clusion of his remarks the Senator was warmly applauded.

MR. A. J. LAFARGUE.

Progress of the State Under the Present Administration.

A. J. Lafargue, of Avoyelles, was the next speaker. He took up the question of the campaign, which he styled a fight against the Democratic administration for the purpose of placing a stigma on the Democratic party. To-day, he said, you are asked to repudiate the administration and to rest it out of power. Do they charge dishonesty? No; they cannot. The personalism of Gov. McEnery consists in taking to his heart every man that has the welfare of Louisiana at heart. There isn't enough personalism in Louisiana. When Nicholls was in office did he not have friends and advisers? I don't charge him with being a poor Governor. I honor him, but to-day, when Louisiana is at peace with the world, when we are enjoying an administration second to none, I do not see why he should interfere in the State. Nicholls refused to run four years ago because his family needed his services as a lawyer. Do we need any one to lead us out of the wilderness? If so, what wilderness?

The speaker next touched upon the third term question. Everything is now going well, but the cry is because they wish to rotate themselves in office. Study it well and you will see their campaign is not for the people's good, but for their own. There is no justification to put a man out of office because he is doing his duty. The only course when we have a tried and true officer is to keep him in office.

S. D. McEnery's only aim is to secure the welfare and prosperity of Louisiana. The assessment has increased $58,000,000 since McEnery has been in office. He asked why, and then cited several examples in his parish. Several months ago there was a section of land which sold at $3 to $4 an acre, and a few days ago he found out that now those lands cannot be bought for $30 or $40 an acre, and it is is due to the levees that McEnery has built, by which the land is now free from the danger of overflow.

Mr. Lafargue next spoke of the improved educational facilities and railroad building in Louisiana within the last seven years. The Mississippi Valley, Texas Pacific and the Southern Pacific, which connect New Orleans with California, have been completed. Would these roads have been built if their projectors had no confidence in the government of Louisiana? He next showed the increase in the productions of Louisiana and compared it with the decrease in other States.

"Slanders on slanders have been heaped upon our Governor," said Mr. Lafargue, "and knowing that he possessed a Democratic heart, I concluded to stand under the Democratic banner with him as the standard bearer. He has done his duty to the people. We have tried him for four years, and we find that he has proved to us that he is entitled to be tried for four years more. It is our duty to guard our Democratic banner, for which the citizens of Louisiana fought, and some died, on the Fourteenth of September, and to place it in loving hands. Those are the hands of Samuel Douglas McEnery.

He cited the congressional election in the sixth district, and showed where the Republicans received majorities, and warned the people as to what will take place if they are not zealous and wide awake to the interests of their party.

HON. E. W. SUTHERLIN.

The "Third Term" and "Personalism" Arguments Demolished.

State Senator E. W. Sutherlin was next introduced. He said:

Ladies and Gentlemen, Fellow Citizens—The so-called "reformers" in this extraordinary campaign are moving heaven and earth to find some reasons, to discover some means to bring about the defeat of Gov. McEnery, and to put the stamp of condemnation upon a regular Democratic administration. Fellow-citizens, they would give their birthright freely, they would give their own right arm if they could, in the desperation of their efforts to find one single act of maladministration, or one single neglect of public duty that would justify at your hands a legitimate censure of the present administration. They overlook the progress that has been made in this State during the present administration. They overlook the fact that during the administration of the present Governor the levees of the Mississippi from the Arkansas line to the Gulf have been entirely rebuilt, walling that mighty river that flows from the Canada line to the Southern Gulf, protecting the people on the banks of that great stream from overflow, inundation and death. They overlook the fact that when Gov. McEnery came into the Executive office of this State that the public securities of this State were not worth fifty cents on the dollar, whereas they are now worth more than ninety cents. They overlook the fact that the assessed value of the property in this State during his administration has increased some $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 since he came into office. They overlook the fact that nearly double the number of children are attending the public schools of this State than attended them when his term of office began. In the desperation of their efforts to find some reasons for the condemnation of his administration, they have been driven to two single points. I refer to their arguments on "personalism" and to the "third term" idea.

They aver that Gov. McEnery's administration has been a personal one; that he has appointed his friends to office in the exercise of his patronage and distributing power. They overlook, fellow-citizens, the fact that when Gov. McEnery was renominated and re-elected in 1884 that in a letter written in his own hand to the President of the United States, Mr. Cleveland, he earnestly and zealously urged the appointment of

GEN. FRED. N. OGDEN

to a high Federal office in this State. Gen. Fred. Ogden was the champion of the "reform" idea, or rather the candidate of the reform faction in 1884. After Gov. McEnery's nomination he, with a magnanimity and generosity that you will never find in a reform administration if they should gain this contest—I say that with a characteristic generosity and magnanimity Gov. McEnery asked at the hands of the President of the United States the elevation to a high Federal office of his opponent, Gen. Fred. Ogden (and I revere the man's memory) the leader of the White League, who led it to victory on the 14th of September, 1874, and who, with it, overthrew the Kellogg government as mere chaff. The letter that was written, fellow-citizens, was by Senator Eustis, who has so ably and eloquently addressed you here to-day, personally delivered into the hands of the President of the United States. The letter, it seems, was unheeded, I suppose because Senator Eustis was not in such close communion with the President of the United States as he flatters himself he is to-day. Judge Estilette, of St. Landry, who in the last State convention put Gen. Ogden in nomination, is now enjoying at the hands of Gov. McEnery a lucrative and honorable office. Judge Kernan, one of the circuit judges of this State, in the Baton Rouge circuit, is also now enjoying that office at his hands, and his son was a late candidate for Congress in the sixth district, and was opposed to the renomination of Gov. McEnery.

It is not necessary, fellow-citizens, to weary your patience by giving you every instance. They go on down from his distinguished opponent, Gen. Ogden, from Judge Estilette and from Judge Kernan, to the lowest officer of the State. He has appointed men without regard to their personal preferences, whether they voted for him or whether they were against him. The sole test with him, according to my judgment and estimation, in the selection of his appointees, has been the efficiency of the appointees and their Democracy, and he has never inquired whether they supported him or whether they did not.

We are told by these reform orators that if they gain this victory their government will not be a personal one; but, unfortunately, one of their speakers at the institution of this extraordinary canvass, in the parish of West Baton Rouge, stated publicly before a crowd that the reason why the supporters of Gov. McEnery were making such a strenuous effort to retain him in office was because "the McEnery people" knew that if Gov. Nicholls was nominated the last one of them would be put out of office. That speaker, fellow-citizens, was taken off the stump; he has retired from the campaign, and we have not heard from him any more.

Fellow-citizens, I now propose to address myself to the next point that they urge before audiences in this State, and that is

THE "THIRD TERM" IDEA.

On the theory that Gov. McEnery should not be elected again; that he has held this office for two terms, and that it is against Democratic usage for him to be honored a third time, they have indulged in the wildest statements. One of the distinguished speakers on the reform side advanced this third term argument in several speeches that he has made in this section of the country,—one of them, notably at Mansfield, to which I had the honor to listen. I refer to no other gentleman than my friend the member of Congress from this district.

That argument has been preserved. It has been condensed and published in the New Orleans *Picayune*, and republished in a journal of this city, the Shreveport *Democrat*, which I now hold in my hand. It seems to be the result of a careful research into the constitutions of every State in the Union since the foundation of this government, in order to prove that it is not Democratic usage to elect a Governor for a third term.

At the expense of being a little prosy, I propose to discuss this matter, and if you will give me your attention you will find that it is quite interesting as we progress.

The gentleman takes up the first State on the list, Alabama, and quotes the constitutions of 1819 and 1865 to show that a Governor is not eligible for two consecutive terms; but, fellow-citizens, he fails to quote the Constitution of Alabama of 1875, which does not limit it at all. *Why didn't he read* further if he was going to give us statistics? Why did he not give us the law as it is in the present Constitution of Alabama to-day? He takes up Arkansas, and quotes the constitutions of 1836 and 1864, but fails to quote the constitutions of 1868 and 1874, the last being the present Constitution of that State, where there is no limit at all. He takes up next the State of Delaware, and quotes from the constitutions of 1792 and 1831. Under the Constitution of Delaware of 1831 the Governor is ineligible for any second term at all, so that if that argument is used then his own candidate is ineligible to the office to which he is seeking to elevate him. Now, fellow-citizens, under his own quotation from the Constitution of the State of Delaware, Gen. Nicholls is himself ineligible to the office, and he quotes that as a reason why Gov. McEnery should not be re-elected.

The distinguished Congressman overlooks, fellow-citizens, the Constitution of California, where there is no limitation; that of Colorado, and the Constitution of Connecticut, in all of which there is no limitation. He comes to the Constitution of Florida of 1838, and quotes that part of it where a Governor is not eligible for a second consecutive term, but fails to quote the Constitution of 1865 and that of 1868, where there is

NO LIMITATION AT ALL.

My friend, like myself, is an advocate, and he knows how to quote the authorities on his own side, and leave the attorney on the other side to quote his. I propose to give the authorities on our side of the question. I have labored in this research and I have gone to the bottom of it in my judgment; but my friend is a reform Democrat, and that is the reason why he doesn't give both sides of the question.

My honored friend next quotes from the Constitution of Georgia of 1777 and of 1865, allowing two terms of two years each. Now, let us take the Constitution of 1868, the present Constitution of the Empire State of the South, and we find there is no limitation at all. A third term for a good man. It is all with the man. If a man is a good man and makes a good Governor, why not keep him in? That is the reason why these constitutions have been changed, allowing you to keep a man in office if you can get him there. He quotes also from the Constitution of Illinois of 1818 and 1848, but fails to quote from the Constitution of 1870, the present Constitution, where there is no limitation at all. This thing is monotonous, fellow-citizens. It is almost clear through just this way. Then the gentleman refers to and quotes the Constitution of Indiana, and that is one of the States that has not been changed, and I give him that. The State of Iowa he skips. He omits that because it has never had any limitation, and he makes no allusion to it. It didn't suit his side of the case. He next goes to Kansas and quotes from the Constitution of 1855, that of 1857 and that of 1858, where there is a limitation; but he fails to quote from the Constitution of 1859, that now in force, where there is no limitation at all. He quotes from the Constitution of Kentucky, and that seems to be one where the provision does exist. He skips Louisiana because it is his own State, and he does not wish to bring it into undue prominence, so he does not refer to the

CONSTITUTION OF HIS STATE

of 1879, where there is no limitation at all. He skipped the State of Maine, because it did not suit his side of the case, for there is no limitation. He omitted Maryland, where there is no limitation; Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, in all of which States there is no limitation. He comes down to Mississippi at last and quotes from some of her old, antiquated constitutions, the Constitution of 1832 notably, but fails to quote from the Constitution of 1868, the present one, where there is no limitation. He quotes from Missouri, where the principle does not seem to have been changed. He does not refer to Nebraska, where there is no limitation at all. Now, fellow-citizens, the Constitution of North Carolina provides that the Governor's term shall be four years, and that he shall not be eligible to the same office more than four years in any period of eight years unless the office shall have been cast upon him as Lieutenant Governor or President of the Senate. Just exactly the situation of Gov. McEnery to-day, yet the Constitution is quoted against him, and if the same prohibition that is in the Constitution of North Carolina were in the Constitution of Louisiana to-day, it would exactly fit his case and make him eligible to the office. He did not reach far enough along the line when he referred to this Constitution. He only read that part of it that omitted his case. [A voice, "He was near-sighted."] Yes, I guess he was.

Fellow-citizens, the gentleman omitted to refer to the constitutions of Nebraska, and of Nevada, and of New Hampshire, where there is no limitation, but he referred to the Constitution of New Jersey, where there is a limitation. He omitted to refer to the Constitution of

THE GREAT STATE OF NEW YORK,

the constitutions of 1777, 1821 and 1846, where there has never been a limitation on the office of Governor. He refers to the Constitution of Ohio of 1802, where there was a limitation, but failed to refer to the Constitution of 1851, the present one, where there is no limitation, except to provide that no member of Congress shall hold the office. (Laughter.) The gentleman next refers to the Constitution of Oregon, and that seems to be one where there is a limitation, and the State of Pennsylvania likewise. He failed to refer to the Constitution of Rhode Island, where there is no limitation, and, fellow-citizens, no reference is made to the Constitution of South Carolina, the cradle of Democracy, the home of John C. Calhoun. That State once had a Constitution that provided that the Governor should not be eligible until four years after the expiration of his term, but the Constitution of 1868, the present one, repealed that provision and said in so many words that the Governor "shall be eligible." That is the Constitution of South Carolina. They were not satisfied to omit the words whereby the right would have existed, but they went so far as to declare the right of itself.

The gentleman referred to the constitution of Tennessee, where there seems to be a restriction, and he refers also to the constitution of Texas of 1836 and 1845, but failed, fellow-citizens, to refer to the present constitution of Texas of 1876, where there is no limit on the right of the people to select whom they please for the office of Governor, and as often as they please. He refers only to the State of Virginia, and I admit that there is a limitation, and if they are in the future to have Governors like some they have had in the past, since the war, it would be better if they had a provision abolishing the office altogether. The constitution of the State of Virginia to-day limits the term of office to three years, and I say that the people of Virginia are going to find that provision in their constitution

A STUMBLING BLOCK

in their way when the term of that gallant man, Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, expires, and it would be better for those people if they could keep him in office for not only one term, but twenty terms. They have got their necks in the halter, and they are going to feel it draw. [Laughter.]

Now, fellow citizens, the Constitution of West Virginia was referred to. There a limit does exist; but my honored friend failed to refer to the Constitution of Wisconsin, where there is no limitation at all.

Now, I will summarize this matter and tell you that the constitutions of eleven States to-day, out of thirty-eight, limit the right of any man to occupy more than a certain time the office of Governor, and one of those eleven States is Delaware, which makes a man ineligible for any second term at all, and which would exclude Gen. Nicholls. Another is North Carolina, which would admit Gov. McEnery. So that there really are the constitutions of nine States of the Union operating to the disadvantage of Gov. McEnery on this theory.

Now, I have found upon my research the following States in which there has been a limitation of the right of the Governor to hold office beyond a certain number of terms, which limitation has since been changed. Since the foundation of the United States government there have been twenty-three States in this Union at one time or another which have had this proscriptive clause in their constitutions, and of those twenty-three States twelve have changed that provision, and Louisiana is one of them. The honorable gentleman said in his speech that he could not imagine and could not divine how it was that the Constitutional Convention of 1879, of which he was a distinguished member, failed to put in this proscriptive clause. I had the honor myself to be a member of that Constitutional Convention from my own parish.

IT WAS BY NO ACCIDENT

that the people of Louisiana, through their representatives, changed this provision. They knew perfectly well and understood well what they were doing, and omitted it purposely, because there were eleven States in this Union that had gone before them and made a similar change. Louisiana was the twelfth State in the Union to make the change. The whole tendency has been that way. The States where they have had a limitation and where none exists now are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Ohio, South Carolina and Texas, every one of them, except two, being Southern States. Now, our neighbors on the east, on the north and on the west have made such changes, and there are only four States in this Union that had constitutions where there was no limitation and that changed those constitutions and created a limitation. These are Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Tennessee and West Virginia, and the Constitution of Kentucky is as old as 1799, where the change was made nearly a hundred years ago. The Constitution of Pennsylvania in 1838, where the principle was first introduced, and in Tennessee in 1834, West Virginia in 1861 and 1863 are in force. Now there are eleven States in this Union to-day where there is a limitation, and one of them is Delaware, which, as I have said before, would exclude Gen. Nicholls; one, North Carolina, that would admit Gov. McEnery; and there have not been but few constitutions made since the war where the limit existed, where it was not changed. Every constitution in the United States where that limit exists is from thirty-five to forty years old, and all the new constitutions have

DROPPED THE LIMIT,

showing that as we drift from monarchy and the Revolution of 1776, the more secure we feel in our liberties, and the more we are disposed to change the old constitutions, leaving the people to select a man as long as he is faithful and efficient in office. There never was a limit on the power in the New England States, and never was a limit in the Empire State of New York. I propose to give you, fellow-citizens, a list, showing where men have been elected three, four, five and some o them as high as ten and eleven terms.

In Pennsylvania—Thomas Wiffin, 3; Thomas McKean, 3; Simon Snyder, 3.

In New Jersey—Joseph Bloomfield, 4; Isaac Williamson, 4.

n New York—George Clinton, 3; John Jay, 3; Wm. L. Marcy, 3; Daniel D. Tomkins, 5.

In Maine—Enoch Lincoln, 4; Albion K. Parris, 5; Robert P. Dunlap, 5.

In New Hampshire—John Page, 4; Samuel Bell, 4; John Langdon, 4; John Taylor Gilman, 11.

In Vermont—Wm. A. Palmer, 4; Galusha Jones, 4; Silas A. Jennison, 4; Thomas Crittenden, 7; Isaac Tichener, 10.

I n Massachusetts—Caleb Strong, 4; Edw d Everett, John Hancock, 5; John Brooks, 7; George N. Briggs, 7; Levi Lincoln, 9.

In Rhode Island—James Fenner, 6; William Jones, 6; Wm. Findlay, 7; John B. Francis, 5.

And in Connecticut—Wm. W. Ellsworth, 4; John Cotton Smith, 5; Oliver Wolcott, 9; Jonathan Trumbull, 11; Samuel Huntington, 11.

Here are instances, fellow-citizens, in New England and other States, where men have held as high as eleven terms in the Executive office. In the constitutions of these States, where the principle still exists, all of the constitutions are of ancient date, and are constitutions that were framed in the early history of this country, showing that in the time of the Revolution, when we were resisting the force of the British government, and when we were rebelling against monarchical forms of government, that it was our intention to set up a Republican government where the will of the people should be the supreme law, and you know that in the time of the Revolution there were men who believed that though we should achieve our independence, that we would eventually set up a monarchy of our own. Was not George Washington frequently urged to put a kingly crown upon his head? Did not some of the strongest and most efficient generals in his army beg him to become the Dictator of America? Was not Alexander Hamilton, his Secretary of the Treasury, a monarchist and an aristocrat? Did he not even, while in Washington's Cabinet, favor the establishment of a House of Lords and a titled nobility? What reader of American history does not know of the

GIGANTIC MENTAL CONTESTS

that were had in President Washington's Cabinet between Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson, one the champion of the classes and the other the champion of the masses. It was in those times, fellow-citizens, when there was a fear that we might drift back into monarchy, and when there might be a rising and growing sentiment in that direction that would finally endanger or imperil the liberties of the people, that these precautions were taken. Have we not demonstrated our capacity to preserve our own liberties, and our capacity for self-government? Are these people into whose faces I look willing to acknowledge that republican government in America is a failure, and that we, ourselves—the Caucasian race of this country are not capable of perpetuating Republican government for all time to come? Where is that man who would have the hardihood to get up before this people anywhere in this country and urge the establishment of a titled nobility, or the establishment of a legislative department similar to the House of Lords? Where is the man that would dare to urge President Cleveland to become the dictator of America? It was said, fellow-citizens, concerning one President, when he went into office, that he would never come out until he was carried out feet foremost. That was President Grant; but he was a Republican, not a Democrat.

"Fellow-citizens, the authority is against them. The whole question is one that involves our right of self-government. It is one that involves our ability to control our own affairs. Now, what power has the Governor of this State? Can he enslave you? Can he do anything to endanger or imperil your liberties? Could he call upon the militia companies (and they are pretty well organized, I believe, in this State,) to maintain him in office after the expiration of his term? Why, you could get a crowd enough in this city in an hour and a half, by ringing the fire-bells, that would take ordinary shotguns and put the militia to rout. Just look at the immense power of the people to put a man out of office when they don't like him and when he won't go. Just look at

THE FOURTEENTH OF SEPTEMBER, 1874,

when the arms that had been shipped to the city on board a steamboat had been captured by the Metropolitan police. The people were gathered together one morning on Canal street and some patriotic gentleman got upon the pedestal of Clay statue, in New Orleans, and most all of you have been there and seen the place I refer to, and made a stirring appeal to the people, advising them to disperse, go to their homes, get their guns and return, and fellow-citizens, that crowd dispersed as orderly and as peacefully as possible not on a peaceful mission however, for in less than three hours they were there armed and equipped, and they marched upon the Metropolitan police force and overthrew the Kellogg government in three hours. A few White League companies and a few clerks on the street were sufficient.

Are you, therefore, in any danger of your liberties? Are you to be seduced into the belief that your liberties will be imperiled by a reference in the columns of a journal in this city to some old, antiquated constitutions that have gone out of date years ago, and that were made at a time when the people possibly had some fear that there might be a tendency in the growth of opinion against republican government, and took these precautions? I think not.

At 3 o'clock everybody was invited to the barbecue, and an adjournment was taken until 7 p. m.

THE NIGHT MEETING.

Four Thousand People Fill the Court-house Square.

At night the speakers' stand, as well as numbers of private residences and stores, were beautifully illuminated with Chinese lanterns and decorated with flags.

The courthouse grounds were illuminated with electric lights and Chinese lanterns, and presented a very pretty appearance. Long before the hour for the opening of the meeting every seat in front of the speakers' stand was occupied. There was a grand display of fireworks, and bonfires were built around the grounds.

When the meeting opened there were between 3500 and 4000 persons present, among whom were about 300 ladies.

Messrs. Burke and Jonas were escorted to the stand by a committee amid applause. Both were presented with bouquets by the ladies. Attorney General Cunningham, Gov. McEnery and a number of prominent citizens occupied seats on the platform.

HON. B. F. JONAS.

He Sharply Criticises the "Reform" Campaign Against a Democratic Administration.

Col. Young, in a neat address, introduced Hon. B. F. Jonas. The audience cheered the honorable gentleman to the echo.

Mr. Jonas said:

Ladies and gentlemen, fellow-citizens of Caddo parish—It gives me great pleasure to appear before so large a concourse of my fellow-citizens assembled in an old-fashioned Democratic meeting, a meeting open to all who love and owe allegiance to the grand old party of the people, and where all are free to express their views in family council, untrammeled by obligations to factions or persons.

I regret the shape which the present canvass has assumed. It seems to me that by this time the issues of the past would have been safely buried or put away, and that we could permit ourselves to discuss the living issues of the present and those likely to conduce to the future prosperity of our people.

I would be glad if I could see a time arrive when the Democracy of Louisiana, like those of other States, could turn their attention to

MATTERS OF NATIONAL LEGISLATION,

in which their interests are involved, and leave their State politics to that period of rest and quiet which seems but reasonably necessary after more than twenty years of strife and turmoil.

I would be glad to appear before my fellow-citizens and discuss great industrial propositions and measures of Democratic policy.

It is time that the people of Louisiana should inform themselves upon questions of the tariff, of revenue and finance. They are interested to know how burdens imposed upon them ever since the war (and by which one hundred millions of dollars of the hard-earned money of the people of the United States are annually wrung from their pockets in excess of the needs of the government), are to be removed. They are interested in great questions of internal improvement, and in the improvement of our rivers and harbors, so that the natural avenues of commerce may be maintained and increased, and devastating floods prevented, so that the dwellers in the valleys may not be compelled to flee to the hills. They are interested in governmental regulation of internal commerce, so that gigantic *monopolies* may be stayed in their grasping control of the transportation of the country. They are interested in having a sound currency, and consequently staple markets, in the proper control and disposition of the public lands, in a hundred great questions, which are matters for national consideration and congressional action, and which are the subject of study and popular discussion in every State but ours. And yet in this State, twenty years after reconstruction and ten years after its government has been restored to its people, we are engaged in a bitter discussion, not over State politics or policies, but over the claim of individuals and factions, and this discussion goes so far as not only to prevent the consideration of questions of national and State policy, but in some quarters to be accompanied by the demand that all issues, claims and candidacies should be subordinated to the

SUPPORT OF A PARTICULAR CANDIDATE

for Governor, and that the field of political discussion shall be closed, and the door of political preferment shut to all who do not align themselves under the banner of a political leader. Against this claim, and this sort of politics, I desire to enter my protest to-day.

From the date of the Confederate surrender, and the restoration of my citizenship, until the government of the State was secured to its people by the election of Gov. Nicholls, I have tried to do my humble part in the constant battle which we waged with our political enemies, the Radical party, for the accomplishment of that object.

For the last ten years we have been in possession of our State in every department of its government. We have elected three Governors, as many Legislatures, and have adopted a new Constitution of our own making. We are now in possession of the national administration for the first time in twenty-five years, and have a unanimous Democratic delegation from this State in both houses of the national Congress. All this has been achieved by harmonious and united action within the Democratic party by Democratic unity.

I for one, now that we have accomplished this great political success, decline to turn my back upon the methods by which it has been achieved, and to join in a war of factions, whose only result can be the destruction of that harmony and union through which we have triumphed, and in which consists our strength. I have never faltered in battle with the enemy. I wish to make no war upon my friends.

As I said in Monroe, we have had three Democratic State administrations since 1877, and the Democratic party are responsible for them all. There may have been errors of omission or commission, but these administrations have been in the main

WISE, PRUDENT AND HONORABLE.

During this whole ten years of Democratic government the State has prospered and improved in every material interest. Taxation has been reduced, the expenses of the government have been cut down, better provision has been made for the education of the children of both races, the levees destroyed by the war and subsequent floods have been rebuilt and placed in better condition than for twenty-five years past. Our public charities and educational institutions have been restored and placed in good condition. Our financial condition and public credit have been materially improved, and the blessings of good government have evidenced themselves in spite of poverty, bad crops and many misfortunes with which our people have been visited.

I have no word of criticism, and, indeed, nothing but praise to bestow upon the three distinguished gentlemen who have during this period filled the gubernatorial chair. One of them has been untimely removed from earth, young in years, but full of honors, while serving the term for which he had been chosen by a great majority, and has left behind him a memory which will be ever dear to the people of the State which he loved and served so truly. The other two are candidates now before the people for the office which they have both filled with distinguished credit to themselves and service to the State.

With this candidacy no one can find fault. The position is one of great honor, and to fill it may well be the ambition of any worthy citizen.

But I have ventured in other places, and I venture here to find fault with the manner in which the campaign is being waged in behalf of at least one of these candidates and the grounds upon which his candidacy is placed, and here, standing upon a Democratic platform, to which all candidates and all Democrats of every shade of opinion are invited, I venture to criticize that style of Democratic campaign which is made in

THE INTEREST OF A SINGLE CANDIDATE,

and solely in opposition to a Democratic State administration.

Gov. Nicholls was chosen Governor by the unanimous and enthusiastic vote of our party. In the trying struggle for the recognition of our government, in which he was our leader, he did his duty well and nobly. I have no desire, as I have said before, to pluck one laurel from the chaplet which adorns his brow. I cheerfully accord to him all the honor which belongs to him. His term was abridged by the constitutional convention. He did not offer himself again for re-election. He retired, as he himself said, willingly from the cares of office, and of a political life for which he had no taste.

He now offers himself as a candidate as he says, not that he desires office and to re-enter political life, but because he is told that he alone can unite the Democratic party, can purify and restore it, and preserve it from the baleful influences which surround the present Democratic administration.

It is with these reasons for candidacy, and not with the candidate himself, that I find fault. I have no objection to Gen. Nicholls for Governor. I do object to the assertion, which I deny, that his is the only name that can unite and harmonize the Democratic party. How can he and his canvassers unite the Democratic party, when they are conducting a campaign of bitter denunciation against a portion of the Democratic party, whose support and votes are necessary to our success?

Then, I ask, as I asked at Monroe, what is this crisis that has come upon the Democratic party, and why this need of a saviour to sacrifice himself for their preservation? Why should war be declared against one-half of the Democratic party by the other, and why should Gen. Nicholls be called from his voluntary retirement to lead in this fratricidal contest? If the present Democratic State administration is corrupt and unworthy of public confidence, the people will condemn it and place the seal of their disapprobation upon it; but if no such charges are made and proven, and no such charges have been made or proven in the present campaign, then it is evident that Gen. Nicholls has but come forward as

THE LEADER OF A FACTION,

and the Democratic party cannot be harmonized through a war of factions.

Who has told Gen. Nicholls that he was the only man whose name could unite the Democratic party? and by what authority has any man, or set of men, undertaken to say to the people that Gen. Nicholls is the only candidate who can be recommended for their suffrages; that he is the only candidate who can unite the opposition to the present Governor? Why should an opposition be united against the present Governor any more than an opposition against Gen. Nicholls? Why should the people be ordered to divide themselves upon these personal lines? Is it Democratic? Will such division harmonize the Democratic party? Have the names of no other candidates been presented for the public approval?

I have seen in certain portions of the State strong popular manifestations in favor of a distinguished citizen of your parish, whose name has been identified with the cause of the people in every political struggle of the past twenty years and whose ability, integrity, devotion and brilliant services commend him to the people of the State as eminently fitted for the high position of Governor. I allude, of course, to John C. Moncure.

On Red river, a little below you, the people of Natchitoches present with unanimity the name of their favorite son, M. J. Cunningham, another brilliant actor in his people's struggle for their liberties, ever faithful, ever true, fitted for and well deserving gubernatorial honors, or any other within the gift of the people.

Still in the Red River Valley the name of James Jeffries has been presented by the true and loyal Democrats of Rapides; a man wise in council, eloquent in debate, devoted to his party and his people, and always in our trying history found in the fore-front of our political battles when courage, coolness and brain were needed. Further south, the names of Brent, and Foster, and Behan have been mentioned as available and worthy candidates.

Are not these men good Democrats, and have they not rendered long and faithful service to their party? Have they not served their people well in war, as well as in peace? Would not the selection of either of them give satisfaction to the people of the State and insure harmony within the party? This is not denied, but we are told that neither of them could unite the opposition to Gov. McEnery, and therefore their names cannot be considered in this great and overpowering crisis.

THE DEMAND OF THE HOUR

is not for Democratic success, it is not for Democratic harmony, it is for the defeat and destruction of the present Democratic administration, even if it should be necessary in the accomplishment of that task to pull down the pillars of the Democratic temple in which we have all been wont to congregate.

Gen. Nicholls says (and I believe him, for I know the cares of office were never grateful to him) that he does not want the office of Governor, but would far rather remain in the private walks of life, but he comes forward obedient to the call of the people, who tell him that he alone can unite and strengthen the Democratic party. If he does not wish the office, why does he permit a canvass to be made for him in every parish of the State? Why does he lend to that canvass the sanction of his presence and his speech? Why does he not give way to the candidacy of Moncure, of Cunningham, of Jeffries, of Brent or of Behan? Because, the inevitable answer comes back again, the object to be attained is not the nomination and election of a Democratic Governor, but it is the defeat of the present Democratic Governor, and the condemnation by the people of his administration, and his friends say this can only be accomplished through the leadership and personal popularity of Gen. Nicholls. To this sort of personal politics I cannot give my assent, and I do not believe that it will receive the sanction of the Democracy of Louisiana.

By whom was Gen. Nicholls called (like another Cincinnatus from his retirement) to lead the people of Louisiana to their deliverance? Who of the Democratic party was consulted when this call was made? Were the friends of Moncure, the friends of Jeffries, the friends of Cunningham, the friends of McEnery, consulted? and certainly they form no inconsiderable portion of the Democratic people of the State. The call came from Caddo, and how many of the people of this parish were consulted, may I ask? Was there a great popular assemblage or meeting held in this or any other parish of the State which passed resolutions calling Gov. Nicholls to come forward as a candidate? And was this cry taken up and echoed by the people from parish to parish until it became one great outburst of patriotic sentiment which could not be ignored—the veritable voice of the people? I think this can hardly be pretended. The call came in the shape of a letter from a distinguished gentleman of this city, which was published simultaneously with the response of Gov. Nicholls.

THE LETTER AND THE RESPONSE

evidenced previous consultation and agreement, but was this consultation and agreement of a nature to bind any but those concerned, or held among so large and influential a portion of the Democratic party of the State as to be expressive of the sentiments and choice of the party? Still more, did it authorize the parties to this action to assume that they constituted the Democratic party, and could decide in this arbitrary manner what was best calculated to secure its harmony and success? I deny all these propositions, and come back to the one with which I started, which is that the campaign being made by Gen. Nicholls, or in his behalf, is not such a one as should be waged in the Democratic party, and is not conducive to its harmony or success.

Can we afford to have war in the Democratic party of this State, still less to encourage war made upon it? And here I repeat what I said in Monroe, that war upon the Democratic administration of the State, which we elected and placed in power, and for which we are responsible, is war upon the party. The bitter assaults made upon that administration, if true, give the lie to what I, as well as others of your representatives, have said in high places to which we were accredited, in defense of the government of our State since it was remitted to the control of its own people. I maintain the verity of my statements. Nothing has been alleged or proven to cause me to retract one iota of my indorsement of the honesty, good faith and general success with which the affairs of this State have been administered by Gov. Nicholls and his Democratic successors to the present hour.

THE PRESENT GOVERNOR OF LOUISIANA

is now on trial, as have been his predecessors. In the administration of his ungrateful office he has made enemies, as did they, but after he shall have closed his official life, whether renominated or not, the verdict of the people will be, as in the cases of Nicholls and the lamented Wiltz, that he was a true and devoted patriot who filled the duties of his high office honorably and well, and with equal credit to himself and the State.

I repeat, can the Democratic party afford to divide, and can we afford to war upon each other? When I last canvassed this State, and when I last had the honor to make a political speech in Shreveport, there was no division in our ranks; our people were not divided into hostile camps. We were united and fighting as one man against a common enemy. Can any one say that this is now the case? Our Democratic newspapers now war upon each other. Our mass meetings and conventions split into factions, our State committee battle for ascendency as if composed of rival parties. New tests are proposed to our candidates for Congress, and they are requested to align themselves upon State and factional, instead of national issues. Is this change because we have come into power in the national government, and no longer have an organized enemy to fight at home? If so, I would far rather that our old enemy, the Republican party, was again fully organized and strong enough to contest with us for political ascendency. Then we would cease to battle among ourselves and turn to fight our enemies. And how long may it be before our opponents are in the field again to take advantage of our dissensions? The Republican party of this State still lives, though sleeping. Their State committee have recently been in session. They are ready to profit by our divisions. I do not fear their party success, but are you willing to divide and to permit them to hold the balance of power in yours? I am not afraid of African domination, but are you willing to divide and to permit

THE NEGRO VOTE

to hold the balance of power and to decide the question between your contending factions? I call your attention to these dangers because they wait upon discord and dissension, and what has happened elsewhere in the history of the country may occur again. The success of Mahone in Virginia grew out of division in the Democratic party, and the colored vote converted his minority white vote into a majority, which sent him to the Senate and temporarily gave the State to the Republicans. In Mississippi the Independent party in 1883 was composed of bolting Democrats, who organized the colored vote and caused all the political trouble in Copiah and other counties.

We cannot afford to divide in this State, and, if we cannot afford to divide, we cannot afford to make war upon each other.

You men of Caddo have won your own liberties and conquered your own peace by your united and determined action. You owe your success to no policy of compromise or conciliation. Do not in a campaign of strife and bitterness imperil or throw away the blessings of good government to which you owe your great and growing prosperity.

And now fellow-citizens permit me a word or two personal to myself. I have declined to be drawn into a war of factions, which I have not aided to inaugurate, and I have been of course subjected to some

UNJUST AND UNWARRANTABLE CRITICISM.

I have been charged by some of the small partisans, and in some of the newspapers of the country, with being afraid to take sides in the contest now going on in the State, and with being, in the vulgar slang of the day, "on the fence."

I have taken, fellow-citizens, an humble part in the politics of the State ever since 1865, when I returned to my home a paroled soldier, after serving through the war as a private.

From that date until the full restoration of our liberties in 1877, I took an active part in every campaign waged by our people for the redemption of our State, and served to the best of my ability wherever duty called me. In all that time I think my record will show that I never shirked or failed to meet any political issue, or any political enemy, and that I was never for one moment undecided, or "on the fence," when the interests of my party, or of the people of this State, were concerned. I served the people of this State six years in the United States Senate, and I challenge investigation of my record to show a single instance where I ever shirked or failed to meet a single question, upon which difference of opinion existed during my service in that body, still less where I failed in my duty to my people on any question in which their interests or honor were involved.

If this is true, and I challenge contradiction, I can afford to treat with contempt, as I do, the petty attacks which are made upon me, because I do not choose to engage in a war upon members of my own party and upon the Democratic administration which it has placed in power.

Fellow-citizens, I do not aspire to party leadership nor desire it at the expense of my convictions. I have no ambition to be a "boss" or to control in any manner the independent and honest opinion of any other man. What I yield to others I claim for myself, and do not propose to submit to the dictation of any party leader, no matter how much personally he may command my respect.

I am indebted to the people of Caddo for their constant and generous political support. The votes of their Representatives aided to send me to the Senate, and they were cast again in pursuance of their instructions for my re-election.

I am notified now by

A PUBLIC PROCLAMATION,

coming from a source which I respect and esteem, that I cannot hope for the vote of Caddo should I again be a candidate for the Senate, and why? Have I faltered in my devotion and duty to the Democratic party? Have I been untrue to my State or her people? Have I committed any wrongful act which would justify the people of Caddo in withdrawing their confidence from me? If either of these questions can be answered affirmatively, I will submit without a murmur to their verdict of disapproval. But no such grounds for condemnation are urged. If I am to be rejected it will be because I do not align myself in the support of a partisan candidate for Governor.

I do not think that the people of Caddo have any cause to complain of me, and they have never done so. In all their troubles I have been with them. When they were assailed on the floor of the Senate I defended them. When many of their best citizens were dragged for political reasons before a Federal court for trial I returned from Washington, and assisted in their defense as a volunteer counsel. For you beautiful building, which ornaments your city, you are largely indebted to the energetic efforts of your able and distinguished Congressman, Mr. Blanchard, but I claim some humble part therein, for I passed the bill in the Senate before it was passed in the House.

I claim no credit for these things, for they were labors of love, but I do ask the good people of Caddo, to whom I am profoundly grateful for past kindness, not to discard me from their favor and appreciation simply because I refuse to listen to a partisan call to arms to battle against my own party.

If I should be a candidate it will be upon my past record, and it is the only guarantee I can give for future conduct. By it I am willing to be judged by the people of Caddo and of the State.

Mr. Jonas was listened to with marked attention, and frequently persons in the audience expressed their approbation of his sayings, and loudly cheered him. When he referred to the letter of Mr. Hollingsworth, the audience hooted at the assertions of Mr. Hollingsworth, and several of them cried aloud: "He has no right to give our parish away. He has no right to talk for us. You can have Caddo whenever you need her. You have been our friend."

At the