The Chief-Justice said to the Sheriff: "Did Mr. Perkins send that message to this Court?" "Yes," said the Sheriff, "and he hoped you would excuse him." "Go down to Mr. Perkins's counting-room and bring him here, and if he makes any further objection to coming, take a sufficient force to secure his attendance." And Mr. Perkins came up, and bowing to the Judge, said that he hoped that he would be excused; that he was fitting out a ship for the East Indies that day, and it was not convenient for him to attend upon the jury, and he had sent his fine. "Where did you get the money or the means to fit out a ship for the East Indies, Mr. Perkins?" "Why, sir, you know my position and my relations to commerce." "Well," said the Chief Justice, "the means to fit out a ship for the East Indies you derived from the protection which the laws of your country give to you, and your prosperity is due to the obedience of the people to those laws." [Applause.] "Now," said he, "take your seat in the jury-box, Mr. Perkins, and let somebody else fit out your ship for the East Indies." [Applause.] And so it is, and so it must be; and I wish it were true—I wish it were true—that those who have received little may love but little, but that those who have received much from their country must love much. [Applause.]

WHAT SUFFRAGE CONSISTS IN.

And now we are at the eve of an election, and of an election of President of the United States, and of an election by suffrage which belongs to the people. There is no power in this country that does not proceed from suffrage, and there is no authority that can be wielded by any citizen who is lifted into great office but what is recognized in him because the free suffrages of the people have conferred the honor upon him. And what do we perceive at this election but this most extraordinary condition of things in this country?—that all over this free country of ours, where loyalty and honor and duty to the Government of the country have been kept and preserved, there is an emotion, activity, discussion, spirit, pride, power, everywhere communicated and communicable. It is vital in every part, and in such a community "cannot but by annihilation die." [Applause.] But in one part of this country—alas! severed from the rest by the same lines that divided revolt from fidelity to Government—the suffrage is dead. There is no discussion, there is no life, there is no love, there is no spirit, there is none of that movement of the popular heart, that exaltation of the popular minds, which belongs to a free people. For the suffrage there is paralyzed; the suffrage there is subjugated. And what is the suffrage, and what does its paralysis and what its subjugation mean? Why a free franchise is not the mere formality of the deposit of a vote. It is in its threefold capacity the great action of an intelligent, of an animated, of a loyal, government-loving people; and if it lacks these attributes it is no suffrage at all.

The first of these attributes is that the suffrage is a reflex of the moral and intellectual forces of the community, brought to a focus in this election of candidates and the choice between them—and thus it is an act of sovereign intelligence and moral uprightness. The second feature is that it stimulates and animates by public discussion the whole region of thought of a great people, and so is the greatest means and the greatest master of education that is free to the whole body of the people. The third great attribute is that it consolidates the great mass into a strenuous community filled with interest, filled with passions, proud of their liberty, proud that they are the masters of the country. It consolidates them to the authority which the laws require to be obeyed by this great and strenuous community. It conciliates them to this authority because they have been consulted, and have taken part in the transaction that has lodged the authority of law in the persons of those who have received the suffrage.

DANGERS OF A SOLID SOUTH.

I need not say to you that if in any large part of this community these traits of the suffrage are not maintained, are not observed, are not potential—whether that portion of the community be reduced to obedience to the laws by force or not—they, for the time, and until these mischiefs are corrected, are struck out of American life, of American liberty, of American Government. [Applause.] And now long can that community, thus curtailed, thus impoverished, thus evacuated of the vitality of our institutions, maintain their freedom? I speak not now of any subject and inferior class that may have these dishonors and these contempts visited upon them; but I speak of what are called the ruling class, of what is spoken of as the intelligent class, and as including the material interests of that portion of the country; now long can the habit of violence, how long can the operations of cruelty, hold sway without in turn fastening a reign of terror, step by step, upon class after class, and man after man? Believe me, no portion of the American people can afford to be without the life-blood of liberty and of justice without itself succumbing in all its parts, in all its classes, to a final reign of terror and domination of force. [Applause.]

And how long can the rest of the country tolerate this unequal partition of power? How long can it be maintained in this country that 138 electoral votes are taken out of politics and are wielded, not by Liberty and Justice, but by power and oppression? [Applause.] How long can parties rest satisfied with peaceful discussions if there is to be thrown down into the arena a solid vote, unintluenced by argument, by reason, by interests distributed in the community and equally proclaimed through the rest of the country? Whoever sides with this majestic mass needs to get only forty-seven votes, and whoever dares to oppose it must get "185." [Applause.]

Now is this free country of suffrage-loving and liberty-loving people to be told that, hanging over our manifold interests, brooding over our strong passion as freemen and freedom-lovers, there is to be and this threat that our opponents shall have the Government with 47 votes and our friends cannot get the Government without the 185. [Applause.] How long will the right of suffrage be maintained in this country of ours if one-fifth of the freemen themselves are only necessary to carry the Presidency one way and four-fifths are necessary to carry it the other? Why, if the Emperor of Germany or the Czar of Russia wielded only 138 votes in our Electoral College of 369, and said to this people: "You may please yourselves with the equality and freedom of suffrage over the rest of the community, but those who vote with the Emperor or the Czar need only 47 votes, and those who vote against him need 185," how long would it be before we should see that there is not only no freedom in that 47 votes, but there cannot be long any in the 185? [Applause.]

LIBERTY BETTER THAN QUIET.

And now that is the great problem that meets this people at the outset, and the alternatives are presented to us in the smooth speeches of Democratic statesmen and orators: "Way don't you see how much easier it would be for you to yield to this wish of the South and have it all peaceful and quiet, and give them the 47 votes without making a fuss about it; and don't undertake to rage through the country and ransack the conscience, the wisdom and the virtue of your people, in the hopeless task of getting the 185. [Applause.]; Just for peace's sake and for good neighborhood, and to show that you value the repose of the community." [Laughter.] Well, gentlemen, I do not think that if the Czar of Russia or the Emperor of Germany wielded those votes, we would answer an argument of that kind by favoring the repose of this great and proud people at the sacrifice of its liberty and self-respect. [Applause.] I think that we will say, whenever that mass of political power is flaunted in our face and brandished over our heads, "If you want our liberties come and take them. [Applause.] Come and get your forty-seven votes if you can, and we will submit; but we won't let you have Indiana [applause], when you were expecting to roll as a sweet morsel under your tongue [laughter and applause]; and we won't let you have Ohio [applause], because we like to have the State where our candidates lives vote for him." [Applause.] And then they say "Well, but the merchants of New-York, the merchants of Brooklyn, they surely won't make a fuss about liberty and honor and pride, and those sentimental vapors that are good enough for the agricultural classes. The merchants, knowing where the real interests of society rest, won't mind giving up the North to this demand of the South."

Well, gentlemen, these young people of the Republican Club have made up their minds, I believe, that, so far as depends upon them, the vote of New-York shall not be surrendered to the consolidated South. [Loud applause.] These Southerners seem to think of the commercial classes somewhat as the great Lord Chatham is said, in one of his most tremendous fulminations in Great Britain, at the time of our advancing revolution, to have spoken of the merchants of England. Now, Lord Chatham was a great friend of liberty and a great friend of America. He had dared to say in the British Parliament: "To force that America has resisted. Three millions of Whigs with arms in their hands cannot be put down by any force you can send against them." [Applause.] And when the commercial classes in England at that day wanted peace and repose, and trade in tea and other articles of consumption, and had ventured to throw themselves against Lord Chatham and against our liberty, what did Lord Chatham say? "Tell me not of the merchant, tell me not of the merchant. His counting house is his temple; his desk is his altar; his ledger is his Bible, and money is his God." [Applause.]

Now, when the South with arms in their hands, spoke to the merchants of New-York and Brooklyn, what answer did the merchants of New-York and Brooklyn make? They went to their ledgers and laid them on the altar of the country. They marched off one-half of their mercantile fortunes as lost by the Rebellion of the South, and they carried the other half to the credit of the Government of the United States to be drawn upon. [Applause.] And you may remember that it was then said of the merchants of New-York that they sold their goods, but not their principles. [Applause.] And now I am glad to know that old merchants and young merchants propose to take their places in the great jury-box that is now listening to argument and in November is to give a verdict, and to say, if necessary, "let other people fit out ships to the East Indies." [Applause.]

WHAT THE SOLIDARITY OF THE SOUTH MEANS.

No, gentlemen; the people of this country have made up their minds that the answer to a "Solid South" is not, in any sense in which the South is solid, a "Solid North," but a deliberate, a manly, a persistent, a noble, a courageous effort to bring out the voice of this people, to maintain the suffrage all over this land. [Applause.] There is not the least objection to a solid vote for a candidate on one side or the other. There is no objection in Vermont, for instance, voting forever and forever on the right side. [Applause.] There has not been any great objection, except a moral one, to Indiana voting ever and again on the wrong side; but it was not a solid vote in the sense that the suffrage was suppressed and something else took its place. We are not accustomed to a report of the suffrage which brings in all the votes cast as being a majority of one party. [Laughter.] That we do not call an election, and the true phrase for the South is its solidarity. And let me read you the definition by Dr. Trench, the accomplished Archbishop of Dublin, who understands well the use of language, as to what this word solidarity means and where it comes from. Says Dr. Trench of solidarity: "A word which we owe to the French Communists, and which signifies a community of gain and loss, in honor and dishonor, a being, so to speak, all in the same bottom.

And that is what the solidarity of the South means. They are all in one bottom of honor and dishonor, of gain and loss. It is a cumulating, an aggregating, an iron-bound mass, from which every symptom of life in the suffrage has been expelled. And now, whenever they bring in the vote, and they find that the population have voted; and whenever they count the vote, and whenever they go through the same subtraction of taking the minority from the majority, and they have reported the vote against the Republican party, and in every one of the fifteen States—why, it is American suffrage, and we will submit to it! Whenever all the blacks, to whom we have given liberty, vote against liberty, we will submit to this would, even in the house of our friends; but until that vote is taken we insist upon all the powers of the American people under the laws and the Constitution—all the moral and intellectual forces, all the pride in our institutions, all our duties as American citizens urging us one way; that we meet that solidarity of votes as now presented by solidity of moral and intellectual force, and of free suffrage that will destroy it forever as an agent and factor in American politics. [Applause.]

NO LONGER PROPITIATING THE SOUTH.

Captain Cook tells us in one of his voyages that in one of the South Sea Islands he found a race that had a peculiar idea of divinity; that they had a belief, to be sure, in a good God, and that it was the most powerful of the spirits, yet they recognized a devil also, and offered all their sacrifices to him. For they said: "The good God, of His own goodness, will do what is right by us, but it is our business to propitiate this devil by the sacrifice of all that is dear to us." And now the Democratic orators and statesmen seem to think that Providence is on our side, and that this good and great, intelligent, free and manly community of the North would always do about what is right, and therefore the way is to propitiate this unmannerly—I use no harsher word—this unmannerly mass of our Southern fellow-citizens. Well, we tried it before the war, and how many of our great statesmen went down to the grave with their heads bowed in shame! how many of the women of the land, how many of the Christian people, how many of the youth, suffered grief unutterable! how has all the land suffered for the shame of slavery? And then when resistance in that same solidarity of slavery was raised by the vote and by arms, how many of our youth, how much of our treasure, did we sacrifice? But then, thank God, it was no longer in propitiation, but in a determination to destroy the enemies of American liberty. [Loud applause.] And now the appeal to the evil spirit that suppressed the suffrage no longer is heard by patient ears. If in Indiana they won't endure it, do you think they will endure it in Connecticut, in New-Jersey and in New-York? [Applause.] The whole stress of the battle finally rests upon us. The eyes of the whole country are concentrated here. Here is the trial, here in your own midst, here in the City of New-York. All the rest have spoken a tone not to be misunderstood. Does anybody doubt how the State of New-York, outside of these great cities, feels and thinks, and how it will act? Does anybody doubt that a hundred thousand majority of the free people of New-York State, outside of these great cities, are ranged with New-England, and the Northwest, and Pennsylvania, and Indiana [cheers], and Ohio, and are saying with one voice, "We will submit to no such oppression any more?"

Well, now, it is said that there will be 100,000 majority in these two great cities, countervailing the free people of the rest of the State and ranging us as the only State of the North on the side of this solidarity of the South. Why, gentlemen, who are to do it? We, ourselves, if it is done at all. Do you believe that the mass of this community, of your city, of which this is in numbers but a feeble representative, great as it is, but which in spirit and in work is the representative of the sober thought and manhood, education, morality and religion of the City of Brooklyn—do you believe that they can be stamped out as an inconsiderable item and crushed in a majority that will not make them worth counting? Not if they do their duty from now till November—not if they swear they will not leave this jury-box until the verdict is rendered for the right. [Applause.]

CHOICE BITS OF SOUTHERN ORATORY.

Now, some of the Democratic statesmen and orators have the advantage of making speeches at both ends of this country. Some of the Southern gentlemen we have heard, and they have wept at the corners of the streets and wiped their eyes in the newspapers [laughter] at the great dangers of oppressions to the suffrage of Brooklyn and in New-York. They seem to think that our adopted fellow-citizens do not have any chance in either of these cities [laughter]—that they are "put upon" [laughter], hustled at the polls, prevented from recording their votes, do not have their votes counted; and if any of them are set up for public office they are shot, I suppose, in the back. [Laughter.] We have not perceived anything of that kind. I do not think that there are any of our Irish fellow-citizens either in your city or New-York that have ever complained that they did not have a fair share of the offices. I have never heard of any uprising on the part of our German fellow-citizens, because their Irish friends did not have a fair chance at the offices. [Laughter.] And I have never heard of any very general complaint among the native American population that injustice was done to our Irish fellow-citizens. I know that in our City of New-York three principal officers at the disposal of the local community—the Mayor, the Recorder and the Controller—are all able, excellent and spirited Irish fellow-citizens of ours in the ticket that they are proposing for the November election. And yet these Southern gentlemen in convention, by their votes, and in their speeches here, are greatly distressed lest this class in our community should not have a fair chance!

Now one of the most intelligent and one of the absest of the statesmen of the Democratic party, our friend the distinguished Senator from Delaware, of whom so many people in New-York and in Brooklyn justly have such a high opinion, and for whom they feel a great regard, and whose disappointment at his failure to receive the nomination was conspicuous, and justly so, in their complaints, made a speech down in South Carolina, and he came up to New-York and gave us an account of what he saw down in South Carolina. He didn't say anything in South Carolina about the enormity of depriving the people of their votes, not a word. But he did talk about the great fraud that had been committed four years ago in the electoral count for the President, and he wished that visited with condemnation. He also spoke of the great duty of the Democratic party to see that marshals at the polls do not deprive the people of the right to vote once, and that soldiers are not so thick about the polls as to deprive the people of that right, which is preservative of all rights—the Democratic platform says—the freedom of the suffrage. He said that he attended a Hancock meeting down here. There were a great number of men standing around on horseback, with red shirts, the most harmless and peaceable people in the world, for all the world just like the yeomanry of New-England and New-York and Pennsylvania. Well that is new to the yeomanry at the North that they are just like the red-shirted people of the South.

And then the blacks that he saw attending that Hancock meeting, why they looked cheerful and peaceable and quiet, not deprived of a single vote, and he talked with them. They came from a distance, some astride of horses and some astride of mules, and they even owned the animals on which they rode. Well, this is the evidence of an eye-witness that, in a Hancock meeting, the blacks that voted the Hancock ticket and the red-shirters were in perfect harmony, and all went smooth and merry as a marriage bell. [Applause.] And he would have you argue that as the Republicans are a quieter and more peaceable people, by so much greater reason a Republican meeting down there would have been even more quiet and more peaceful.

Now in his own state of Delaware, in his own City of Wilmington the other day, he made a speech, and he took up this subject of the freedom of the suffrage, and see what noble sentiments he utters, and how deeply he feels it. He said:

The question for each man to answer is simply, how shall the vote of each, that the laws of the land have given to him, be cast in November? I feel it to be each just as its owner desires it should be; and if every man is true to himself, it can be so cast. No man has the power, in this country, to control another man's vote, if the voter will but do his duty. It is not merely a man's duty to cast his free and unfettered ballot, but it is his high privilege to exercise that privilege, as the dignified duty of a freeman. To interrupt any man's answer to rob him of it is to exhibit the disgraceful qualities of a coward. When any one seeks to control the vote of another by any other than the legitimate means of argument he goes beyond the spirit of an American citizen and exhibits the spirit of a tyrant.

Now why didn't he make that speech down in South Carolina? [Applause and laughter.]

But in Wilmington he had heard that there was such an excitement on the question of labor that Democrats thought really of voting against the Democratic ticket; and he thought that ought to be put a stop to, and that the oppression and intimidation and suppression of the suffrage that the people of the North were threatening to practice ought to be resisted, for any man who attempted it was a tyrant. And yet all over the South the rule is ostracism—social ostracism—for the whites and exclusion from patronage and from livelihood of the blacks who vote the Republican ticket. Why didn't he make his speech in South Carolina? Probably the red-shirt men would not have been as peaceable as the Northern yeoman. [Applause.]

Well, I don't know how people can go around this country with a grave face talking in this way. Whenever I hear such a speech as that at the North from a Democratic statesman, somehow or other I expect to see the screen that he would hold up between you and his Southern allies fail to the floor and disclose that Southern virago, "the little French Milliner"—the *Lady Tenzie* of this comedy of "Democracy" behind the screen—[applause and laughter]—with a tunic—she is in full dress, of course—with a tunic cut in the fashion of a red shirt, with a japon whose warp and woof are the principles of Lee and Stonewall Jackson, with a scarlet overskirt and a deep black fringe—in bullion, I think the ladies call it—of the murders of Hamburg, Yazoo and Kemper County.

Let us have a fair understanding with our public men; let them have none of these noble sentiments so much out of place.

SHALL THE PRESENT PROSPERITY CONTINUE?

Well, gentlemen, this country is in abundant prosperity in all corners of the land, North, South, East and West; and a people in possession of these great blessings of civilization and Christianity, of these magnificent fruits of their Government and the principles on which it rests, are called upon to cast their suffrage for the continuance of that rule that has brought it about or for the reversal of that rule and the chances of what may follow.

I see that a very intelligent writer on Political Economy, Mr. Atkinson, of Boston, in counting with great gratification, as we all do, the magnificence of the cotton crop—five millions of bales and odd—says that this shows that labor has its rewards in the South, and that violence is not the general rule. The general rule? Why we didn't suppose they shot all the people at the South. [Laughter.] We should have very little trouble in the suffrage if that was so; we should have it all one way. But I cannot tolerate this method of talking about the rights of our Southern friends. Not the general rule? Why, who made all this cotton? The black Republicans did the work and the white Democrats have the politics. Good heavens! do you suppose, if the yeomanry of the North had made a crop of five million bales of cotton, that it would be considered a most grateful and agreeable fact to notice that they owned the animals on which they rode. [Laughter.] Why, they would own the farms [applause] as they would own the cotton, and they would own the fruits of their labor. But the truth is the South is divided into three classes: Those who labor, and they are Republicans; those who make politics, and they are Democratic statesmen; and a large class intermediate, that abhors labor and adores politics. [Laughter.] So the Republican blacks pick all the cotton of the Democratic whites, and the Democratic whites pick all the votes of the Republican blacks. [Loud laughter and long applause.]

Now, gentlemen, we must talk plainly to and to these countrymen of ours. To take the political strength in Congress and in the Electoral Colleges which makes this arduous concentration and aggregation in the free parts of the country and overcome it—to take those votes, and then take from the blacks, to whom they were counted out, per capita, as it were—to take the suffrage from them, cannot be respectable in the contemplation of God or man. [Applause.] All the reasoning about it, all the rhetoric, all the screens in the world, cannot hide that ghastly fact, that a great mass of our countrymen takes the power, in comparing suffrage with you, that was meant for the blacks and robs them, who would vote with you, of being counted in the suffrage. As Junius said of certain unworthy characters in English politics: "Such conduct can never escape censure except when it escapes observation." [Applause.] I think the sober judgment of the people of this country—yes, I think the sober judgment of a great portion of the white people of the South takes precisely the same view of that transaction that I have submitted to you; and I beg of you, by your manhood, and your firmness and your solidity, to help this recurrence of honor and cry and pride in the Southern people, so that it shall not be trampled out by your surrender to the pretensions of the solidarity of the South. [Loud applause.]

But now what about this pretence that, as it is not a general rule that violence is offered, therefore it is unbecoming in us to make so much ado about the instances in which these rights are suppressed and this violence is exhibited. What is the measure of it? As *Mercutio* said of his wound: "It is not as wide as a church door; it is not as deep as a well, but as the life-blood flows from it, it will do; it will do." There is enough of exhibition, and enough of perpetration to answer the purpose of suppressing the wound and reducing the solidity of the South. It will do; it will do. Hume, having once written a treatise which brought upon him the condemnation of the religious portion of the English people, complained bitterly that he was visited with so much vituperative criticism when he had only written one bad treatise, and had written so many good works; to which a gentleman engaged in the conversation said to him: "Why, Mr. Hume, your reasoning is like that of the French notary, who, when he had been detected in a forgery and was sent to the galleys for it, thought it very hard that a man that had written so many genuine signatures should be punished for one forgery." [Laughter.]

But, as I have said, the country is prosperous, and I think I may be permitted to add that the Republican Administration now present to the observation of the people, and in the light of whose conduct of affairs the people are to determine whether their servants shall be changed and another party put in possession of a lease of power—I think I may be permitted to say that the actual conduct of the affairs of the country is irreproachable. [Great applause.] I have not heard any Democratic criticism of this Administration or of the present conduct of affairs. And yet I submit to you that the real issue before an intelligent people, abounding in prosperity and having no fault to find with the conduct of affairs, is really this and no writer: Do you wish for the next four years that the affairs of this country should be carried on as they have been for the last four years? [Applause.]

I have observed some criticism, to be sure, when attacks are made upon the Republican party in the way that these statesmen and orators—and within their right—make, not of the actual conduct of affairs, but of the past and of the party. A complaint is made that the principal officers of the Government should find it their duty to speak to their fellow-citizens of the States in which they live of the facts and of the nature of the prospects of the issue that is before them. I never have known yet in any of the experiences of English politics, or in any of the experience of ours, that when the question was between a party in administration and a party in opposition seeking power, there was not a right to canvass the question on one side as well as on the other. [Applause.] I am ready to a count for any great that I may exercise whenever the citizens of New-York or the citizens of Brooklyn are ready to do me the honor to listen to what I have to say. [Applause.]

A DEMOCRATIC SUGGESTION ANSWERED.

You will observe that theoretic politics, dogmas, historic points, to an intelligent, manly people like ours, cease to have an interest when the present issue is one of the simple nature that I have explained to you. Our people know whether they like the administration of affairs as now exhibited by the party in power. They know whether they are pleased with the harvest of this sowing, of this culture; and as to such a question, thus rigidly observed, there can be no answer unless the people have lost their senses.

Our Democratic friends are fond of saying, "Oh, if you had only renominated President Hayes we should not have been able to make any headway against him. When the country is so prosperous and he is so upright and he is so considerate of the rights of all—when he loves the whole country and serves the whole country, it would be ungrateful for the Democratic part of our fellow citizens not to recognize Hayes's Administration as worthy of their praise." Well, gentlemen, supposing that the identical shape of the canvass is not the presentation of his claim, I ask the Republicans—I ask the Democrats of the country, which is nearest like him, and which promises more nearly to follow in the path that he has trod, of this prosperity,—James A. Garfield [immense applause and repeated cheering] and the Republican party behind him, and the Solid North behind it, or General Hancock and the Democratic party behind him, with the Solid South behind it?

Well, there may be some force in the suggestion that the Democratic party could not stand against the renomination of President Hayes, but I think they will find that they cannot stand against the nomination of James A. Garfield. [great applause.] Among the curses denounced by divine authority against the people of Israel, if they should swerve from the right path and from their duty to their God, was this, that, in war, they should go out in one way against their enemy and should flee in seven ways. It seems to me, if I can look over the field of battle, that the Democratic party has come out one way against the Republican party behind General Hancock, and is now fleeing seven ways. [Applause.] And so near as I can see, the issue that all the leaders of the different arms of the service, so far as I can see, are flying into one another. [Applause and laughter.]

Well, gentlemen, as the Democrats will insist upon getting away from this issue and going back a little ways into history, what are the grievances? Why is the South solid against the prosperity of the country and the party that has produced it? Why is it? And what answer do you get? What answer do you get that does not go back to the memories and the resentments of the war that was waged against this Union—that does not go back to the grievances in the processes of reconstruction; that does not go back to the retaliation and the reaction that wishes to place in power the same party, under the same lead and with the same make-up in which it was driven from power. And yet, and yet when they go back, if they will go back, to the source, to the cause, to the responsibility and to the guilt which has produced all these disturbances, all these obligations and all these disasters to them and to us, they say it is a cruel recalling of the issues of the war. But if they go back to the halting or the stumbling or the errors in this grivous process of reconstruction, why that is nothing but becoming self-respect. But I have looked in vain for an identification of the mischief that induced this solidarity, and I find that the only thing a man can put his finger on is presented by a very intelligent statesman of Virginia and by General Hampton in a speech which he made in the streets of New-York, that when in 1866, I think it was in Virginia and in some of the more Southern States, they chose a very intelligent, a very patriotic and a very respectable body of old Whigs and sent them to Congress. Congress refused to receive them; and that justifies the solidarity of the South until they have put their foot on our necks and restored themselves as they were before the war. [Applause.]

THE STATESMANSHIP OF THE PLOUGH.

But there is one argument which they have to parry, the prosperity of the country, and that is by ascribing it all to Providence; and there is a phrase which Governor Seymour has produced, and which Mr. Bayard has applauded in one of his speeches, that it was not the statesmanship of the Republican party that did all these great things for the public credit, for the public honor and for the public prosperity, but it is what Governor Seymour calls the statesmanship of the plough. Well, let us choose the plough as President. [Laughter and applause.] There were ploughs in this country before this prosperity came, and there was not any statesmanship in the plough then. But what speeds the plough? What stops it from rusting in the furrow, or the crops from rotting in the field? What, but that step by step the Republican party pacified the South at the outset of its administration, and has restored the public credit, has reduced the public burdens and has made a demand for the crops that the plough produces. This is the part that statesmanship plays; and the plough might slumber under the dossiers of an administration that might follow just as the plough slumbered before we had unsnarled our finances and reduced our burden of troubles that the great war had brought upon us.

Chief-Justice Chase used to delight in telling a story of a journey he made, when a young man, in going to Cincinnati to establish himself in life, and passing through the magnificent scenery in the upper part of Virginia. As the passengers waked up in the morning after their night's sleep and looked out upon it, a gentleman mentioned, "Way just here is the birthplace of Patrick Henry." And Mr. Chase, fresh from college and full of enthusiasm, broke out in a rhapsody—"How could he fail to have had that magnificent gift of eloquence, that genius of liberty, when he was born in the midst of this magnificent scenery, that would inspire anyone with those gifts." The Chief-Justice said that a sober and respectable gentleman spoke to him from another seat in the stage, and said: "Young man, this scenery has been here ever since Patrick Henry was born, and there haven't been any more Patrick Henrys since." [Laughter.] And I think this statesmanship of the plough that pleases our Democratic friends is very like the genius and eloquence being the production of the magnificent scenery of Virginia.

Now, I think I have never heard that it was wise for a people to wish to change their rulers upon the single argument that Providence seems to have been on their side. [Laughter.] I do not think that that by itself is a good reason for trying somebody else that peradventure Providence might not be on the side of. [Laughter.] But it is the only argument that I have heard brought forward by our Democratic friends against giving the Republican party the renewal of power that belongs to the party that has carried the country through unheard of disaster and brought it out to unexampled prosperity. [Loud applause.] I think that the American people would rather keep this prosperity in the hands of the Republican party and Providence, rather than give it into the hands of the Democratic party and take their chance of what Providence might do. [Laughter and applause.] I know there is one bitter curse denounced upon that people that calls evil good, and good evil, and I have heard from no side except the Democratic any praise of the abominable oppressions that are practised in a large part of this country.

A PARTY AND A CANDIDATE THAT "DON'T KNOW."

Well, gentlemen, the Democratic party, having been up for examination several times during the last twenty years [laughter], has now presented itself once more. You may have seen the story of the schoolmaster down in Texas who offered himself for the examination of the school board, to be trusted with the charge of the education of the young people of the neighborhood. Well, he had got all the political divisions of the world by the ears, had thrown the multiplication table into confusion, and the solar system into absolute disorder and destruction by the answers that he made, and he was rejected. But he prevailed upon the kind-hearted board to give him a chance at another examination, and he was rejected again. His friends said to him, "Why, you didn't pass this time?" "No," says he, "how could I? They asked me the same questions as before." [Roars of laughter.] And that is the disastrous position the Democratic party is in now. People have asked them the same questions as they did four years ago, and eight years ago, and twelve years ago, and sixteen years ago; how can they reply satisfactorily when they are asked the same questions every time. [Laughter.] Hereafter let me advise them to follow the example of a student in a certain academic examination. He was coming out, looking, as we called it in those days, "badly pinched," and was asked by his classmates how he had fared? "Fared?" says he, "I don't pass at all, and yet I answered every question correctly; and they asked me a great many questions." "Why, how could that be, that you don't pass the examination if you answered every question correctly?" "Why," he replied, "to every question they asked me I answered that I didn't know." [Laughter.]

Now, I think that when General Hancock is asked what he thinks about the war claims, he had better answer that he don't know; what he thinks about suffrage in the South—whether it is likely to be bettered at all, or any good come out of it—that he don't know; and when he is asked about the tariff question—[laughter]—that he don't know. He has answered, not in those words, but in a manner that his countrymen, under a charitable construction of his answer, have considered as equivalent to saying it. [Applause.]

PARTIES AND CANDIDATES ON THE TARIFF.

Well, now that we are on this subject of "examinations," let us see. The subject of examination was the platforms of the two parties on the subject of the tariff. The Democratic party said in 1876: "We demand that all custom house taxation shall be only for revenue"; in 1880, "A tariff for revenue only." The Republican platform of 1880 says that the reviving industries should be further promoted, and that the commerce, already so great, should be steadily encouraged. We affirm the belief avowed in 1876, that the duties levied for the purpose of revenue should so discriminate as to favor American labor. [Applause.]

General Hancock, in passing the examination on the Democratic platform, answers: "The principles enumerated by the Convention are those I have cherished in the past and shall endeavor to maintain in the future." [Laughter.] Garfield says in reference to our customs laws: "A policy should be pursued which will bring revenue to the treasury, and will enable the labor and capital employed in our great industries to compete fairly in our own markets with the labor and capital of foreign producers." We legislate for the people of the United States and not for the whole world, and it is our glory that the American laborer is more intelligent and better paid than his foreign competitor. [Applause.]

Now General Hancock, when informed that his countrymen were nearly interested in this question of whether American labor was to be pauperized or not, and that there was an impression that the Democratic party had declared for a well-known principle and a well understood principle, says that there should not be the swerving of a man's breadth to the right or to the left in the laying of customs, but that the most money from the largest importations and the largest gains on the skilled labor imported from abroad was to be the rule of the American people. Does anybody ever hear of revenue increasing on the mere principle of the lowest rate that will bring in revenue that does not flood the market with foreign goods? That is an intelligible principle; it has been understood for fifty years. Well, now, General Hancock says, having had an interview with a Paterson editor [laughter]—which Governor Randolph didn't think did him just ice, but which has not been contracted, as far as I can discover—he said that it was in vain to think that anything that the Federal Government could do about a tariff would effect the industries of the country; that it was a local issue, came up about once in a half a century in Pennsylvania, and that it was all right. He was astonished that anybody should be so stupid as to suppose that it was of any consequence what the opinions of the candidate for the Presidency were on the subject of the tariff. [Much laughter.] And then, when that was not quite satisfactory to his intelligent countrymen, too many of them being stupid, I suppose, he comes out with the saying that he is too sound an American to ever have it supposed that he would do anything that did not help and favor American industry in comparison with industry abroad.

But the people say, "What we wanted was not to know whether you are too sound an American to have that opinion, because that is the very question that we are going to determine—whether you are too sound an American—what we wanted was to know whether you were, as Garfield is, for a system of duties that will protect the dignity of American labor, as a more intelligent body, and better paid than foreign labor?" [Applause.] "If you will tell us *that*," say the laborers all over this country, "*then* we will know whether to vote for you or not." Well, having the war claims all right, he entertains the view that nothing can be done to hurt the North, that the suffrage is to be protected to the extent of a "free ballot, a full vote and a fair count" all over the country. And now, having said that he is "too sound an American," what is there left to undervalue American labor, what is there left for him but to write one more letter [laughter and applause], and address it to Mr. English, of Indiana. [laughter] conceived somewhat in this way:

MY DEAR SIR: There seems to be an impression prevailing in the minds of some of our countrymen that I am running on the same ticket with you. [Laughter and applause.] I am astonished that anybody should give credit to such a bugbear. [Laughter.] For myself I denounce it. There also seems to be an impression that I am running on the Democratic platform. I am too sound an American to do that—and this is the last letter that I shall write, [laughter] and not only is this the last letter that I shall write, but the last that I was ever expected to write. [Uproarious laughter.]

The truth is that when a man in the public gaze of the whole country stands upon a platform, and plank after plank of it breaks down, so that there is not a wide enough spot in it to stand upon except on one leg, it gets to be very irksome and very awkward. It is true you can shift from one leg to the other [laughter], but still it is not graceful and it is very tiresome. [Great laughter.] Then come down from the platform! Come down from the candidacy and let us have the return of the votes all for General Garfield and the Republican ticket. [Hearty applause.]

MANHOOD OF THE AMERICAN LABORER.

Now, gentlemen, there are a great many things in this country that are of interest to the people of it, and among other things of great interest to the people of this country is the question of the labor of the country. The labor of the country holds in its hand, by the gift of the suffrage, the political power of the country—that is to say, in that part of the country where the laborers are allowed to vote. Starting as we did, a poor, sparse people, without great inequalities of rank, we put suffrage upon *manhood*, and said that the man is greater than his circumstances or his property. Pericles had some such idea about a man, when he advised the young women of Athens to marry a man without an estate rather than an estate without a man. [Laughter and applause.] I think the ladies of this country have generally followed that advice—partly, perhaps, because there are more men than there are estates. [Laughter.] But, nevertheless, that is our proposition; and the laws of this country are intended to preserve the dignity of labor. The South never desired the dignity of labor to be preserved under the old system—I do not see that they have much care to preserve its dignity under the new. But in this country of ours, where intelligence and tariff and domestic virtue and personal pride are just as generally and just as clearly the possession of the laboring men as they are of the learned and the powerful and the rich, no peace, no prosperity can exist if we undertake to put our labor in the system of the world upon the level of the labor of countries where its dignity and its political power are not accorded. [Applause.] Any party, any people, in this country that undertake to say that upon the mere economic question of whether a broadcloth coat for a gentleman, or a Worth dress for a lady, can be bought cheaper or dearer is the great problem of American statesmanship will find that the laborers of this country do not agree with him. [Applause.] They mean to have it understood—and they are right—that having education open to them; that having equality in politics their right and their heritage that having the hopes of the future and all the delights of home, its purity, its dignity, their possession, for which they will vote, and for women they will fight, they will tolerate no party that subjects this manhood of the American laborer to the necessities or conveniences of wealth and luxury.

It is not a question of the manufacturer or of the merchant. It is not a question of the foreman or of the master-workman merely. It is a question of all the common people who take part in the magnificence of your commerce and of your manufactures, and who bear their share of the taxation and the burdens, in peace and in war; that uphold this country. And now, when it is found out that whether the Scribes and the Pharisees do or do not understand this problem of the tariff to protect labor, the laborers understand it. You may be sure that the votes of those laborers will settle the question in the great strenuous industries of those great States of Connecticut, New-York and New-Jersey in favor of the dignity and the security of American labor. [Loud applause.] And if General Hancock don't fully understand the subject now, on the 3d day of November he will see through it clearly. [Laughter.]

Well, gentlemen, we are to come to the great judgment. Parties are to be judged; people are to be judged. We lawyers have a maxim that in our trials the judge is condemned if the guilty escape; and by the same rule the judge is condemned if the innocent are condemned. And this people, looking at these two parties, are quite as much in judgment as they, the parties, are. If this people deliberately drives from power a party with the record of the Republican party, and with the fruits of the strenuous labors, and courage in the field, of its soldiers, from Grant down to the private soldier [applause], and in civil life from Garfield down to the common artisan [applause]; if they put in power the opposite party, with such a record as that of the Democratic party, in the field, from Jefferson Davis down to the common soldier, and in statesmanship, from the men that betrayed their trust to the common people that they deluded to their ruin, it is not the Republican party that is guilty, but the people are guilty of a desertion of their trust. [Applause.] Let us understand this matter. Let us hasten on the judgment of this people that follows close a flying foe. Let us hear already the glad shouts of the American people renewing power in the name and in the persons of the Republican party and their candidates. [Applause.] Let us hear, deserved by us,

Omnium consensu capax imperii quia imperavit:

that in the judgment of foreign nations, in the judgment of all this people, in the judgment of the learned and the wise, in the judgment of the feeble and the poor, this party is capable of the trust of government because it has discharged it. [Applause.]

BUTLER AND THE SOLDIERS' HOME.

A DISCREPANCY IN THE ACCOUNTS THAT IS BEING TALKED ABOUT—HOW THE CLOTHING WAS SUPPLIED TO THE HOME—ALLEGED EVASIONS OF THE LAW.

[BY TELEGRAPH TO THE TRIBUNE.]

WASHINGTON, Oct. 20.—It is stated here that there remains a discrepancy of about $18,000 between the statements of account with the Soldiers' Home as they were rendered by General Butler and those rendered by an associate member of the Board. Somebody has had the use of this money for a year, and apparently no effort is being made to account for it.

During the four years of General Butler's service as treasurer, clothing valued at $500,000 was purchased from a single firm in Philadelphia. So far as can be learned this was done without advertisement and without competition. A clause was introduced into the last appropriation bill requiring that purchases should only be made after due advertisement. When he next quarter's vouchers came in General Butler was notified that there was no evidence that this law had been complied with. He replied evasively that the transaction had been of such a nature that no especial sums could be named, and that the law had been constructively complied with.

It was noticed, however, that the vouchers named the sums paid the Philadelphia firm in round thousands.

DEMOCRATIC RUFFIANISM IN NEW-YORK.

A mass-meeting of the Republicans of the XVIIth Assembly District was held last evening at Wendel's Assembly Rooms, Forty-fourth-st., between Eighth and Ninth aves. A