MEMPHIS APPEAL

Terms of Subscription.

DAILY,
One copy, one year, by mail.....$10 00
One copy, six months, by mail.....5 00
One copy, one month, by mail.....1 00
One copy, one week, in city.....25

WEEKLY,
One copy, one year.....$1 00
One copy, six months.....60

GALLAWAY & KEATING,
F. C. GALLAWAY, } 282 Second street,
J. M. KEATING. } Memphis, Tenn.

Entered at the Postoffice at Memphis, Tenn., as Second-Class Matter.

THURSDAY, : : SEPTEMBER 2, 1880

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR PRESIDENT,
W. S. HANCOCK, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

FOR VICE-PRESIDENT,
HON. WM. H. ENGLISH, OF INDIANA.

FOR GOVERNOR,
JOHN V. WRIGHT, OF MAURY.

FOR CONGRESS,
CASEY YOUNG.

TODAY the Hon. Casey Young will formally open his canvass for congress at Somerville. He will be assisted by Colonel Gantt and Judge Key. Morgan, congressional elector, of this city, and several others of our ablest speakers. The people of the ancient capital of Fayette county, skilled as they are in all the arts of generous hospitality, have made extensive preparations, and it is earnestly to be hoped that the weather will be propitious. To the people of this congressional district, whatever their political faith, Colonel Young has made himself almost indispensable by the promptness with which he has answered the calls of his constituents individually, and the fidelity that characterized him in the performance of all his public duties. By his fellow-congressmen he is known as one of the most industrious and indefatigable members of the House. Whatever concerns his district has his whole attention and he is always kind and considerate where the claims or business of other districts are concerned. Earnest and honest, he is also prudent and useful. To re-elect him is to secure to the district a continuance of services whose results are before us in many needed works and to indorse a man whose conservatism and good sense have many times been commended at Washington. We repeat, we hope the weather will be propitious to-day, and that the people of Somerville may realize their fondest anticipations.

We surrender a great deal of our space this morning to a full report of the speech recently made at Boston by General Benjamin F. Butler, on the occasion of his renunciation of Radicalism and his return to the Democratic party. In many respects it is one of the ablest as it is one of the most logical speeches of the campaign. It is a calm review of the policies or rather impolicies of the Republican party, especially of the particular impolicy expressed by the nomination of General Garfield for President by the Chicago convention. He gives the history of the great mobilier affair, and while he does not defend the conduct of Oakes Ames he executes General Garfield for his cowardly assault upon the great shovel manufacturers veracity after death had sealed his lips. General Butler gives his reasons for leaving the Republican party in plain and vigorous language which, nowhere is weakened by personal abuse. He confines himself to facts and dwells with great earnestness upon the happy condition of the negro laborers of the south as contrasted with the abject and servile-like condition of the laborers and mill-hands of Massachusetts. This speech was delivered from the most independent standpoint, for as will be seen by our dispatches from Worcester, Massachusetts this morning, he refused, as he said he would, to accept the nomination for governor at the hands of the Democratic State convention. He will now enter heartily into the work of stumping for Hancock. Next week he will canvass the State of Maine in the cause of the Fusionists. The outlook there shows the fight to be exceedingly close. The Republicans are pouring their money into the canvass, but their work in that direction will be offset by the labors of the Democratic leaders. After leaving Maine, General Butler will stump Indiana for Hancock.

The committee charged with the duty of making arrangements for the coming grand public revival have made rapid progress with their work, and it is confidently expected will have everything ready by the date and time named. The railroad and steamboat companies have, with commendable public spirit, promised their co-operation, which means a very large number of people. Mr. Brooks, lessee of the Theater, writes one of the editors of the APPEAL that the Theater will be opened on the night of the twentieth, and with a company that will prove one of the chief attractions of the happy occasion. Mr. Brooks, in this letter, most heartily indorses the plans and purposes of the committee, expresses himself with the gratitude and fervor of an old Memphian over the promising prospects, and hopes it is the "beginning of a long and prosperous career for the old place." This sentiment, so affectionately expressed, is the one uppermost in the minds of all who have ever known Memphis, and, judging by what the press says, it finds a hearty echo in all parts of the country. The revival will certainly be a grand success.

MR. FRANK B. EARNEST offers good advice in short compass. Writing from Texas to the Knoxville Dispatch, he says that, in his opinion, after a careful survey and much expense, "no Tennessean who is comfortably situated and willing to work can better his circumstances by emigrating to Texas, or any other country, as they have great advantages in the way of climate and natural surroundings, and the soil yields as rich a return to the energetic and intelligent laborer as the majority of western lands. What my old friends need is greater energy, more intelligent agricultural labor, more contentment, and, above all, a more honest administration of the State government." We had not heard before that our State administration was dishonest. Mr. Earnest is surely not in earnest in stating that.

BROTHER TALMAGE, of Brooklyn, in the course of a recent sermon descriptive of the labors and love of a good mother, said that if parents knew more of dietetics there would not be so many dyspeptic stomachs and weak nerves and inactive livers among children. If parents knew more of physiology there would not be as many curved spines and cramped chests and inflamed throats and diseased lungs as there are among children. If parents knew more of art and were in sympathy with all that is beautiful, there would not be so many children coming out in the world with boorish proclivities. If parents knew more of Christ and practiced more of His religion, there would not be so many little feet already starting on the wrong road, and all around as voices of riot and blasphemy would not come up with such ecstacy of infernal triumph.

DR. RICHARDSON, the great sanitarian, of London, who has done so much good by his lectures and writings, recently published a paper on the corset, which, he announces, "deadens the mental capability of woman," and he says that no woman of brilliant intellect has worn corsets. In support of this assertion, Sappho and Aspasia, George Sand and George Eliot, and a host of other prominent women might be cited, but it is sufficient to refer to women of our own time. The long and brilliant career of Miss Susan B. Anthony has been marked by her consistent repudiation of the corset of every form; and others might be mentioned whose names the world will not willingly let die.

IN a speech delivered at Canton, Ohio, last night, Mr. Hayes, the fraudulent President of the United States, stated that by official reports from the treasury department, the expenditures growing out of the war, after deducting all the expenses of the government other than those of the war, have amounted to the sum of $6,189,929,908 58. In the last nineteen years $4,275,000,000 of this has been paid, an average of $225,000,000 per year, besides the ordinary expenses of the government. This has never been paralleled by any other government in the world, and yet Hayes never will.

THE Democrats of every other State in the Union ought to follow the example of those of Hardeman county. Compromise and harmony are good enough in their place, but when it comes to a question of principle, the Democrats of Hardeman county are for the right and the right alone. Hardeman county Democrats will not be found wanting in the fight for the principles for which our fathers fought and bled.

BEN BUTLER,

After Many Weary Years of Political Harlotry, Repenting of His Sins and Making a Frank and Candid Confession Before the People of Massachusetts

Returns to the Democratic Fold—His Most Masterful Speech, in which he Arraigns the Republican Party and Gives Good Reasons for Supporting Hancock.

Boston special to the Cincinnati Enquirer of Saturday: General Benjamin F. Butler, tonight, like the prodigal of old, returned once more to recline upon the bosom of his historic mother, Democracy, and right gladly was he again embraced into her loving fold. The scene of the feast was most appropriate, and was in Faneuil hall. The place was actually packed to every inch of standing room by as many as seven thousand people, many of whom, owing to the oppressive heat, were in their shirt sleeves. As many as five thousand were unable to gain admission, and turned away. Among those present were many old Republicans, as well as old regular Faneuil leaders, who have fought the general for many years in politics. There was no music nor decorations, but what enthusiasm might have been lost by these defects, if they were, was more than fully made up by the thunders of applause that fairly rocked the old cradle when the general appeared. When he took the platform it was many minutes before he could be heard, on account of the reception given. Those whose lungs were weak stamped their feet and clapped their hands in joy and jubilation, while in some instances hats were swung in the air. General Butler was equal to the occasion. He smiled in his usual urbane and gracious way, and, with thanks for the reception, began his speech in a clear and ringing voice, which seemed much improved over that of a year ago. He spoke for two hours, and held the immense audience throughout. His speech was as follows.

THE SPEECH.

By a wise provision of the constitution, the people are called upon at every recurring period of four years to pass solemn judgment upon the policy, integrity and efficiency of the administration of the government in the past, and to choose and appoint those who shall administer their government in the coming like period. On this power in the people to frequently change their rulers our fathers relied for the preservation of the form and fact of a republican government; because, during the term of office of the chief executive and his advisers, who are by his appointment, the constitution gives no efficient power to control their acts, to shape or change the policy of the government, if deemed unwise or hurtful, or to remove from office the President or his subordinates. To that end the process of impeachment is powerless, except, perhaps, in cases of heinous crime. The President, having the power to appoint and dismiss at will an immense number of officials, in fact can *sompel* at least one-third of the house and senate, so that, by his veto, he can prevent the repeal or enactment of any law. In fact, there is no potentate in any country which has a semblance even of constitutional government more absolute and despotic than is the President of the United States during his term of office. If change of policy or administration of government is needed it can only be attained at a Presidential election. That past, for four years at least, as we have seen, the will of the people is powerless. Still more, Under our system of close, practical ballot the people vote under their power upon one of two men only, as the supreme executive head of the nation. As demonstrated by the practice of quite a half century in fact, no third person can be supported for President with any result save in the nature of a protest against the nominee of the conventions of the two great political parties. There is, therefore, no more solemn duty imposed upon any patriot or citizen or higher power exercised by any elector, than to determine which one of the two candidates represents more nearly his convictions upon the greatest number of the measures and principles of government, the administration of which would be most likely to redound to the common good, and the perpetuation of a republic, which no patriot desires, or as yes dares, to say is not the best form of government known upon earth for a free and enlightened people. The voter, if accustomed to think for himself, and not blindly or carelessly follow partisan leaders, may find many things in both candidates and principles of the two great parties which he may think should turn his own judgment. Therefore, the practical result of the election puts this question alone to the elector: Which party and which candidate, on the whole, is nearest what I would have? The voter cannot choose the executive he would have, because, in most cases, his answer would be, Neither; and the result would be inaction, or an unwise choosing an older his ballot upon an impossibility, powerless for good and useless against evil.

The Narrow Limits of Political Action.

These narrowed limits of political action which confine his choice compel the reflecting citizen carefully and candidly to examine the claims and candidates of two parties only—not, perhaps, with the hope of finding in either all his most cherished convictions or ideal President, but "balancing probabilities" to select the man who represents the ideas to which and to whom the welfare of the country can be most safely intrusted. Irrespective of the merits of the principles or candidates of either of the parties, there is a primary important factor in the question to be taken into account by every patriotic elector which ought largely to determine his vote. All History teaches that long continuance in power breeds corruption in the administration of governmental affairs. That corruption always seeks perpetuation, and fears change of administration lest its wickedness may be detected, even if not punished. This, indeed, has become axiomatic, and has so impressed itself upon our people that a tradition, claimed to be almost a law, finds itself in American politics—that no President, however wise, great or good, can be safely trusted with more than a second term in office. If no man can be great, wise and good enough to wield power longer than a second term, how great, wise and good ought a party composed of men presumably much less wise and good to be which seeks to be kept in power for a fifth term in time of peace? What should the thinking voter say to such a claim for renewed power by such a party, if the party has declared in the most emphatic manner, through most of its leading journals, and all its so-called reformers, that its own administration had been corrupt under one whom they admitted to be its greatest and best man, that his officers and subordinates so administered their offices as to lead to widespread defalcation, peculation and abuse of public trust? How shall the conscience of the voter answer to that claim when the party declares by its votes in national convention that such a great and good man, hailed by them as the very savior of his country, ought not to be returned to power, even after the lapse of an intervening term? He chose his officers from the Republican party. They were confirmed by a Republican senate. Were they not, when appointed, the very flower and sweet perfume of the Republican party? Heavily ought these considerations press upon the judgment of the voter when he is thus made certain that he cannot rely on the party for purity of administration, but upon the man alone whom that party has put forward.

Guarantees Demanded of the Republican Party.

What guarantees, then, should not be required of such a party making such accusations and confessions of his predecessor in their own party administration, that the candidate they propose in his stead, accidentally nominated, without having been the first choice, or even in the thought of nine-tenths of the delegates in the convention that chose him, and specially not in the mind of those virtuous reformers of the Republican party who made and proved, to their own satisfaction, these damning sins of their party leaders and officials—one whom, although in company during all this corruption and peculation, never made one honest protest against them, but played the part only of an accused participant in the most of them—is the man to receive, in the minds of such conscientious voters, the support of such a commanding vigor of intellect, of such keen-sighted moral perceptions, of such bold courageousness, unswerving adherence to his own well-matured views, or such moral and mental stamina, that he will stand up firmly in the right, when partisan passions rage about him, and partisan pressure is brought upon him in behalf of the wrong for the good of party, and when, perhaps, millions in temptation are thrown at his feet, and when the hopes of a re-election may be flattered to swerve his conscience and judgment? If this remedial frequent change of officers and party administration—deemed under all political systems which have either in form or in fact ripened into constitutional government, so necessary for the purpose of preserving purity of administration, and for vanishing the tendency of all governments to wind the despotic use of power—is ever to be applied in this country, ought it not to be enforced now? The question will recur to the elector, what vital measure of policy must I give up, what great guarantee of the perpetuity of the government must I weaken, what danger to the safety of the republic do I invoke to obtain this change of administration which is in itself of necessity a great hazard? If the answer shall be, that no one of all these is at issue in this canvass, is not the necessity for this reform of itself sufficient to the citizen to determine his vote? Having thought out these questions for myself with a careful, and, I trust, a candid desire to ascertain my duty as a citizen, having put aside, as far as possible to human infirmity, all hope, or wish, even, for political preferment which might sway my judgment, I have come here to meet you, fellow-citizens, face to face, to give you the result of that thought and deliberation on my part, so that those with whom I have long acclaimed to act in political harmony shall understand and appreciate some of the reasons, at least, which induce me to give my voice and vote, to avail what they may, in favor of a change in the party policy that has governed the United States for the last long years.

Why He Prefers the Democratic Platform.

That my words may have all the effect they can, or ought to have, let me premise by saying that I am not, and shall not be, a candidate or aspirant for any office, elective or appointive, at this election, or under the influence of any such consideration. I am a Democrat, simply, perhaps, but a Democrat with all my heart and all my strength, and I shall do what I can, as I have always done, to make my party, its principles and its candidates, triumphant in this, the free-will offering of patriotic duty, when it shall be given to my comrade-in-arms in the war for the preservation of the Union, the tried and loyal soldier and patriotic chieftain, General Hancock. In so doing, I neither shall detract from, or add, one jot or tittle to that declaration of principles which has been my guide in political life: Equal rights, equal powers, equal burdens, equal privileges, and equal protection to all men by law under the government. The realization of these is true democratic government. They are true republicanism. Without their fulfillment this republican government cannot be preserved, and without them it would not be worth preserving. I have examined with care the platform of principles enunciated by the Democratic party at Cincinnati, and I find nothing therein to contravene them. Indeed, they are more distinctly set forth therein than in the platform of the Chicago convention. Neither of them go so far as I could desire in specific declaration of the right of every man to vote in the election of his rulers, and to be represented in his government, simply because he is a man; but in this regard even the platform of the Cincinnati convention is the more specific. I may be met with the objection that party platforms go for very little in governing the action of the administration elected under them. That is too true. And perhaps there is no more strikingly illustrative example of the fact than the course of the administration of Mr. Hayes during the last four years, regarding the plank in the platform under which he was elected—of civil service reform. Or, if that illustration does not convince my Republican friends, with whom I labored for Mr. Hayes's election, of this truth, let me give them another illustration, which will do so, unless they listen with ears closed to the evidence.

Protection for the Negro.

Our platform in 1876 proclaimed, in words not ambiguous, the necessity of the protection of the colored man of the south by the whole power of the Federal government. How that was interpreted by our candidate is certain when we call to mind a speech which he made to his neighbors in Ohio in November, 1876, soon after the voting, when it was generally understood that Mr. Tilden was elected, wherein he said, in substance, admitting the probability of his defeat, that the result affected him only as the result affected the condition of the poor colored men at the south, who would now be left without protection. Yet, the very first act of his administration—nay, the very consideration for which he was counted in—was that he would abandon, as he did abandon, all care and protection of the colored man, as both he and his party had theretofore understood their duty. And Mr. Hayes has lately told us, in a speech at Yale college, that the enfranchisement of the former slaves, by universal suffrage is unwise and dangerous, that there should be some restraint upon the people, either to restrict or control their votes; that uninstructed people, if left to themselves, would vote wrongfully; that the many would oppress the few; that the poor would harass and despoil the rich. Is this true? Show me an instance where the ballot has been taken advantage of by the poor men to impose taxes upon the men of property. Show me the instance where a numerous party has been run in debt, by the votes of her workingmen, for extravagant public buildings and expensive municipal expenditures, against the votes of the men of property. Nay, broaden the range of observation, and show me where in the world the many have opposed the few, by such caps as can be found. Every page of the history of nations is illustrated with horrible examples of wrong and outrage where the few have oppressed the many. What complaint has ever been justly made, in this country of the results of universal suffrage? Take as instance of its worst exhibition, and where the surroundings are most unfavorable to its just action.

Partisan Counting in New York and Philadelphia.

Take the city of New York, where the ballot is universal, governing itself with a cosmopolitan mingling of nationalities, and where all having the right to vote even without previous instruction in the principles of free government and self-control. What is the complaint there? What has it been for a long series of years? That the ignorant masses do not vote right? No; the chronic complaint now is that the learned, the well-educated, the shrewd party managers don't count the votes right. The few count the votes as they may themselves to plunder the rich. They in New York happen to have been of the Democracy. But turn to Philadelphia, which has been steadily Republican. How have the votes been counted there? Why, it is the question of who shall count which does the wrong to the State. How was it in Republican Louisiana in 1876? What was the complaint there? False counting again. Nay, more; when the electoral commission was called to determine the count of the vote for President, and the ermine of the supreme bench was dragged in the mud of politics, to give the people hope of a fair count, what was the complaint then? Of this tribunal, composed of the highest, most educated, and most judicious, one of them the sole candidate of the Republican party for President? Still partisan counting. Seven one way, eight the other, exactly according to their political prejudices. Was the result any different than it would have been had the question been committed to an equal number of voters of the Five Points of the same party biases? The silk gown of the judge, the black frock of the clergyman, the dress-coat of the scholar, and the "free-and-easy" garb of the congressman, all covered partisan, following party axioms in judging of a great question of constitutional law and fact. What would have been the effect of the blue uniform of a blunt and gallant soldier among these politicians to make them do the right the people are about to say. What do the Republican party complain of in the present campaign in Alabama? That anybody voted as he ought not to have done? Oh, no! the fault again is claimed to be in the counting.

So that upon the question of universal manhood suffrage I am asked, that all ought to vote, and laws should be enacted that those votes should be as justly counted as they are rightly cast. The people know how to vote rightly. Oye reformers, send somebody who knows how to count honestly.

Why He Proposes to Act with the Democratic Party.

When any one of my Republican friends desires to put to me a political question which he deems unanswerable, he asks, How can you act with the Democratic party which undertook to break up the Union which you fought to sustain?" The trouble with your question, my friends, is that you have forgotten the history of your country. A portion of the Democratic party undertook to secede from the Union, and thereby broke up the Democratic party. If the Democratic party had undertaken to break up the Union, the Union would surely have been broken. Does any man think, not blinded by partisan prejudice, could that without prompt, vigorous, loyal, courageous and patriotic action of the masses of the Democratic party, now it would have been possible for the Republican party to have preserved the Union? If Dix, if McClellan, if Farragut, if Smith, if Thomas, if Grant, if Meade, if Meagher, if Corcoran, if Buford, if Sheridan, if Hancock, and a host of others, whose names which will come to every man's thought that I might recite—had not stood by the Union, drawn their swords and marched to the support of the government, do you believe it would have been saved by the present stay-at-home senators and representatives of Massachusetts, after Massachusetts Democrats showed them the way, remaining at home in safety, so that their ranks, undimmished by disease or the bullet, are able to fill all the governmental offices both in the State and Federal government, with not a soldier, either Republican or Democratic, among them. But I need not cite as examples of the fealty and devotion of the Democracy of the north to the flag and constitution these great and illustrious names. Look at the rank and file of our armies! They were so largely recruited from the Democratic as from the Republican party. For the correctness of this assertion, let me speak of my own knowledge. I marched to the gulf with a New England division, containing six thousand men, and there could not have been found five hundred men in that division who had ever voted any other than than the Democratic ticket. They came back voting for the Union for which they had fought, and they have been voting in the same direction since, and will continue so to vote when they vote with the Democracy for Hancock, by whose side they fought. Go to your soldiers' homes, where the shattered and war-worn veterans are collected to the number of some six thousand, and you will find their votes have of late been largely for the Democracy, where they have been permitted to vote by the laws of the State.

Secession is Dead—The Union is Saved.

In saying this, I by no means detract from the patriotism and zeal of the rank and file of the Republican voters who stood shoulder to shoulder with their Democratic brethren for the preservation of the Union. I pay, and have at all times paid, just tribute to their good qualities as citizens and soldiers, and I never have undertaken to discriminate between soldier comrades in a partisan sense more than I do now. I admit, freely, the fact that there were more Republican than Democratic officers in the volunteer armies of the United States—gallant, good men and true, who arose from the lower to the higher grades of military rank by their heroism and devotion to their country's cause. The reason for this is obvious; quite all the governors of the northern States were Republicans. They appointed all the regimental officers, and, therefore, they appointed most largely their Republican friends. But the Democratic soldier, when he enlisted, patriotically appointed himself a private. Yes, my comrades, whether you were Republicans or Democrats, and whether you are now Republicans or Democrats, whatever tickets you may vote, let any body of men undertake to disrupt this glorious Union of ours, whether from the north or the south, or from the east or the west, with what there are left of our diminished ranks, we will march again under the leadership of our old commander, General Hancock, and give another lesson to the stay-at-homes in patriotism and devotion to the cause of our country Hancock did it then. In his letter of acceptance he says it now, and who shall dare doubt his pledged honor to the nation? Secession perished by the sword! The Union is saved! Nay, stands stronger, firmer, better, more glorious and lighted up with the hallowing been tried, cemented now by the renewed acts and oaths of loyalty of all its people. More worthy the love and reverence of all its children, because everything but freedom to all, and equal rights will be bleeded from her escutcheon! Who fears for the stability of the Union now save our stay-at-homes? But they are always afraid!

As the Friend of the Negro Can He Help the Democrats?

Another objection against the change of the rulers of public administration presents itself more especially to me than to other men in this form: "You have proclaimed yourself the champion of the negro race. You have pledged yourself to do all that you can to protect and care for them, and make them worthy of the condition of free citizenship to which they have been raised; now, then, can you deliver the negro to his enemy—the Democratic party?" To these questions I frankly and eagerly answer yes, as I hope I am the champion of the lowly and oppressed of all races and nationalities. I did pledge myself to the colored man when he fought by my side, that hereafter his race should have all that I could do for them, and I shall do it now, as ever, new that pledge. I have the full and honest belief that I am doing in this hour the best thing I can do for the elevation, protection and welfare of the negro race, by taking a decisive position in the Democratic ranks of the other laboring classes of this country, who so largely compose the Democratic party, so that all workingmen of the country may stand united for the elevation of all against the oppressions of monopolists and aristocrats, in that day of darkness and dread, which must sooner or later surely come. There never has been, and there never will be, any reason why the free workingmen of the north and the south should be enemies to each other, in order to build up an aristocracy of wealth. They are not antagonistic; they are not even rivals. When the laboring men of Massachusetts join hands with the laboring men of Mississippi their class will govern the country. The alliance is not an unnatural one, and needs only a little time to make it effective. Before the next presidential election, involve the whole issue of the campaign, as now presented by the Republican party in the present canvass, being the very issue, it deserves careful and candid consideration. To me it has given the best thought of which I am capable.

The Republican Party Tried and Found Wanting.

The platform of the Chicago convention is not mistaken on this question. It simply says it will leave the question to peaceful solution of the ballot." Within the last month the national committee of the Republican party, and the principal leaders of that party, at the notable reception, assembled at the Fifth Avenue hotel to lay out the plan of their campaign. In their discussions but two questions were tested. The one which occupied the largest portion of time, was why they should do with their money, the chairman of the committee having before that announced that all his transactions would be "for cash." A quite significant index to Republican methods in the canvass. The other question was: What should be the campaign in the south? It was decided to send no money or speakers there, at least until after the canvass in Maine and Indiana was over, thus making their course secondary only. The further determination was reached to claim that it was necessary to keep the Republican party in power to the better protection of the negro in the south. In this vital issue, I would pause long and carefully before I should do anything to hinder the success of the Republican party. Can the Republican administration protect the southern colored man in all his rights, and will they do so? Since the war closed, for sixteen years, the Republican party have had absolute control of the executive department, and, until the last congress, of the legislative department of the government, and most of the time by a two-thirds majority. Has that party given protection to the negro in the sense in which they put the necessity for so doing before the people? Their very campaign cry is an admission that they have not so done. If they cannot, or will not, do it in sixteen years, how much longer shall we trust them with the power in order that they may do it? If, at the end of sixteen years, they claim that they must be continued in power four years longer that they may do it, how long shall we, who have some misgiving as to the misconduct of the party in other regards as well as in this, put up with all the other shortcomings of the Republican party, in order to have them fulfill their promises, so often solemnly made, and as religiously broken.

The Negro Safer Under Hancock than Garfield.

I unhesitatingly declare that, at the close of the war, and during the period of reconstruction, I was one of those who believed stringent measures necessary for the protection of the newly enfranchised political citizens in the south. I was of this opinion in 1876, four years ago, and fought the Presidential campaign of that year upon that issue only, if I do in earnest. I desired laws to be passed that should protect every man everywhere in his rights as a voter and a citizen. But: the first act, as we have seen, of Mr. Hayes, acquiesced in by his party, was to abandon all possible claim of right of interference on the south in behalf of the negro—to remove the few troops that were there, if any were necessary, and to take away from every the government of Louisiana and South Carolina to the Democratic party, destroying the governments created by Republican votes there, which, if they were not duly and legally elected, then Mr. Hayes himself was not legally and legally elected. The assertion of the one fact must be the assertion of the other. The assertion of life to his office was the assertion of title to the Louisiana State government for Louisiana. The denial of the election of Governor Packard to office was the denial of the election to office of Governor Hayes. Indeed, Packard had some half a score thousands more of a majority than Hayes had. Nothing has been done. Nay, nothing has been attempted to be done to afford protection to the negro, in the south, or, indeed, anybody else there. Indeed, these States in the south were in a condition so that nothing could be done by the Federal government. Nay, all, both black and white Republicans, have no recognition at the hands of the administration, except the few who were engaged in the false and fraudulent count of electoral votes in the several States. In fact, Mr. Hayes, since his experience with them, would not admit these same enough Republicans honest enough to take the census, and his party are now finding fault with enumeration made by his appointees. These facts are too notorious for comment even, much less denial. As a friend of the negro, bound to fight another campaign in his behalf as a Republican simply to see him abandoned and myself cheated once more? What guarantee have I that General Garfield will take a different view of this question from Governor Hayes? Place myself, both from Ohio, and each has been and is a supporter of the rights of the negro race.

The Negro Better off Than the Laborer of Massachusetts.

Why are Republicans to be deemed to have abandoned their political principles, and gone over to the enemies of the country, because we propose to vote for a Union general for President, while Mr. Hayes, who has been the moral and official head of the Republican party, scorns not to give President Woolsey of Yale, can with applause appoint a Confederate general to a cabinet office? I fail to see any distinction between the two acts in any respect, and yet we are going to vote for a union general and Hayes appointed a little one. Now, and it is because I am a friend of the negro; it is because I desire to stand up for him; it is because I desire to aid him in his rights and all they do so? Since the war closed, for sixteen years, the Republican party have had absolute control of the executive department, and, until the last congress, of the legislative department of the government, and most of the time by a two-thirds majority. Has that party given protection to the negro in the sense in which they put the necessity for so doing before the people? Their very campaign cry is an admission that they have not so done. If they cannot, or will not, do it in sixteen years, how much longer shall we trust them with the power in order that they may do it? If, at the end of sixteen years, they claim that they must be continued in power four years longer that they may do it, how long shall we, who have some misgiving as to the misconduct of the party in other regards as well as in this, put up with all the other shortcomings of the Republican party, in order to have them fulfill their promises, so often solemnly made and as religiously broken.

The Great Fraud of 1876.

As we have seen, the Republican party, in a long series of years of power, have, necessarily, become corrupt. It is only saying that they have followed the necessary logical result from long use of power. Abuses will creep into an administration, and must be worked out. Has the Republican convention given us for its candidate one who can correct these abuses, who can command his party, shaping its policy? Change the officials of present office administration, largely filled from his own State, and upon his own recommendation? Has he shown himself so able to resist temptation, so steadfast to his opinions, so willing to accept the consequences of his acts, so little likely to be swerved from the path his judgment has convinced him to be the best, that at this time, in this crisis of affairs, when, according to his own party press, there is almost an Augean stable, transmitted from a former administration, to be cleaned out; when it would seem to be agreed that all the men that had anything to do with the counting of the votes in Louisiana, or participation in those infamous wrongs, should be turned out to give place to other and worthier men—that he will do this? Have these Louisiana and other officeholders no hold upon him? Quite as much as upon Mr. Hayes, from whom they forced their appointments. The Republican nominee was in New Orleans, superintending the count and preparing returns. Either hoodwinked or partizan—charitable to believe the latter. But if he disturbs these men in office who made the count, won't they prove upon him that it was the last? Can he escape their tolls? Has he shown, when involved in other accusations, such courage of conviction and such willingness to stand by his acts and brave consequences as to give any hope to the country or expectation or belief that he is fit to govern? Having satisfied my mind that there is nothing in the action of the party which would cause me to support it, I do not find in its candidate such qualifications as to require me to take the party for the sake of the leader.

DeGolyar Garfield's Corruptions.

I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the personal character of the nominee of the Republican party or his acts, except so far as they bear upon the questions I have indicated. There is one matter, however, that I wish I might be permitted not to touch upon, and if it had concerned the canvass alone I should have passed it by in silence. But as the defense of the Republican candidate by Republicans orators and newspapers has degenerated into an attack upon a friend of mine, valued and loved, long since deceased, I must do what I may to vindicate his memory at whatever cost. I should not be myself if I did not. Related of personal friendship, all love of justice standing to the right as I see the right—all compel me to that end. Mr. Oakes Ames, of Massachusetts, was my personal friend. I knew him to be an honest, upright, patriotic, self-sacrificing man. He had undertaken a great enterprise of very doubtful success. The Union Pacific railroad company had been chartered by congress. It had been given great privileges and great subsidies, that were afterward turned out to be. They were subject, at any time, to be attacked in congress by any set of designing, unscrupulous men, who should attempt to levy blackmail upon its management. Mr. Ames himself might not be there to defend it. Nobody might take any interest in that defense. He wanted no further legislation in its aid. He only wanted that it should not be exposed as everything else which the ingenuity of the lobby could invent, and be preyed upon by those who, under the name of lobbyists, and by connection more or less with newspapers, make their living by preying on business enterprises within the power of congress. Mr. Ames, therefore, sought to interest leading members of congress in his enterprise by selling them shares of stock in the construction company of his road. Credit mobilier in its success, where men were willing to ultimately become owners of the stock, he promised to carry it for them; and so sanguine that he promised to guarantee them ten per cent. on the investment. He offered to some half score of his associates in the house and senate portions of this stock. They took it. It was profitable. They took the profits.

Garfield's Perjury.

When the election of 1872 came on an attack was made upon these men who took the stock by a newspaper which reported stole some papers showing the facts from a lawyer's office, and, with characteristic enterprise, made use of the stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen. That frightened some of the weak-kneed representatives and senators who had the stock, or the profits of the stock, which had been allotted to them by Mr. Ames. And as some of them had not received their certificates of stock, they were foolish enough to come out in cards in the newspapers denying that they ever had any of the stock. Congress came together. The speaker of the house left his chair and called from the floor for an investigation. That investigation was ordered. The gentlemen who had published these unfortunate cards were put in this dilemma: They must either testify that they had not received any of the stock, directly or indirectly, or the profits thereof, or else their cards would show an evident attempt to deceive. The only witness against them was Mr. Oakes Ames. They concluded that a half dozen men, under oath would have strength of reputation enough to swear him down, as he hadn't their names to any paper, he having simply paid them the stock dividends money, and charged it against them on his books. It was hoped that the investigation would not be too close. Mr. Ames was importuned to say simply that he had delivered none of the stock, and the investigation was to stop there. That he said, and said truly; but, unfortunately, there were some men upon the committee who had personal griefs with some of these stockholders, and they pushed the investigation so close that these men, in their testimony, were obliged to deny that they had ever received the profits from any stock from Mr. Ames, which they told do. Among them was the now Presidential nominee of the Republican party. This put Mr. Ames in the predicament of having called upon his company for dividends to be paid to these gentlemen, which they declared they never having received. That brought Mr. Ames to the stand again with his memorandum-book and his check-book, which showed this money had been paid, and in some cases it was traced into the bank account of some of these men who had sworn they had never received any of it, and then these swearers went under.

Garfield Whitewashed.

At last this testimony between the Republican nominee and Mr. Ames seemed to agree that he had received three hundred and twenty-nine dollars of Mr. Ames. But here arose a question of veracity between them. The nominee said the money he had was a sum that he had borrowed of Mr. Ames. Mr. Ames said it was a dividend on the credit mobilier stock which he had paid him. It was agreed that if it was money borrowed, no note was given for it. If it was a dividend on the credit mobilier stock, no receipt was given for it. Therefore the whole question was left open as to the probabilities of what that money was for. Was it a loan or was it a dividend? Now, the stock dividend would exactly amount to three hundred and twenty-nine dollars. That precise amount was a very odd sum for one man to borrow of another, unless the borrower had one dollar more and wanted to make up thirty, or unless he had twenty-one dollars more and wanted to make up three hundred and fifty dollars. As a rule, however, even impecunious congressmen don't run as near the wind as that in their financial transactions. The probabilities, however, most likely led the Republican investigating committee to find that the nominee did receive the money of Ames as dividends on credit mobilier stock. That committee was composed of Hon. Luke P. Boland, of Vermont; Hon. N. P. Banks, of Massachusetts; Hon. George W. McCrary, of Iowa; Hon. William E. Niblack, of Indiana, and Hon. William Merrick, of Maryland, who reported in the following words: "The facts in regard to Mr. Garfield, as found by the committee, are identical with the case of Mr. Kelly to the point of his reception of the check for three hundred and twenty-nine dollars. He agreed with Mr. Ames to take ten shares of credit mobilier stock, but did not pay for the same. Mr. Ames received the eighty per cent. dividends in bonds, and sold them for ninety-seven per cent., and also received the sixty per cent. cash dividends, which, together, paid the price of the stock and interest and left a balance of three hundred and twenty-nine dollars. This sum was paid over to Mr. Garfield by a check on the sergeant-at-arms, and Mr. Garfield then understood this sum was the balance of the dividends after paying for the stock." Here the matter rested, save that the house, in a spasm of virtue, censured Ames for giving the stock to members to influence their votes, but forgot to censure the representatives and senators for receiving it as a bribe, perhaps because there were so many of them who did.

Garfield's Dastardly Attack upon a Dead Man.

I believe none of the gentlemen of that committee now say that there was nothing to impeach the integrity of the nominee of the Republican party in receiving that stock. I agree with them. I do not think there was any harm, and never did think there was any harm in anybody's receiving the stock from Mr. Ames under the circumstances. I took that ground before the house in 1873. I have seen no occasion to alter my opinion. All the members who frankly testified before the committee that they had received the stock received no censure from the committee or from the country. But that is not the point of my objection, which I am trying to make plain. Having taken the money as a dividend—for, says the proverb, it is no worse to eat the devil than to drink his broth"—my ideal of a President would not have denied it. The case is not without parallel in the history of men notable to withstand the pressure of public opinion. Peter, when he got among the servants and retainers of the high priests, denied his Master three times over, and cursed and swore to it until the cock crew shame on him, and then he went out and wept bitterly. But then I should not have voted for Peter as a President to stand up in a crisis. Should have preferred one of the other disciples—even the doubting Thomas, who stood by his master when he was convinced. The thing I most regret, partly because it has caused me all this trouble, is that the nominee should have delayed his defense, which he issued in pamphlet form, in which Mr. Ames is accused of untruthfulness, until after Oakes Ames's eyes were closed in death, and the honest tongue which would have repelled the slander was silent forever.

GRAIN MOVEMENTS

In the Port of Buffalo During the Month Just Gone.

BUFFALO, September 1.—The August statement of the grain movement at this port shows a much heavier gain than for years, with prospects of a continuance of the present extensive shipments. The imports by lake of flour for the month foot up 182,000 barrels, and of grain 18,670,000 bushels from the opening of navigation to date; receipts of flour, 713,400 barrels; grain, 66,387,000 bushels. Railway receipts for the month, 88,200 barrels of flour and 3,668,000 bushels of grain; from January 1st to date, 622,000 barrels of flour and 33,193,000 bushels of grain. The grain receipts by lake for the month are 2,750,000 bushels, and from January 1st to date 19,995,000 bushels. Canal shipments from the opening of navigation to date, 4,720 barrels of flour and 44,16,000 bushels of grain. Canal tolls for the season, thus far, $467,499. The foregoing figures show that the receipts by lake for August exceed those of the same month of any previous year over 1,000,000 bushels, while the total receipts exceed the largest movement of any preceding year for the corresponding period by over 25,000,000 bushels, and being very near equal to the entire shipments for the season of 1879, while the gains in shipments by rail for the season foot up nearly 20,000,000 bushels, and show an increase in the toll revenues of $180,718, and the clearances of boats of 2360 over the season of 1879.

Republican Guarantees Worthless.

What surety have I, if I support him, when this cry of the stalwart wing of his party that the negro must be protected, now so loud raised, is hushed after the election, and the over-righteous newspapers of the party insist, as they have before insisted, that nothing shall be done by his administration for the protection of the negro? Is that President will have the courage to stand up against that clamor and do what is right, and so protect the negro? Indeed, I much fear that he will not stand up to the honest of his campaign upon which he is to be elected, if elected at all, in any event,