THE VOICE OF A STATESMAN

GREAT SPEECH BY GOV. PALMER IN DECATUR, ILL.

An Original Republican on the Issues of the Campaign—Grant's Administration a Failure—Greeley's Election to be the Beginning of an Era of Peace and Honesty.

Extracts from Gov. Palmer's speech in Decatur, Ill.

MR. PRESIDENT: I have the pleasure of being personally acquainted with a great many of the citizens of Macon county, and I think of making more appropriate than that you (Mr. Chairman) should honor me by introducing me to those whom I do not know. Sixteen years ago you and I were what were called "Soreheads" then, and we went to the Convention at Philadelphia that nominated John C. Fremont. A friend of mine said to me to-day that as we nominated Fremont we have no right to complain of those who nominate Grant. I said to him, "We only did it once; you propose to do it twice. We are are wiser than you." [Laughter.] My first political speech was made thirty years ago. I was then a member of the Democratic party. I was born in the Democratic party. My father had voted for Jefferson and claimed to have come down in regular succession. When I was a boy I learned to hurrah for Jackson, and I stood with my party, believing, however, that slavery and Democracy were inconsistent with each other. I was an original anti-slavery man. I believed in the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, and I believe to-day that freedom and equality before the law is a natural as it is now a constitutional right of every man within the limits of this Republic. In 1856 I did what I could to elect Mr. Fremont. In 1860 I exerted myself to assure the election of Mr. Lincoln. In 1864 I was absent from the State in the army, and did not vote. In 1868 I voted for Gen. Grant.

GRANT A FAILURE.

Now those who seek the renomination of Gen. Grant have undertaken to show you that, with his four years of experience, he is a success. I am not speaking to partisans, because there is no well-founded reason why there should be any parties to-day except the parties that are formed with reference to the duties of to-day. [Applause.] Then addressing you, gentlemen, who have been with me through those long weary years of strife over slavery, secession, and the civil war, addressing those gentlemen who have differed with us during this dark and bloody period in our history, appealing to each one of you, as a citizen and a man, I ask the question of you, can it be affirmed of Gen. Grant that his Administration has realized your idea of what should be the Administration of a Republican statesman? Without any spirit of detraction, allow me to ask if you were satisfied with his nomination in the first instance? Do you not know that, when Abraham Lincoln was made President, he called around him the great men who had been marked by public opinion as his rivals, and who were, at the same time, great popular leaders? There were Seward and Chase—but I need not enumerate that constellation of great men gathered around him.

WHO ARE FISH AND BORIE?

When Gen. Grant became President, he chose Mr. Washburne temporarily, and finally Mr. Fish, for his chief counsellor, the Secretary of State. Now, who of you, unless it is some old fogy like myself, who happened to live a good while ago, had ever heard of Hamilton Fish before he was called into Gen. Grant's Cabinet? Hamilton Fish? Who had heard of him? For Secretary of the Treasury, do you not recollect that he appointed A. T. Stewart, the great merchant of New York, and then found that he was ineligible by a law passed in the last century? And you will recollect that he then said it would be necessary for us to make Stewart eligible to the position. He called John Rawlins as Secretary of War, and no objection could be urged to that appointment. But do you remember who his Secretary of the Navy was? Do you remember how, as the telegraph gave us the name, some had it Borie, others Borie, or Bavier, and a great variety of other names, and finally it turned out to be Borie. Had you had ever heard of Borie before? I will not trouble you with a recapitulation of these names, because they are only remembered on account of the extraordinary fact that anybody ever thought of bringing them into a Cabinet.

THE SACRIFICE OF CHARLES SUMNER.

Do you not remember that it has been a ground of complaint, among Republicans, that Gen. Grant called around him such inferior men for his counsellors, without going at length over the history of his Administration? Is there any Republican here who attempts to defend that most extraordinary act of attempting to acquire the Island of San Domingo? Even Gen. Grant himself was compelled, bold as he is, to back down from it in view of the storm of public sentiment. And, gentlemen, you remember how he visited his indignation upon one of the foremost statesmen of his time? You recollect the man who was sitting in this very place, this place in the Senate, because he dared speak for human freedom? The man whose eloquent voice has been always loudest and firmest for liberty on this continent? Gen. Grant demanded and obtained the sacrifice of Charles Sumner because he was bold and true to freedom in the acquisition of San Domingo. Sumner was stricken down from a position which he has filled, and for which he is better fitted than any other public man in this country, and Simon Cameron made Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. What was the crime for which Sumner was hot on on good terms with Hamilton Fish, Charles Sumner was not in favor of the acquisition of San Domingo.

Let me ask you, is there a public man in the country, who has dared to resist Gen. Grant's will, who has not been visited by his wrath? Is there a man who has dared to differ with him, who has not been visited by his displeasure? What was the crime? What was the offence? What was the object of Gen. Grant's wrath? Is there a man who dared to differ with him, who has not been visited by his displeasure? Is there a man who has dared to differ with him, who has not been visited by his wrath? What was the crime? What was the offence? What was the object of Gen. Grant's wrath? Is there a man who has not been visited by his displeasure? Is there a man