in love, and the bonds with which nearly every body is in love, if they can only get them. [Laughter.] They do a part of the printing there. What says Mr. Sherman in regard to that Bureau of Engraving and Printing? He went into office on the 4th of March, and this speech was delivered on the 17th of August. There are five months that he had been in office when he made his speech. What has he done with this Bureau right there in the same building with himself, and that has been in the same building all the time: that has been under the nose and the eyes of every Secretary of the Treasury from the time the Bureau was instituted, during the war, down to this time? It has been under the nose of the President all the time; for it is not five minutes, no, not three minutes' walk from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing over to the White House. What does he say about that? Why, that he turned out, because they were of no use, no less than five hundred and five persons, making an annual saving to the Government of $360,000?. Just think of that! The Government paid more than a third of a million dollars a year to over five hundred persons, and in the very Treasury Department of the Government itself, right under the very nose and eyes of the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States, and that thing going on for years after years! And yet we were told, when we said that there is corruption there, there is a necessity for reform; we were told that it is all demagogism, all an idle clamor of men who are out of office and want to get in. And now, the men who have got in are compelled to admit that what we charged was true, yea, even worse than we ever charged. Before we leave this matter let us call your attention to a report made by the Secretary.

Mr. Sherman appointed a Commission or Committee of experts in the Treasury Department to make an examination of this Bureau, and they made the report which I hold in my hand, and according to their report, not only 505 persons were turned out, as Mr. Sherman has stated, but 591 have been turned out because there was no use for them at all; none whatever; just so many supernumeraries there feeding at the public crib and doing nothing; and that made an annual saving of $423,000, so they have taken $423,000 of your money, year after year, and that, I repeat, right in the Treasury building — right under the nose and eyes of successive Secretaries. And that is not all. What does this Committee say? I have not time now to read much—I wish I had time to read a great deal from it—but I want just to show you that this thing has been going on a long time. They report as follows, among other things: "Our investigation shows that the force of the Bureau has for many years"—"for many years," mark that!—"been in excess of the requirements of the work, and that this was the case even when the work was the greatest. We are informed, and believe, that the force employed in some of the divisions was for a number of years together twice as great as was required for the proper performance of the work, and that in others it was three times as great as necessary." Now I think you can find out a little as to how your money goes—where in one single Bureau of the Treasury Department, right under the eyes of the Secretary and the President, three times as many people were employed as were necessary, and the cost has been growing until it has reached from three to four hundred thousand dollars every year. You can understand very well one of the reasons why you have to pay such heavy taxes, and can understand very well why it is those people cling to the success of the Republican party as they cling to life itself. But I must hurry on. I have been speaking fifty minutes, which is as long as I expected to speak, but as Mr. Converse, whom we intended, is not here, I must go on. I always detest long speeches, but can not help myself to-day. I will be as brief as I can.

Now, that is not all. Brother Sherman tells us that in the rents of buildings he has effected a saving of $58,852 a year, and he expects to do a good deal more in that line. Then he tells us that in a revision of the contracts for the War and Navy Departments one building will, in the end, result in a saving to the Government of $700,000—just that one. And, in the case of the Court and Custom-houses that are being erected, he says he saves $450,000 more, making in these buildings alone $1,150,000. Now, in the name of common sense, I ask how came it that any contract was made for the construction of the War and Navy building that should cost $700,000, nearly three-quarters of a million more than there was any necessity for? Will any body tell me that was honest administration? Will any body tell me that in the construction of these Custom-houses and Court-houses that remained to be constructed it was possible to save $450,000 in a lump if there had been honest administration when making the bargain for the erection of these buildings? Now these things sum up, in less than five months after the Administration began, $2,290,208—if you will correct the Secretary's figures by what I read from this report, it makes over this—nearly $2,400,000.

Well, now, fellow-citizens, if our friend, John Sherman, who has been so long in the public service, so long in the Senate, and who was Chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate for, I believe, not less than twelve or fourteen years, and thereby brought into direct contact with the Treasury more than any other Senator—if he, with a natural disposition to shield his party, is compelled to admit two millions and a quarter of those discoveries in five months, I ask you what would likely be the revelations if the Democrats had taken possession of the Government on the 4th of March last?

Now I give the President and Secretary of the Treasury credit for what they have done—credit for this reform—but I say, just as certain as the sun shines, in my judgment, you never will get one tithe of the villainies that have been perpetrated until there is a

CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATION.

You must change the Administration; you must put in men who have no interest to hide; you must put in men who can go down into the depths of this thing. The Secretary can not do much. He is only one of a great many men. I believe there are about twelve thousand men in the Department of the Treasury of the United States. Not all at Washington, but some scattered here and there. Of course one man can not investigate all of them. You must go down into the depths of it, and you can not get into the depths of it until you put at the heads of all these various Bureaus a new set of men, who have no interest in concealing the truth, but who have every stimulus to seek for the truth until they find it.

But I have dwelt long enough on that, and now pass to another subject. It is a somewhat dry subject to talk about, and yet there is no one that interests you more. I shall have to treat it, necessarily, with great brevity, for I have already spoken as long a time nearly as my strength will permit.

I now invite your attention to some remarks on the subject of

THE CAUSES OF THE DEPRESSION OF BUSINESS

And of the want of employment and labor in the United States. Without alluding to the destruction of capital in the late war, in which thousands of millions of property were utterly destroyed, and just as much taken from the wealth of the country as though it had never existed; without alluding to the circumstances that grew out of the war—of men being a long time withdrawn from the productive industries of life and then returned to such industries—I want to call your attention to three great leading causes, all of which operate upon the condition of laboring men, and some, if not all, of which operate to produce the depression in business that exists,

The first thing to which I call your attention is the effect of the wonderful improvements that have been made in labor-saving machinery, and its effect upon labor. I can not go into detail on this subject, but let me show you what is the general result in the United States, and I now read the opinion of one of the ablest statisticians in the country, and usually one of the most accurate men. He makes this statement after a very full and careful survey and study of the subject. "An estimate by Mr. Atkinson, of Boston, founded on an extensive investigation, is that at present about 90 per cent. of our population, using the improved tools and machines, can produce all that 100 per cent. can consume of the standard articles—food, fuel, clothing, tools, wares, and the like, which constitute the great bulk of our consumption—and can, in addition, produce all that we have yet been able to find market for abroad." Now, just think of it, that with the improvements in labor-saving machinery nine-tenths of the community can produce all that the whole community can consume, and also supply all the markets that, under existing laws, we have abroad. The consequence is that the labor of one-tenth of the country is practically dispensed with, or in danger of being so. That is the inevitable result of it, or would be if it were not for some counteracting influences.

Now, I will give you an illustration or two as samples. First, that of the cotton-mill known as the Boott Mill, of Lowell, Massachusetts. I read from the North American Review, No. 257: "The important fact brought out in this analysis is that ninety operatives (men and women) engaged in the manufacture of cotton in one of the best mills in Massachusetts produced regularly in 1876 with sixteen and a half hours less labor per week more cloth, measured in pounds and of nearly the same quality, than 231 operatives working in the same mill did in 1838." That is, with the improved machinery, ninety operatives, men and women, working sixteen and a half hours less per week, produced more cloth than 231 operatives did thirty-nine years ago.

Now mark it: There were 231 operatives working in that mill who had to be supported. They had need of food, clothing, fuel, light and other necessaries, and to supply these wants required the labor of about 460 persons. But the ninety mill operatives now employed are supported by the labor of about 135 farm-laborers and others.

So you see how the tendency is to throw labor out of employment?

Now let us turn again to some other instances—"results similar and possibly more striking." I read from the same article in the North American Review, page 151: "More striking results are afforded by an analysis of some other American industries. Thus, in the manufacture of boots and shoes, three men working with machinery can do at present what, prior to 1860, would have required the labor of six men to effect. While the individual or per capita consumption of boots and shoes in the United States has probably been more uniform during the same period than is the case with almost any other commodity."

"In the manufacture of straw goods, three hundred hands in one of the largest factories in New England do more with the sewing-machine than what a comparatively few years ago required a thousand to effect when sewing was done by hand. And the steam press turns off four hats to the minute in place of the old rate of one hat in four minutes."

Now, it is easy to see how this increase of production by labor-saving machinery has dispensed with the employment of so many hands, and to see how the tendency of it is to throw human bones and human muscle out of employment. But do not understand me as condemning labor-saving machinery, for there is a great compensation to be noticed. While it has a tendency to throw men out of employment who have nothing in the world but their bone and muscle to give them support; while it has this tendency, it has also a tendency to give more employment by increasing consumption. It does that by lessening the cost of production. It thereby increases consumption prodigiously, and gives to many people—in fact, to the whole community—a much larger share of the necessaries, and in some instances the luxuries, of life, than they would otherwise enjoy. Yet, owing to circumstances, such as this country is laboring under now, the consumption is not so great as it would be in prosperous times, for all are economizing, all wearing their old clothes and living on just as little as they can; so that the increased market for labor ceases for the time being, and laboring men feel the full effect of the competition of iron hands with human hands and human eyes. That is one cause of our condition.

TAXES ANOTHER CAUSE.

Another cause that seems to have been almost entirely overlooked by those who have been addressing the people, so far as their speeches have come under my observation, is on taxes. One of the greatest causes of distress in the country is the burden of taxes which the people have been bearing for many years—the enormous taxes, so great that one is almost afraid to state the amount for fear his statements may appear extravagant. Well, now, let me say to any

LABORING MEN,

For the truth is that every man who engages in any pursuit so as to become a producer is a laboring man—I consider myself a laboring man, and a very hard laboring man—let me say especially to that class of laboring men who have but little property, if they think because they have no property on the tax duplicate they do not pay taxes they are the most deceived men in the world. Why, my friends, so far is that from being the case, that nearly all the taxes in the country, no matter how levied, come down in the end upon consumption.

To use a familiar expression of political economists, "all taxes are paid either out of wages or oet of profits." But taxes are not paid out of profits until wages are reduced so low that you can not pay them out of wages any longer, and you are obliged to take them out of profits—when it becomes so that laboring men would starve if a stop were not put to taking taxes out of wages. How is it that the

CONSUMPTION PAYS THE TAXES?

Let me illustrate it in a very simple way. I will suppose one of you own a store-house across the street. The taxes on it this year are, say $100, and you rent it for $500. I will suppose that next year the tax is raised to $200. What do you do? If your rent is $500, that less $100 tax would leave $400, which you receive net for your house; and we will suppose that was no more than a fair return upon your investment. You must receive $400 net or your investment is not paying you. What then will you do? You go to your tenant and say to him, "Mr. Store-keeper, I rented you this property last year for $500, when I paid $100 taxes on it, so that I received $400 clear, which was no more than a fair return on my investment. Now they have raised the tax on it to $200, and I can not get a fair return on my investment without raising the rent; therefore I must raise the rent to $600." Well, if the store-keeper can not get another room to suit him at a less price, he pays the $600. Then what does he do? He makes up his goods so as to provide for this $100 additional expense. Now, suppose Patrick, who is a laboring man, comes into this store and says: "Mr. Store-keeper, I will be obliged to you for a little muslin for a shirt today?" Now, right in the price of that muslin Pat pays a part of that additional $100 tax, and if he has a good many backs to cover, if he has a wife and children that he wants to clothe decently with a just pride in his wife and children, he pays more tax than the man with half a million dollars, who has nobody but himself to clothe.

Take another illustration. Here is a tax on sugar. Suppose you are a man who has a family consisting of a wife and a half dozen children; and perhaps have a hired hand and two or three domestics about the house. You buy the sugar consumed in your family and pay for it, and in the price lurks the tax imposed by the Government, and you pay just according to the amount you consume. If you consume fifty pounds a year, you pay fifty times as much as the man who consumes only one pound. Thus you see, if you have a family of six or eight children, you are compelled to pay largely to raise this tax, while the rich bachelor, the old hunker, who will not marry a girl, as he ought to [laughter], will in a great measure escape taxation. So that it will be seen taxation comes down on the shoulders of consumption. And as the great body of consumers in every community must be composed of laboring men, ninety-nine one-hundredths of every community being composed of laboring men, you see that in the end taxation comes down on the shoulders of the laborers, and what political economists say is true, that taxes come out of the wages of the laboring men. Therefore I would say to my workingmen friends, who are so eager to get up a new party, that really I have always thought that if there ever was a workingmen's party in this country it was the Democratic party, for ninety-nine one-hundredths of the Democrats are workingmen and always have been. I would say to you while giving your attention to the means of seeking relief from the things that are bearing down upon you, don't forget that of all things that press you the most, one of the greatest is, the enormous taxes you pay are levied by the Federal Government, by the State Government, and by the counties and cities, and townships and school districts until there seems to be no end of the taxing power, and no end to the amount of taxation.

APPRECIATION OF THE CURRENCY ANOTHER CAUSE.

But, my friends, there is still another cause which has been operating in this country and which has been operated with prodigious effect and for a good many years, about which I must speak briefly, I will not speak at length upon it, because most speakers have treated it, though I do not agree with all that has been said, some have exaggerated it a great deal and some have fallen far short of the truth. Yet I shall speak of it because I think it is entitled to great weight. It is one of the causes of the depression of business and financial suffering in this country, and that is the appreciation of the currency. What I mean by the appreciation of the currency is the increased purchasing power of the dollar.

The close of the war found us with nothing but paper money or credits. We had it of all sorts and colors [laughter], and it was a very inflated currency. It has been growing less, and has grown much less than it was at the close of the war; and as it has grown less in amount, the purchasing power of the dollar has increased, until now a greenback which would once purchase fifty cents in gold, will now purchase ninety-seven cents in gold. It has risen forty-seven cents. That is an immense amount for it to have risen. Now, what is the effect of this rise in the purchasing power of the currency? Why, my friends, it is to make it very much harder for every man who contracted a debt when the purchasing power of the dollar was so much less than now, to pay that debt. For instance, if a greenback would only buy a bushel of wheat five years ago, and you gave your note for so many dollars then, and you have to pay it now, and a greenback now will buy, say a bushel and a half of wheat, then you see it takes just one-third more wheat to pay your debt than it would have done if you had paid it five years ago.

This increased purchasing power of the currency, however wise it may be in the end, however beneficial in the long run, it may be for the country to come to a solid basis for its currency, yet in the meantime, while the operation is going on, it is an extremely severe operation, and one that makes it much harder for every man who owes a debt contracted when there was an inflated currency to pay it.

Now, it is for this reason that I never believed in forcing resumption too rapidly. I voted against the Resumption Bill for two reasons. In the first place, because I didn't think there was any wise provision in it to reach resumption; and, secondly, because I didn't think it was right to name a day, and one in so short a time, too, and force resumption by that day. I thought the proper way was to grow up to resumption gradually, and I think events have justified the views I held.

Why, are we not getting to specie payment fast enough? It was but a little while ago when gold was at a premium of 10 per cent., now it is but 3⅛. Is not that getting along fast enough? Is it necessary to put three and one-eighths dollars on every one hundred dollars of debt a man has to pay in order that the Government may resume on the first day of January, 1879? Are we not running toward resumption as fast as we can stand it? I think we can get a solid resumption, one that can be maintained sooner by striking out this first of January, 1879, than by leaving it there. I may be mistaken but my judgment is that if Sherman's resumption—what he calls resumption, trying to resume by the first day of January, 1879—is undertaken and continued, real resumption will fail and our later condition will be worse than our first. That is what I fear. Therefore I think the Democratic party is right in insisting that this fixed day for resumption—January 1, 1879—should be stricken out of the law, that it should be repealed, and that you should not be compelled, although the difference between the greenback and gold now is only 3⅛, you should not be compelled to pay for every $100 you owe $103⅛. Now, my friends, these are the main causes, in my judgment, of pretty much all the depression in business.

There is one other cause that will have that effect to which I have not referred. I must say a word about that, and then I will dismiss you from further attendance. You have heard that silver money was demonetized. That must have sounded pretty strange to you, especially to some of you old men who can not recollect so long back that "the dollar of the fathers," as General Ward christened it, was not the chief legal tender of the United States, and considered good enough for any Government, down until the year of grace 1873; and yet that silver dollar has been demonetized; the old silver dollar and the sudsidiary coins—the half-dollars, quarters, dimes and half-dimes—are, as we know, only a legal tender for five dollars, and such has been the case for a long time, because two one-half dollars are not equal to a dollar. They were made lighter to keep them from being exported, so that for many years, perhaps since 1851, they have not been a legal tender for more than five dollars, yet the silver dollar was alway a legal tender up to the time of the passage of the Revised Statutes, for any amount whatever. And it was under this law making gold and silver equally a legal tender that our debts were contracted, public and private. But when nobody suspected it, except those who were in the secret, this silver dollar of our fathers was demonetized. Let me tell you

HOW THAT WAS DONE.

First, I want to correct an error which Judge West, candidate for Governor, fell into in his Bellefontaine speech. He said every Democrat in the Senate voted for the demonetization of silver. He never was more mistaken in his life. Not one single Democrat voted for it, that I know of. I don't know what would have been done if they had known what was in the bill, but certainly not one of them ever did.

There is an error about this demonetization of silver. Many suppose it was demonetized by what is called the Coinage Act, which passed Congress and received the approval of the President April 12, 1873. They suppose that that is the thing which demonetized the silver dollar; but it is a mistake. The fifteenth section of that act which is referred to is in these words: "That the silver coins of the United States shall be a trade dollar, a half-dollar or fifty-cent piece; a quarter-dollar, or twenty-five-cent piece, and a dime, or ten-cent piece; and the weight of the trade dollar shall be 420 grains troy; the weight of the half-dollar, twelve grammes and a half gramme, and a quarter dollar and a dime shall be respectively one-half and one-fifth the weight of the half-dollar and said coin."

Now mark it, that is, the *trade dollar*, these half dollars, and quarters, and ten-cent pieces, "and *said coins*, shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding five dollars in any one payment."

Does that touch the dollar of our fathers? Not a bit of it. That is what that Act says, and the only dollar mentioned in it is the trade dollar, and

WHAT IS THE TRADE DOLLAR?

The trade dollar was coined for the purpose of trading with Japan and China, and contains considerably more than the dollar of the fathers. The dollar of the fathers contained 412½ grains and the trade dollar 420 grains standard silver. The trade dollar was not originally made a legal tender at all, because it was not intended to circulate in this country. This Act made it a legal tender, but did not demonetize the dollar of the fathers.

THE DOLLAR OF THE FATHERS

Was still a legal tender. If you had had plenty of them you could have made a payment however large.

Upon that act no ayes and noes were called in the Senate: nobody dreamed of any demonetization of silver in it so far as I know. Nobody thought of it, but it passed without a call for the yeas and nays, and with little discussion.

Now, when did the silver dollar come to be demonetized? It was demonetized by the passage of what are called the Revised Statutes of the United States. The Revised Statures of the United States were a compilation of statutes made by Commissioners appointed under an act of Congress to gather together the statutes of the United States which were scattered through some eighty or ninety volumes into one volume, that is, such provisions as were of a general and permanent nature.

They did so, and made a great big book, containing more words, I believe, than the Bible. Now, mark it, that Commission was not authorized to alter a single law in its meaning. They might improve phraseology, and where there were two or three laws on the same subject identical in meaning, they might drop those last passed, because the first had already provided for the case.

The title to these Revised Statutes is "Revised Statutes of the United States, passed at the First Session of the Forty-third Congress, 1873-4, embracing the Statutes of the United States of a general and permanent nature, *in force on the 1st day of December*, 1873, as revised and consolidated by Commission appointed under act of Congress."

This act, called the "Revised Statutes," was passed in June, 1874, and approved by the President on the 22d of that month. It was passed through the Senate without being read, because it was supposed to make no change whatever in the law—it was merely read by its title.

Section 2586 of these Revised Statutes reads: "The silver coins of the United States shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for any amount not exceeding five dollars in any one payment."

It doesn't say as the act of 1873 did, that the trade dollar merely should be a legal tender for the amount of five dollars, but *the silver* coin, thereby including the dollar of the fathers, as well as the trade dollar; and in that way—that secret way—without its being known at all, unless it was to some few who were in the secret, there was taken from the people of this country the faculty of using more than $100,000,000 in silver in the payment of their debts; and that, too, in an indebted country, and that, too, when of all countries in the world we ought to value silver, because we are the greatest silver-producing country in the world, and just as we value wheat because we produce so much wheat. And yet that thing was smuggled through in that way. Now, I tell you I am for setting it right straight back where it was. [Laughter and applause.]

IT IS NOT UNJUST,

And no man need tell me it will do injustice. On the contrary, I am in favor of setting it back in order to do justice. I say the man who contracted a debt: I say the nation that contracted debt, when, under the law of the land, the dollar of the fathers, of 412½ grains standard silver would pay a dollar of debt, I say that in honesty that man ought to be allowed to pay that debt with that dollar. Therefore, I shall vote to put it back; I hope we will put it back, and when we do I think that will be a great stride toward bringing about resumption of specie payment and setting the finance of the country upon a solid basis; but whether we do or not, I plant myself upon the position that this Government issued its bonds and promised to pay them in coin, actually specifying silver as one, and the men who bought the bonds knew they could be paid either in gold or silver. The State of Ohio issued her bonds; many of the cities issued their bonds; counties and townships issued their bonds; the people issued their promissory notes and gave their bonds; every one of them had the right to look at the statutes and say: "When this becomes due I can pay it in silver coin," which, from the time of Washington until this day has been a legal tender [great applause], and no man and no community shall be deprived, with my consent, of that privilege ["Good"]; none at all. And, my friends, if it had happened to turn the other way; if it had been gold that depreciated instead of silver, we would have heard these very same people who are now clamoring against the remonetization of silver, insisting upon their debts being paid in silver, and that gold should be demonetized. I am not for gratifying them either way. They took the risk and they must stand by it. They have gone regularly to work to depreciate silver, and it is by their act that it has been depreciated more than by any increase in the production of that metal. Let it be remonetized and there will be no substantial reason to complain of any injustice whether a man is paid in silver or gold.

AND HERE IS JUDGE WEST,

The Republican candidate for Governor (and the Cleveland platform has the same squint), saying he is in favor of silver, but that you ought to put more silver in your dollar; that is the position if I understand it. Now, look at it: You promised to pay 100 silver dollars in 1873; gave your note for 100 silver dollars, and could pay that note, as it then stood, in silver dollars of 412½ grains each. Now comes Judge West and the Republican Convention at Cleveland and say you ought to be compelled to pay in dollars of 420 or 430 grains each. If you are compelled to do that, it will take more of your wheat to get them than it would those of 412½ grains. I would like to know where is the honesty in that? You purchased, and the man was willing to sell to you and take your promise of $100 of 412½ grains each in 1873. That was a bargain, a perfectly fair bargain, and now comes Judge West and these Republican sages up here at Cleveland and say: "We will change that bargain; we want to have that bargain so that you shall not pay it in silver dollars of 412½ grains each, but of 420 or 430 grains each." I say there is no honesty in it, nor any good policy in it. Why, we undervalue silver now. Even the silver dollar of the fathers was undervalued. According to the Coinage Act, and before and since we have rated one gold dollar as worth sixteen silver dollars, that is, we make the relation between as sixteen to one; and yet the greatest silver-using nation in Europe, France, rates it at fifteen and a half of silver to one of gold—that is, we give one-half dollar more of silver to one of gold than the Frenchman does. And yet here are people saying that is not enough; you ought to give seventeen or eighteen or nineteen silver dollars for one of gold. I don't believe it at all. I say there is no honesty or sound policy in it. Now, my friends, to close these remarks, which I know have been somewhat scattering, let me recapitulate. I have said that the improvement and increased production of labor-saving machinery is one of the causes of our distressed state. I have said that taxation was another cause, and I mentioned the appreciation of the purchasing power of the dollar and the demonetization of silver. Now, let me tell you, if you will have

RELIEF FROM THIS STATE OF AFFAIRS,

There are some things you must do. You must require Congress in the first place to set about revising the tariff laws of the United States. Those laws are so shaped now that we are deprived of many and many a market which ought to be ours, and would be ours, and would afford a relief to our laborers engaged in manufacturing and agriculture if these markets were opened. The effect of this oppressive tariff law is and will be, and must be, until it is remodeled, to almost shut the doors of several countries to us which ought to be opened to us, and which would afford to us a market which, if it had existed three years ago, would have done more, perhaps, than any thing else to relieve us of the distress we have been experiencing.

In the next place, you must set your faces against this enormous taxation—not alone Federal taxation, but the enormous taxation of the State, counties, cities and villages. You must insist upon the taxes being reduced to the very lowest amount consistent with an efficient public service: and, in order that the taxes may be reduced, you must insist that the reform must extend further than pointed out by John Sherman in the Treasury Department and Custom-houses; and you must cease to pay, as it seems we have been paying from one to two millions to perfect idlers, and that in only a few offices; and perhaps tens and twenties of millions if you could take the whole country through. You must stop all that, and must get the expenses of Government, Federal and State, down to the lowest notch consistent with the necessities of the Government; you must get rid of any man who spends your money extravagantly or uselessly.

Then we may hope to be relieved; then we may hope to see good times, and not only good times, but once more have an honest Government.

CONCLUSION.

My friends, I thank you very kindly for having listened to me so patiently, for I have spoken nearly twice as long as I would have done had my friend Converse not been prevented from being present.

What I have said I hope you may think worthy of some consideration, and if it shall be of the least benefit to any one of you; if it shall cause any one to ponder over the condition of the country and see what is necessary to be done; and, above all, if it shall make you to cherish still more highly our great country, which, with all its faults and all its misfortunes, is still the most blessed home for poor laboring men in the world, I shall be happy. [Long continued applause.]

NEVADA HIGHWAYMEN.

Successful Resistance of Two Express Messengers.

The Eureka (Nev.) Republican contains the following thrilling account of an attempt to rob one of the Wells, Fargo & Co.'s coaches, which was successfully resisted by the messengers, one of whom (Brown) formerly ran in and out of that city. The stage that left Eureka for Tybo on Monday afternoon, the 3d inst., containing Professor T. Prince, the mining expert, and J. M. Haskell as passengers, the driver, Jack Perry, and an employe of the Stage Company, was accosted about nine o'clock at night as it had drawn up before the Willows Station, forty miles south of Eureka, by three masked men, one of whom called upon Blair to surrender, saying: "Eugene Blair, get off that stage and surrender." Believing that the men in the station had got drunk and that one of them was playing a bluff game, the demand was not immediately complied with; besides the night was so dark that the speaker could not be distinctly seen. The demand, however, was more peremptorily repeated, when Blair prepared to dismount, leaving the driver and Jimmy Brown on the seat. Blair had hardly reached the ground with his trusty shot-gun when he was greeted by a double discharge of shot, one from the rear of the stage and the other from the corner of the stable, both passing so near his head that the powder of one warmed his face. Blair returned the fire almost simultaneously, but being partially blinded by the smoke, and not seeing his object plainly, evidently without effect. The report of his gun had not died away before the cold muzzle of a gun was placed against his breast by one of the robbers, with the intention, no doubt, of making sure work of the brave messenger. Blair caught it and chucked it aside and turned the robber, who was pulling the wrong trigger, half round, when Brown, on the seat, watching his opportunity, raised his shot-gun as quick as a flash and gave the road-agent the full contents of one barrel square in the back, and he fell over mortally wounded, loaded with eight buckshot. Almost instantaneously with this deadly shot, Blair had placed his shot-gun squarely against the fellow's breast, and would have blown a hole through him as big as the moon had not his brave companion performed the service. Brown, after firing the shot, jumped from the stage, but had not fairly reached the ground when he was shot in the calf of the left leg, inflicting a painful but not serious wound. The other two robbers then fired four more shots at the messengers at close range with shot-guns and revolvers, none of which, however, did any harm, though they came uncomfortably close, and disappeared in the darkness. The firing having ceased, the passengers got out of the stage cautiously and took a look at the wounded robber, who was writhing in mortal agony, and implored, begged and prayed to be killed. A noise in the station now attracted attention, and on proceeding thither it was found that the blacksmith and rancher, who were in charge of the place, had been bound securely and threatened with instant death by the robbers if they would give any alarm on the approach of the stage. The robbers had come to the station about an hour previous, compelled the inmates to surrender, cooked a meal and ate it, unharnessed the horses that had been prepared for the incoming coach, and then proceeded to lay their plans of attack. A small fort was built with boards at the corner of the stable, and an old ax placed handy for the purpose of opening the treasure-box. The wounded robber was taken into the station, where all the parties remained during the night. Yesterday morning Messrs. Price and Haskell continued on their journey to Tybo, while the two messengers, the driver and the dying robber, who had suffered excruciating tortures through the night and was very low, proceeded to return to Eureka. Every effort was made to induce the robber to reveal the names of his associates, but to no purpose, and when nearing Page's place, a few miles from Euréka, he began to breathe his last. Just before expiring he gave his name as Jack Davis. The party arrived in town with the corpse on Tuesday evening at seven o'clock, and stopped before Wells, Fargo & Co.'s office.

James Brown and Eugene Blair deserve the gratitude of the people of this State for their matchless heroism. They have fought one of the greatest battles that is recorded of the highway, and their miraculous escape against such large odds, covered with double-barreled shot-guns and a dark night, can only be attributed to their unflinching bravery.

Greenbackers, Socialists, Cary.

[New Haven (Conn.) Union.]

The lowest estimate gives the Greenback party of Ohio twenty thousand votes, and the highest fifty thousand. It is also thought that the Social Democrats will poll between six and ten thousand votes, mostly confined to Hamilton County. It bothers the politicians to know which of the old parties will be damaged the most by these independent movements. As a general thing the Democratic leaders are confident of success, holding that the dissatisfied voters are mostly confined to the Republican strongholds. But the phase of the Workingmen's movement which alarms both parties the most is in regard to Senatorship. There is a strong probability that the Independents will elect a sufficient number of members of the Legislature to hold the balance of power, in which event General Samuel F. Cary will be a prominent candidate for United States Senator, with good prospects of success.

What General Grant Said.

[New York Tribune.]

Somebody in Washington has received a letter from another somebody in London who heard General Grant say President Hayes promised him not to remove his friends, Minister and brother-in-law Cramer of Denmark, and Consul-General Badeau of London. The President had asked the General if he would like to have any of his friends kept in office, and he had requested as a personal favor that these two be spared. And was not Mr. Pierrepont included, also?

Bill Allen—Judge West.

[Hancock Courier.]

Three years ago Republican papers had a great deal to say about the old fossil, Bill Allen, who was in vigorous and robust health, with good eyesight and lungs, and able to stand erect and look his audience in the face, eye to eye, while addressing them. But they have not a word to say about West, their candidate for Governor, who is so nearly blind that he can't see his audience before him, and so feeble as to be unable to stand up while speaking.

McClellan's Popularity.

[Philadelphia Record.]

Yesterday was certainly a red-letter day for General McClellan. He had a public reception at Faneuil Hall, Boston, and was nominated for Governor at Trenton. The best of it is that neither the reception nor the nomination were solicited beforehand.

THE Israelites in England are collecting subscriptions in aid of their brethren in Bulgaria, who have been robbed and oppressed by the Russians. They call on Jews all over the world for assistance, and particularly on the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The Jews, six hundred thousand strong, in Hungary, have already responded to the appeal. In Russia the persecution of the Israelites is continued, with nearly all its ancient cruelty. They are not permitted to reside in many of the greatest cities. Kief and Novgorod, as well as Moscow, are forbidden to them, and even in the rural districts they are burdened with multiform exactions.

A PHILADELPHIA physician's published opinion that Davenport, the actor, was killed with acid pills that destroyed the coating of his stomach, has brought a reply from Dr. Henry A. Martin, of Boston. Dr. Martin denies the pill story, says he gave salicylic acid for the gout and stomach difficulty of Mr. Davenport, and justifies the treatment by the rules of the Faculty. The amount of silicylic acid prescribed was three hundred grains, divided into sixty gelatine-covered capsules, containing five grains each. Two of these capsules were to be taken at a dose; the first ten doses at intervals of two hours.

A DOG in Sierk, France, returned good for evil. His master, a peasant, attached a stone to his neck and threw him into the Moselle. The poor brute sank but the cord broke, and he rose to the surface and made desperate efforts to get into the boat. His master pushed him repeatedly with an oar, and, at length stood up and endeavored to strike him a violent blow. In the attempt the man fell into the water. The dog swam to him and held him up by the clothing until aid arrived.

BURLINGTON HAWKEYE: They have "sacred concerts" every Sunday in Terre Haute. Last Sunday one of the musicians got into a quarrel with a hackman who was on a sacred drunk, and in the sacred row that ensued the hackman had his sacred bowels most sacrilegiously profaned with a dirk knife. After which the evening's entertainment was concluded by the rendition of "Sweet Sabbath Eve," cornet obligato, with orchestral accompaniment.

PRINCE BISMARCK appears to be a thoroughly impartial person. A military friend gave him an elaborate disquisition the other day on the deeds, errors, and chances of the Russian and Turkish armies, and when he concluded asked the Prince plainly what he thought about them. Bismarck answered with this laconic sentence: "I think that each army is getting the thrashing it deserves!"

A MAN at Niagara is building a raft of pine logs, with a house at one end for the accommodation of cats and dogs that are to make a compulsory voyage over the Falls. If the raft goes over smoothly and the cats and dogs are not hurt, Robert White says he will attempt the same perilous voyage on a similar craft.

M. THIERS' small stature was often ridiculed. One day as he was walking up the Champs-Elysees two ladies, who wished to get a good view of him, approached, and one of them exclaimed, "How little he is!" "Yes, madam," replied M. Thiers, turning round, "but I am somewhat bigger at a distance."

MAX MARETZEK told a Baltimore journalist that shoddyism and opera bouffe had killed legitimate opera in this country.