MEMPHIS APPEAL

WEDNESDAY, : : OCTOBER 11, 1882

THE DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

For Governor—WILLIAM B. BATE.
For Congress—CASEY YOUNG.
For State Senate—D. T. PORTER.
For State Senate—J. S. GALLOWAY.
For Representative—JOSIAH PATTERSON.
For Representative—MORGAN S. KELLY.
For Representative—ED. J. WENDEL.
For Representative—W. F. PRICE (Colored).
For Representative—M. P. NORRIS (Colored).

EGYPT AND ENGLAND.

England has conquered Egypt; now she has it all Europe is asking what she will do with it. That she will retain it as she does India is not expected, but that she will claim and obtain some substantial advantage is pretty certain, and that advantage will doubtless be of a commercial character. As Egypt is one of the most fruitful countries in the world England will, in all likelihood, retain in her hands every advantage she can gain in transferring to herself its rich products. Among those products is cotton, which is a material of fine fiber and long staple. England longs for few things more heartily than to be independent of the United States for her cotton supply. We may therefore expect that she will use her present opportunities to benefit herself in that way. Should she do so, it will be an additional reason for us to manufacture American-grown cotton in the land where it is grown. In speeches which Mr. Gladstone has made of late he has let no hint drop as to the intentions of the government with respect to Egypt, but the course of events will before long bring out the secret. The quick and victorious campaign has placed the English ministry in a strong position, and as Gladstone has no liking for the vile Turkish government, we may hope to see the Turks in the official sense kept out of Egypt, which will be a just retort for the Sultan's crooked policy.

HUBBELL'S CAMPAIGN BOOK.

Hubbell's campaign book affords the country a great deal of fun. It flaunts the bloody shirt, as the New York *Post* says, "in the faces of a people who have ceased to be alarmed or even amazed by it." He quotes an injudicious speech by Senator Wade Hampton, which has already done service in two campaigns, and a number of "spread heads" that are untrue to the text. Then there are denunciations of Confederate brigadiers in the Senate, some "Testimony of the representative press of the South as to the demonlike rule of the Bourbons," some statements about convicted ballot-box stuffers in Mississippi (nothing about Philadelphia or Indiana or New York), and a thrilling report of a representative Southern murder in Chalmers's district. A chapter on appointments and removals opens with the name of Washington, as if our first president, who during his eight years of executive service removed only nine officials, was the originator of the removal abuses. In a chapter entitled "Bounties for Treason Through Unlawful Claims to ex-Confederates" is a story of a wicked "Southern mail contractor's fraud," although the most discreet silence is maintained about mail frauds of the variety known as "Star-route," of which Dorsey, the secretary of the National Republican Executive Committee, has all but been found guilty. The river and harbor question is belogged, the Chinese question muddled, the pension swindle defended, the Republican party is committed to high tariff principles, and the claim is made that it has been economical. Ignorance, malignity, venom and stupidity, lying and deceit are all prominent in the pages of this volume, which the New York *Herald* thinks should cost the Republican party 1,000,000 votes.

ELECTRICITY, GAS AND ELECTRIC DANGERS.

Much interest is felt as to the question whether the electrical light—taking expense, practical utility, convenience and other considerations into account—will, within a moderate space of time, prove better than a light *from coal gas. The matter is still in doubt,* but the beginning made in New York by the use of Edison's electric lights will, no doubt, afford the *data* required to ascertain the prospective availability of gas and electricity for ordinary use. The gas companies are making strenuous efforts to "hold their own" as against electricity, but little things occur now and then that show in how serious a light they view the forward strides their rival is making. An expression of their fears, the more noticeable as it is indirect, was given the other day when the *American Gas Light Journal*, the very able organ of the gas companies of the country, admitted into its columns statements as to the failure of Edison's dynamo to supply the necessary electricity for lighting the 2500 houses in New York where his incandescent apparatus has been put up. The statement was false, and it has given the Edison company opportunity to make statements of a very encouraging nature as to the success of incandescent lighting. The failure charged against the Edison light in the columns of the gas company's organ was attributed by the writer to insufficient insulation, owing to the wires being placed underground instead of on poles. The Edison company say that in no part of their management have they been more successful than in their underground wires. The insulation not only sustains their expectations, but goes beyond them. This is a gratifying statement outside of its connection with electric lighting, as it shows that electric wires can be placed underground without injurious loss of electric power, and such a proof from such a source may be considered as pronouncing the doom of the detestable street telegraph poles. We observe that Mr. Edison has expressed himself on the subject of carrying electric wires upon poles in a way that shows not only that the wires can be put under ground, but that safety will require that they *must* be put there and not upon poles. A few days ago a workman was killed in New-York by coming in contact with one of the wires of the Brush system of electric lighting, and when Mr. Edison was asked for facts as to danger from such electric wires he stated that if, during a fire, a stream of water from a fire engine should come in contact with a broken arc-light wire the fireman who held the nozzle would be killed, as the stream of water would prove a perfect conductor of electricity, as much so as a copper wire. More than this—should falling walls knock down a pole laden with wires it would be impossible to distinguish the harmless wires from those that were charged to a deadly degree with electricity, and to handle such would be death. To cut such a wire with an axe should the handle of the implement be wet, as it almost certainly would among the streams from the engines—the same fatal result would follow. Still further—poles bearing wires are occasionally cast down during fires; should the current from an electric wire come in contact with telegraph or telephone wires the electricity would be carried to the places which connected and set them on fire. After such a statement the day of doom for the hideous telegraph pole must be fast approaching.

THE DUTY OF THE STATE TO EDUCATE.

Is the compulsory education of children proper or desirable? is a question that is beginning to occupy attention, and promises to occupy still more attention. Shall my child be sent to school whether I please or not? To take him spite of my will, to educate him when I desire that he shall not be educated, is a strong strain upon a parent's rights. Can a free country consistently enforce that strain? Many, we know, as they read the question will answer, no. Put the same question in another form, from the side of the child instead of that of the parent, and perhaps the same reader will change the "no" to "yes." God has given the child certain faculties which, if their use be developed by education, will aid him in his progress through life, save him from many mistakes, and add to the sum of comfort and enjoyment during existence. If it is hard to take a man's child and educate it against his will, what is it to leave the child in ignorance without consulting its welfare or caring for its fate? You would not send a man on the water without a plank under him, or put him in a desert unprovided with food and water. Would you send him up among the inextricable windings of mountains without a guide to lead him or a map to guide him? If to do so would be cruel, what is it to send one of God's accountable creatures to pursue the journey of life among the evil and the good, through trouble and joy, amid the allurements of pleasure and the lustings of the senses? Snares, pitfalls, deceptions, besetments and dangers, and the faculties given by the Creator as helps and guards all left dark and useless, imprisoned in the thick darkness of ignorance! The parent's claim of a right to say "no" when the State offers to educate his child is therefore a claim to have the right to do wrong, to have the right to refuse to the child the glorious light of knowledge. It is a claim to a right to send the child into the world unable to maintain itself, except by toiling as hardly and unintelligently as the mule or the ox. Would the reader say that a man has the right to cut an arm or a leg from the body of his child? If a man may not blind his child by putting out its eyes, may he keep it mentally blind by preventing the light of knowledge to fit it for walking in the paths of life, so that it shall stumble over every obstacle that lies before it, and fall into the first pit it approaches? Has a man a right to devote his boy to the miseries that the records of courts and penitentiaries show to attend on ignorance? Has a man the right to doom his daughter to ignorance, to leave her defenseless against the wiles of the seducer, to condemn her to infamy—to the degradation that ever steels the heart of her sister woman against her and robs her of the scant mantle of human charity? In view of all these considerations, when the parent asks, "Shall my child be sent to school whether I please or not?" will the reader still answer, "No?" Will he not regard the question as really being, "Shall I not be allowed a right to make my child a life-long sufferer, and a torment to society, by sending it into the world lame, and deaf, and blind, because the God-given intellect, by my decision, was never cultivated? France, in her progress toward liberty, has found it absolutely necessary to insist with all the force of law that every son and daughter born on her soil shall receive an education, and the State provides education for every family that chooses to accept it at its hands. France under the Bourbons endured slavery and misery; under the revolution it was visited by crime and wholesale murderings; under Napoleon her children were led to perish on a hundred battlefields that a heartless tyrant might obtain the flattery earth always accords to successful oppressors. All this was the result of ignorance, and, as France wants no more Bourbon tyranny, no more spurting of human blood from the guillotine, no more wholesale slaughters on the field, she insists with the force of law that every one of her sons and daughters shall be educated. This very week the new law to that effect comes into force. The brutal, the besotted, the greedy who want to make money by setting the little ones to tasks above their strength, all these object to the new law, and the church, we blush to say, mutters curses, but France wills that every child of the country shall be educated, and it will require obedience to its will. The time may come when we also, like France, may have to insist on the right of the State to banish ignorance from our borders.

THE ENGLISH LABOR CONGRESS.

The New York *World* of Thursday last had an article, from its correspondent at Manchester, England, giving an interesting account of the proceedings of the fourteenth annual meeting of the representatives of the English trades unions, an article which is of interest in these times of strikes and labor disputes among ourselves. From 1859 to 1870 the working people of England made a determined stand against the hardships and oppression they were compelled to submit to. Their organizations were made the subject of intense vituperation and bitter ridicule on the part of those who considered it to be their interest to keep the workingmen in a condition approaching to that of serfs and vassals. Experience has proved that the efforts of the downtrodden have resulted in good and brought about reforms and changes which those who were at first opposed now generally acknowledge to be for the good, mutually, of employer and employed. The unions, however, were compelled to recognize, in the course of their struggles, that the employers had a case as well as themselves, and that no settlement could be well made unless the interest of the employer was consulted as well as their own. This discovery brought reflection and self-restraint, and action was taken only on sound grounds and when there was a fair prospect of success. In 1868 the chief-justice of England decided that the regulations of the unions "operated in restraint of trade," which was illegal. This left the unions, and the friendly societies connected with them, without any protection by law for their funds. Much excitement followed, and steps were taken to hold a congress of labor, a congress that now meets every year. The unfavorable legal decision led to the appointment of a government commission to inquire into the complaints of the working-people, which, in the end, resulted in beneficial changes of law. At these congresses the subjects of the limitation of the number of apprentices, the hours of labor, protection of life in labor involving risk, national education, co-operation, and arbitration were discussed, also the desirability of having representatives in Parliament, which resulted in the election of two members. In subsequent legislation on labor subjects the congress and its legislative members were able successfully to oppose some arbitrary bills offered in Parliament, and to secure the passage of some excellent legal provisions. The abominable system of paying in goods instead of money, for instance, was abolished; the system of treating the person employed in domestic or farm service as a criminal in case he broke his contract, while a similar act on the part of the employer subjected him to civil damages only, was done away, both cases being made civil. The annual congresses generally base their discussions upon the proceedings of Parliament respecting questions pertaining to labor. In 1876 a labor bill the unions ardently supported was passed, and there was great rejoicing among them in consequence. That present congress, says the correspondent, is a superior body of men: "A finer nor more intelligent-looking body of men than these representatives of the workingmen of England I never saw. There was a dignity about their proceedings, and I may say about the tone of the report as well, as far removed from what one associates with meetings of trades unions as anything that could be imagined. It was that dignity which you only see when men know the limit as well as the extent of their power, and so knowing both feel secure." This is very high commendation, and such as a similar body of English workingmen could not have won or deserved fifty years ago, but hard bought knowledge and painful experience has taught them that the effort to accomplish their purposes by the use of mere brute power, seeking to drive and force employers to adopt measures dictated by the workmen from their standpoint alone, in indifference as to the welfare of the employer, will, although sometimes temporarily successful, in the end bring disappointment. Rationally to look at both sides of a question requires thought, and thought brings the dignity that gives weight to the proceedings of the English Labor Congress. This brief sketch is not undeserving of the attention of the working people on this side the ocean.

This is the difference between Lowe and Pryor as drawn by the Huntsville (Ala.) *Independent*: "Instead of devoting his energies to getting appointments for Peter Crenshaws, Chris Sheatses and other Stalwarts, colored and white, Congressman Pryor will look after the Muscle Shoals and other material interests of the country. He will likewise give attention to the burdensome tariff."

CRUSHED AGAIN.

The Republican Ring of Shelby County Flattened Out by the Democratic Candidate for Congress.

Col. Casey Young Before a Large Audience Makes One of the Most Masterly Speeches of the Campaign.

An Exhaustive Analysis of the Stirring Questions of the Day—State and National Issues.

Judge Wm. M. Smith Makes a Rambling and Unsatisfactory Reply to Col. Young's Speech.

The joint discussion between Col. Casey Young and Judge William M. Smith, Democratic and Republican candidates for Congress, attracted a large audience at the Greenlaw Operahouse last night. Col. Young made the first speech, and it proved to be one of the best efforts of his life. It was so weightily worded, so full of the juice of modern Democratic doctrine, so intelligently contrasting the Democratic and Republican parties, that the Appeal publishes it substantially as he uttered it. It will be found a valuable contribution to the political literature of the day. Judge Smith's speech could not be given in full for its great clearness and the careful elucidation of the political issues made by Col. Young. He was content to point out apparent inconsistencies. His speech provoked but little enthusiasm, and it was the sentiment of the house that Col. Young had worsted his Republican rival. The following is Col. Young's speech.

Col. Casey Young's Speech.

FELLOW-CITIZENS—I trust my audience will pardon me for so far yielding to a public discussion to personal feelings and emotions as to preface my opening remarks with a tender to my sincere and grateful thanks for the unmistakably kind and friendly feeling manifested in the manner of my reception this evening, and a brief expression of how strongly it impresses my judgment with an appreciation of its priceless value, and how deeply it stirs my heart by a conviction of its sublime sincerity. It adds another to the thousand proofs I have already had of the kindly feeling and good will entertained for me by those among whom I have spent my life and with whose fortunes in the varied vicissitudes of many years my own have been so closely linked. It gives me additional assurance that I am cordially disturbed the apprehension that I may not, in the judgment of many, meet the most sanguine expectations of the occasion, nor prove to the most indulgent friend disposed to be lenient to my political shortcomings and delinquencies. We are at an era anomalous in the political history of Tennessee—and, indeed, in that of the country—in many, if not perhaps, all the leading and in many striking particulars. We are confronted by politicians, ousted from their political homes, retired in this district—possibly never in this state. To meet and overcome the difficulties and prejudices of these facts imposes a task not of easy performance, but the undertaking is rendered more difficult by personal and

PUBLIC CONSIDERATIONS AND INFLUENCES

so closely and intimately blended that an entire separation of them is almost impossible. I shall, however, discussed them as far as possible and to the extent I may consider it proper. In such questions as are proper for public discussion, I propose to discuss them as far as my sense of course strongly rebels against, my judgment and sense of propriety. That I have abundant cause to overstrain the rebellious feelings and violate decorum in the position I hold and give loose rein to indignation and resentment, I have been assured by anyone acquainted with the manner in which this campaign has been conducted, and the attitude taken against me, unless he be waiting in the proper spirit for the time when I can speak out, and it requires something of a sacrifice, something of self-denial to refrain from returning in kind some of the blows that have been showered upon me and half bestowed upon me. But I have never believed that a sound and lasting policy or principle could either be created or directed by the coarse and vulgar denunciation of an adversary. But, there is another feature of the blackguard, the methods of the prize fighter, that I have never liked, and which I have always believed that correct principles worthy of public support need not, and should not, be maintained by invoking men's judgment and reason than by appealing to their lower qualities, inflaming their passions, and, I think, force to their prejudices. I have always thought the "grand old party" was the party of ideas, and marked by clearly drawn and distinctive principles and theories as contrasted with a party and that they should be taught in a purer atmosphere than the pothouse and the grog shop, and on a higher plane than that fixed by the demagogue and the smoker. I have always conceded to every man the right to have his own, to make his politics or views and opinions, and to all the opponents I have ever met, I think I can truly say, courteous and dignified discussion of them. Hence, in all of

MY POLITICAL CONTESTS

I have given offense to no man by the advocacy of my views nor in the condemnation of his; and however strong the provocation, I shall not offend against the intelligence of my hearers, I hope, by departing from the rule I have heretofore observed, unless driven to it by the circumstances which may self-respect will not permit me to disregard. Now, that there is an AMERICAN PARTY in field to conduct operations, I suppose I may flatter myself, I think, that I am entitled to some of the whackers will slacken their fire on me for awhile and allow him to do battle with me alone. But I trust they will not, because I am sure, I think, I suppose they will turn over to him all the weapons and ammunition they have been hurling so freely on me. This will be right, and what I desire. I have no quarrel, no controversy with the new party. I want all hands of them, the young soldiers and the old one, to rally round the flag whenever to bring all their engines of war, pop guns, blow guns, columbiads and other weapons to bear on the Democratic party. I want to see and I can't return the shot of every stranger, but I want to see and know that every shot they fire at me, I can't meet every Don Quixote who mounts his Rosenante and gallops with spear and shield into the lists, but whenever the knight chosen to meet me in this tournament comes I am ready for him. I shall be ready to lift it. Let all the conditions which are to be utilized for my defeat be formulated in Democratic in Tyrone. I will not, I ask, tions thatkee to be urged against me be given to me, and whenever and wherever I shall be ready to meet and answer them, and if I do not I will submit without complaint to the judgment the public may pronounce. I shall not be able in the space of an hour, the time allowed me by the rules of this discussion, to say all I would like to say, and very little possibly of what I may be expected to say in reference to the

A CAMPAIGN JUST OPENING,

and which in many respects will be one of much interest and importance, not only to the people of this district and state as well as to Judge Smith and myself, but I shall endeavor to give a general outline of the principles and the leading issues, the questions upon which the two leading political parties are divided in opinion. Having a new opponent, one I have not had the pleasure of meeting in joint public discussion during a previous occasion, I am not in possession of his individual views in respect to any of the questions we are to discuss, but suppose they are such as those generally accepted by his party. Nor am I advised of the line of argument he will pursue in presenting them, but I assume that he will not wander very far from the old worn and beaten path which Republican orators have plodded along with such easy assurance and complacent satisfaction for nearly half a century. Political history, I may, however, hope for, and even expect, this refreshing change, will be found, I think, that Judge Smith cannot afford, with his high character and acknowledged ability, to resort to these devious and subterfuges under which men of smaller parts or too cowardly to be manly, driven from the field of fair, intellectual and honorable controversy, I am sure, may expect from him no argument which will be either discreditable for him to use or dangerous for me to answer. I think I may assume that he will make a candid, belittling an intellectual and cultured gentleman, and not insult the intelligence of this district in the guise of a charlatan and with the methods of a humbug. In ignorance, however, of the course which he will give for his political faith, and the precise nature of the issues he will present and the principles of his party and in vindication of its conduct and practices, I can only conjecture, and will answer as best I can the speech I assume he will make. And this I think I can more nearly forecast by reason of his long and well known and brief remarks accepting his nomination, repeat some of the stereotyped stampedes in common use when

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

and its principles are under discussion, and it is desired to amuse the faithful with the amount of enthusiasm deemed necessary in the opening of every campaign. On that occasion he adopted a *nobriquet* bestowed on every party that has had an existence since Cassar was assassinated by the Bruti of England was beheaded, and lovingly called it the "grand old party," the patriotic party, and claiming that it was the author of all the political good ever accomplished by any political organization in this country; that we are indebted to it for every blessing of government which we enjoy—for all of greatness, wealth, prosperity and happiness which the American people have achieved in the hundred years and more of their national life. The good claimed to have been wrought by this party—its great achievements in governmental science and political economy—are usually summarized somewhat after the style of the following formula: That the Republican ideas and theories of government are those upon which our own is based, and the principles which it has sought to be best administered for the objects and purposes of its creation; that the Republican ideas and theories of our history are those during which those ideas were in the ascendancy and that our most rapid advancement was given forward by the stimulus of their promulgation and influence; that it fought the war of the rebellion, and for freedom, as loyal Republicans choose to call our

UNFORTUNATE CIVIL STRIFE,

which was precipitated by causes which neither Republicans nor Democrats chafed, and which neither could very long have prevented, and that their loyalty, patriotism and courage preserved the life of the nation, against the subsequent unity of the States, gave freedom to the slaves and established the sublime doctrine of universal and perpetual liberty in all the vast area over which the American flag flitted slavery folds. That when the war was over it was to the Republican party most vigorous foreign policy, the safest and most stable system of finance and the most rapid growth has ever had, under which we have attained to a greatness and prosperity which astonishes and puzzles the world, and finally it is claimed by the Republican party that it founded up and compacted in great work by placing the ballot, the weapon of freedom, in the hands of the enfranchised slave. For these things they fondly call themselves the "grand old party," and demand at every recurring election at the hands of a credulous and indulgent people a renewal of their hold upon the agencies of political power. I do not intend to denounce as vicious and wicked all of the few principles upon which the creed of the Republican party is so ostensibly based, nor, perhaps, shall I condemn all the theories which it has from time to time promulgated, faulty as I think many of them are; but I shall assail the practical methods which they have at different periods selected to put these principles and theories into practical operation—methods, and those which no doubt many of the party will dare to uphold to-day, and which I do not think Judge Smith will undertake to defend in this canvass. Neither am I going to brand the whole Republican party of the country with that mark of public disgrace well merited by the conduct of some of its followers, for I do not believe that the more unworthy and disreputable acts, private or public, charged to the Republican party have emanated from the sanction and approval of the better element which composes not only its leadership, but its rank and file as well. I think too much of the Anglo Saxon race, have too much the feeling of national kinship, to believe that one-half the American people are

POLITICAL SPOILSMEN

and robbers. I entertain no such opinion, and I will make no such charge. I know that men may well differ in respect to principles of government and questions of political policy, and there is no one freedom in any country or government in which such differences are not, and should be, respected by popular judgment and protected by public law and he who would destroy or even abridge the right of free speech or free political action, is an enemy to human liberty and free government. I am not going to maintain that all the political worth and public virtue of the whole country belongs exclusively to the Democratic party, nor am I going to insist upon the proposition, however plausibility it might lend to my side, that all political rascality and corruption that has been brought to the surface in the last twenty years is a monopoly to which the Republican party has an exclusive proprietary right, but I may say, with all respect for my friends here, that it seems to me to have done a somewhat larger business in that line than any other party that ever ruled in the United States. It may be, however, that this can be accounted for upon the ground that it has been in the business longer than any other, and has more money invested and more hands employed than was ever used or employed for such a purpose before. But I am not going to quarrel with my Republican friends in this or elsewhere, and call them thieves and robbers (for personally they are honest men and good people be sure, and half the half the gospel they preach), yet I am going to charge upon the party to which they belong the class public confidence and support to which it is entitled, and which, if it is strongly upon can be upheld and maintained by any evidence found in the facts of colemporary history, I shall narrow ideas, and gathering its nine broad and sweeping wave that will carry comfort and happiness to every household in the land. This would not suit Vanderbilt with his $200,000,000 in government bonds; it might not find favor in the sight of Gould, the Napoleon of the financial world, with all his vast wealth of public securities, stocks and railroads—nor would it, I apprehend, meet with the cordial indorsement of all the monopolists, beneficiaries and the money kings who lord it over the American people and levy tribute upon their energies and industries. But it would bring light and happiness to over 40,000,000 of honest, industrious people, who labor in the workshops and in the fields in every day building higher and making stronger the temple in which dwells the spirit of free government, equal rights and universal liberty. They tell us that this system of finance the credit of the government was maintained during all the years of the war and through all the financial stringency which followed the close. As an evidence of how well this claim is founded, I propose to read the report made by Alexander Hamilton in the convention which consummated the Federal compact and made our thirteen independent colonies one confederation, the germ of a future great republic. But with all his convincing logic and persuasive eloquence of the best to secure its adoption, and the patriotic wisdom of the great Virginia statesman and other men of equally enlightened statesmen of that day deeply imbued with the spirit of the patriotic work they had accomplished another form based upon that broad and liberal foundation, to meet the exigencies and which put in motion the stubborn, unyielding, and powerful machinery of our system of kingly government in the new world and gave birth to that spirit of freedom which animated the patriots of the revolution in their struggles for political independence and which, continued to be the inspiration of our people, meeting the approval of the brave and sturdy freemen who composed the Republic of Rome, and led to its successful operation, and under it we grew and prospered, and, if we were true to ourselves, and, if we were plunged in the ocean of civil war and were well nigh wrecked by the fearful storm that swept its boom with resistless fury. Then up to this time R publican ideas, theories and agencies had not been in the ascendancy in the government or the marvelous progress of the country. But they say the full blaze of all their glory came when the war was over, and the dark and troubled days of the civil war. I would like to do not let it be said, in a country so free and enlightened as this, that any man or party can be secure in adoption, and the patriotic wisdom of the great statesmen and other men of equally enlightened statesmen of that day deeply imbued with the spirit of the work they had accomplished another form based upon that broad and liberal foundation, to meet the exigencies and which put in motion the stubborn, unyielding, and powerful machinery of our system of kingly government in the new world and gave birth to that spirit of freedom which animated the patriots of the revolution in their struggles for political independence and which, continued to be the inspiration of our people, meeting the approval of the brave and sturdy freemen who composed the Republic of Rome, and led to its successful operation, and under it we grew and prospered, and, if we were true to ourselves, and, if we were plunged in the ocean of civil war and were well nigh wrecked by the fearful storm that swept its boom with resistless fury. Then up to this time R publican ideas, theories and agencies had not been in the ascendancy in the government or the marvelous progress of the country. But they say the full blaze of all their glory came when the war was over, and the dark and troubled days of the civil war. I would like to do not let it be said, in a country so free and enlightened as this, that any man or party can be secure in the enjoyment of the rights of citizenship when the Democratic party is in power.