THE SUM OF MEANNESS.

Which Means the Doctrine of State Sovereignty, as Advocated by the Democracy.

It Refuses a Man Protection at His Own Fireside, and Tells Him to Go Away from Home if He Wants to be Protected.

[Extract from Col. Robert G. Ingersoll's Rockford speech.]

The great difference to-day between the Democratic and Republican party is, that the Democratic party believes this is a simple confederation. The Democratic party believes in what we call State sovereignty, and the Republican party proclaims this country to be a nation, one and indivisible. There is the difference. The South believes this is a mere confederacy, and they are honest; they are willing to fight for it; they are willing to fight for it now; they are willing to commit frauds for it; they are willing to use the shot-gun to uphold it; they are willing to use tissue ballots to substantiate it, and they believe it. Now the question with us is whether we will put a party in power knowing, as we do know, that the principal part of that party absolutely believe in the doctrine of State sovereignty. They believe in the sacredness of a State line. In old times, in the year of grace 1860, if a man wished the army of the United States to pursue a fugitive slave, then the army could cross a State line. Whenever it has been necessary to deprive some human being of a right, then we had a right to cross State lines, but whenever we wished to strike the shackles of slavery from a human being we had no right to cross a State line. In other words, when you want to do a mean thing you can step over the line, but if your object is a good one you shall not do it. This doctrine of State sovereignty is the meanest doctrine that ever was lodged in the American mind. It is political poison, and if this country is destroyed that doctrine will have done as much toward it as any other one thing. I believe the Union one, absolutely. The Democrat tells me that when I am away from home the Government will protect me, but when I am at home, when I am sitting around the family fireside of the nation, then the Government cannot protect me; that I must leave if I want protection. Now I denounce that doctrine. For instance, we are at war with another country, and the American nation comes to me and says: "We want you." I say, "I won't go." They draft me, put some names in a wheel, and a man turns it, and another man pulls out a paper, and my name is on it, and he says: "Come." So I go, and I fight for the flag. When the war is over I go back to my State. Now let us admit that the war has been unpopular, and that when I got to the State the people of that State wished to trample upon my rights, and I cried out to my Government: "Come and defend me; you made me defend you." What ought the Government to do? I only owe that Government my allegiance that owes me its protection. Protection is the other side of the bargain; that is what it must be. And, if a Government ought to protect even the man that it drafts, what ought it to do for the volunteer—the man who holds his wife for a moment in a tremulous embrace, and kisses his children, wets their cheeks with his tears, shoulders his musket, goes to the field, and says: "Here I am to uphold my flag!" A nation that will not protect such a protector is a disgrace to mankind, and its flag a dirty rag that contaminates the air in which it waves. I believe in a Government with an arm long enough to reach the collar of any rascal beneath its flag. I want it with an arm long enough and a sword sharp enough to strike down tyranny wherever it may raise its snaky head. I want a nation that can hear the faintest cries of its humblest citizen. I want a nation that will protect a freedman, standing in the sun by his little cabin, just as quick as it would protect Vanderbilt in a palace of marble and gold. I believe in a Government that can cross a State line on an errand of mercy. I believe in a Government that can cross a State line when it wishes to do justice. I do not believe that the sword turns to air at a State line. I want a Government that will protect me. I am here to-day—do I stand here because the flag of Illinois is above me? I want no flag of Illinois, and if I were to see it I should not know it—I am here to-day under the folds of the flag of my country, for which more blessed blood has been shed than for any other flag that waves in this world. I have as much right to speak here as if I had been born here. That is the country in which I believe; that is the nation which commands my respect, that protects all. This doctrine of State sovereignty has to be done away with; we have got to stamp it out. Let me tell you its history. The first time it ever appeared was when they wished to keep the slave trade alive until 1808. The first resort to this doctrine was for the protection of piracy and murder, and the next time they appealed to it was to keep the inter-slave trade alive so that a man in Virginia could sell the very woman that nursed him to the rice fields of the South. It was done so they could raise mankind as a crop. It was a crop they could thresh the year round. The next time they appealed to the doctrine was in favor of the Fugitive Slave law, so that every white man in the North was to become a hound to bay upon the track of the fugitive slave. Under that law the North agreed to catch women and give them back to the bloodhounds of the South. Under that infamy men and women were held, and were kidnapped under the shadow of the dome of the national Capitol. If the Democratic party had remained in power it would be so now. The South said: "Be friends with us, all we want is to steal labor; be friends with us, all we want of you is to have you catch our slaves; be friends with us, all we want of you is to be in partnership in the business of slavery, and we are to take all the money and you are to have the disgrace and dishonor for your share." The dividend don't suit me.

The next time they appealed to the doctrine of State rights was that they might extend the area of human slavery; it was that they might desecrate the fair fields of Kansas. The next time they appealed to this infamous doctrine was in secession and treason; so now, when I hear any man advocate this doctrine, I know that he is not a friend of my country, he is not a friend of humanity, liberty, or of progress.

There is another reason why I am opposed to the Democratic party. We have not only got parties to trust—we have got sections of country to trust. They say: "Are we never to be friends with the South?" Yes, when the South admits that they were wrong. When they get up to that point they will know that whoever is conquered by right is, after all, the victor; they will know that every man that was whipped by freedom remains a conqueror upon the field; every man trampled down by right rises like a god; and when they get great enough to understand this philosophy they will be glad that they didn't succeed; they well know that defeat was their only possible road to success. We, having saved them from the crime of slavery, have made it possible for them to go abreast with us with the great march of human progress, and the time will come when the South will rejoice that we succeeded because the right was victorious.

Now we not only have to choose between sections and between parties, but also between men. The Democratic party has nominated Gen. Hancock for President, and Mr. English for Vice President. For several years past the Democratic party has been doing all in its power, or pretending to do all in its power, to destroy the army and the national banks, and in order to show that it is sincere it nominates for President a Major General in that very army, and also nominates for the second place on the ticket a President of a national bank. Now you know they are honest. I have not one word to say against Gen. Hancock. No doubt he was a good, brave, splendid soldier, but if he was right at Gettysburg he is wrong now; if he believed in State rights then he had no right to trample that right between the hoofs of his horse. The South, when at Gettysburg, believed in State sovereignty. Lee believed in it, Jackson fought for it, and Hampton swears that the cause of the Democracy to-day is the same cause that Lee and Jackson fought for. Hampton, an honorable man, told the truth. Who has changed since the battle of Gettysburg—Hancock or the South? The South remains where it was, firm as ever; the men who shot at him then wish to vote for him now. They have not changed. Who has? Hancock is a soldier, I know, but a few of his ideas with regard to government—all I know—I get from Order No. 40, his letter of acceptance, which is in general terms an approval of the constitution, and from two or three letters and telegrams that he has written and sent since his nomination. They say that by Order No. 40 Gen. Hancock showed that he was in favor of exalting the civil power above the military. That order did no such thing; that order tells the General that he must not interfere unless for the purpose of keeping order. Who, under that order, would decide whether there was order, the General or the civil power? Under that order the General was to decide whether there was order or disorder. From his decision there was no appeal, and order No. 40 puts the civil power beneath the feet of the military authorities, and everybody knows it that has sense to read. Gen. Hancock, too, the other day, had the kindness to certify that, if his party did wrong, he would not. He tells the American people in substance: "Of course you cannot trust the Democracy, but you can rely on me. If my party passes a law to pay the Southern claims, I now give you my honor that I will defeat the party that exalts me to power." In other words, he agrees to veto the bill in advance; he agrees, even before he is elected President. He swears now he will use a certain discretionary power vested in him by the constitution, and he cannot foresee what the circumstances will be: yet in advance he solemnly swears what his better judgment will be then. He knows exactly how discreet he will be. He certifies to the American people that he will veto any law that the party may pass for the payment of Southern claims. How did he ever come to suspect that his party would ever pass such a law? Garfield has written no letter that he will veto a law to pay Southern claims. Is it not a little strange that the candidate has to certify to his party? As a rule, in this country, the party has always certified to the candidate. If Gen. Garfield would certify that he would veto a certain law if it was passed by the Republican party, the whole party would feel insulted. We would say to him: "We will take care of ourselves; when you become President exercise your power as in your discretion you believe you ought, but do not certify to the moral character of the Republican party." Why did Hancock think it necessary to certify to their character? Because he knew it is bad. He really thought the American people had more confidence in him than in the Democratic party; for that reason he steps to the front and says to the country: "I will not allow these ragamuffins behind me; I will not allow these rebels who placed me in power; I will not allow them to pass a law that I don't want." He says: "I admit they are bad; look at them. I admit you cannot trust them; but between this hungry horde and the American people I promise to throw the shield of my veto." He says: "Ladies and gentlemen, I will protect you from this party. All I want of these men is to make me President, and then I will protect you and let them go to the devil. Gen. Hancock might die; death might veto him. From the grave he could not carry out his promise, and who comes in then? Mr. English. Death has never elected a good President in the United States yet; death has always made a frightful mistake. Read the letter of acceptance made by Mr. English, and tell me whether you are willing to trust that man. Read his history—a man who has done nothing but loan money, take deeds of trust on the "life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness" of the people, and then foreclose the deed, and yet, after nominating that man, the Democratic party passes a resolution that they will save the people from cormorants. It won't do; we don't want him. I had rather trust a party than any man; so would you—you had rather trust the Republican party than simply Gen. Hancock. He says: "I am a shepherd; I will take care of the sheep; I admit that my followers are wolves." Well, I say rather than have the wolves we will dispense with you. What are the ideas of this soldier? What are his ideas about money? He was a hard-money man, they tell me. Mr. Bayard—the representative of hard money, a man who once in the Senate wanted to pay the bonds of the United States in depreciated money, and to pay them at the same price at which they were originally sold—that man now says: "As fast as we redeem a greenback let us burn it up; let us put the greenback out of the country," when he knows it is good as gold. What are the opinions, I say, of Gen. Hancock? I say he is for hard money, and yet, when a Greenbacker carried Maine, he congratulated him. Why should he do that if he is a believer in hard money? Why should he be delighted because a believer in paper money carried the State of Maine? I don't know. Maybe, after all, he was not so glad that the Greenbackers carried that as that the Republicans lost it. What does that man believe in? Does he believe in free trade? I don't know. What kind of a tariff does he want? I don't know. What is his opinion about things of interest to every man here? I don't know. You do not know. I would like to hear from him. I wish we had heard from him years and years ago. In 1868 he was opposed to all legislation that has made the negro a citizen. In 1868 he was opposed to all the legislation growing out of the war. Only a little while ago he was in favor of soft money; only a little while ago he said we never could redeem; only a little while ago he was a Democrat of that school, and now we are told he is in favor of the constitutional amendments. Now we are told he is in favor of an honest vote everywhere. It won't do.

On the other hand, we have a man who is a trained statesman, who has discussed these questions time and time again, and whose opinions are well known to all the intelligent people of this Union. He was as good a soldier as Hancock was. The man who makes up his mind in a time of profound peace to make war the business of his life, the man who makes war his profession, the man who is adopted by the Government, is, in my judgment, no better than the man who in time of peace would rather follow the avocations of peace, and who, when war comes, when the blast of conflict blows in his ears, buckles on his sword and fights for his native land, and, when the war is over, goes back to the avocations of peace. I say that Garfield was as good a soldier as Hancock, and I say that Garfield took away from the field of Chickamauga as much honor as one man can carry. He is a trained statesman. He knows what he is talking about, and he talks about it well. I have known him for years. I know him as well as I know any other man, and I tell you that he has more brains, more education, wider and more splendid views than any other man who has been nominated for the Presidency by any party since I was born. Some people say to me: "How can you vote for Garfield when he is a Christian and was a preacher?" I tell them: "I have two reasons: One is I am not a bigot, and the other is, Gen. Garfield is not a bigot. He does not agree with me; I do not agree with him on thousands of things; but on the great luminous principle that every man must give to every other man every right that he claims for himself we do absolutely agree. I would despise myself if I would vote against a man in politics simply because we differed about what is known as religion. I will vote for a liberal Catholic, a liberal Presbyterian, a liberal Methodist, a liberal anything 10,000 times quicker than I would vote for an illiberal freethinker. I believe in the right. I believe in doing to other people in these matters as I would like to have them do to me. Gen. Garfield is an honest man every way; intellectual every way. He is a poor man; he is rich in honor, in integrity he is wealthy, and in brains he is a millionaire. I know him, and if the people of Illinois knew him as well as I do he would not lose 100 votes in this State. He is a great, good, broad, kind, tender man, and he will do, if elected President, what he believes to be right. I like him, too, because he is a certificate of the splendid form of our government. I like him because, under our institutions, he came from abject poverty to occupy the position he now does before the American people. He will make Hope the tailor of every ragged boy. He will make every boy think it possible, no matter how poor he is, no matter how hungry he may be, he will make every one of those boys believe that there is in their horizon some one beckoning them to glory and to honor. That is the reason I like this country, because everybody has a chance. I like it because the poorest man can live hoping his boy may occupy the highest place. This is the reason I like this country. That is one of the reasons I want to see Gen. Garfield elected. He believes in honor, he believes in liberty, he believes in an honest ballot, he believes in collecting the revenues, he believes in good money, he believes in a Government of law, he believes that this is absolutely a nation, and not a confederacy, and I believe in him. Throwing aside, throwing to the winds all prejudice, all partisanship, all hatreds, I beg of every one who hears me to conscientiously decide each for himself what, under the circumstances, as a man, as a patriot, as a lover of justice, he ought to do. That is all I want you to do. Be honor bright. Do not be led away by the appeal of gentlemen who once belonged to the Republican party. Vote to sustain the greatest possible cause, human liberty. I know and appreciate what our liberty has cost. We are reaping to-day the benefits of the sufferings of every hero who ever died. We are to-day enjoying the benefits conferred upon us by our heroic dead. We are to-day a great, a united and a splendid people simply because somebody was great and grand enough to die that we might live. Now, do you believe, if the dead could rise from their graves—the men fallen on all the battle-fields of the war—could they rise from the unknown graves that made this continent sacred, how would they vote next November? Think of it. Let us be true to the memory of every man that ever died for us.

Let me ask you another question. How do the men who wished to destroy this Government wish you to vote now? How would every rebel in the South, could he have come to the North, have voted in 1864? How would every rebel in the South, if he could have visited the North—how would he have voted in 1868, in 1872, in 1876? How would Jefferson Davis vote if he were in the North to-day? How would the men that starved our prisoners at Andersonville and Libby—and Andersonville and Libby are the mighty, mighty wings that will bear the memory of the Confederacy to eternal infamy—how would the men who starved our brave boys there vote if they were in Illinois now? Every one of them would hurrah for Hancock?

Let us be honest. We are reaping the reward of all those great and glorious actions, and every good man who has ever lived in the country, no matter whether he has been persecuted or not, has made the world better.

The other night I happened to note a sunset. The sun went down, and the west was full of light and fire, and I said: "There, there is the perfect death of a great man; that sun, dying, leaves a legacy of glory to the very clouds that obstruct its path. That sun, like a great man, dying, leaves a legacy of glory even to the ones who persecuted him, and the world is glorious only because there have been men great enough and grand enough to die for the right." Will any man, can any man, afford to die for this country? Then can we afford to vote for it. If a man can afford to fight for it and die for it, I can afford to speak for it.

And now I beg of you, every man and woman, no matter in what country born—if you are an Irishman, recollect that this country has done more for your race than all other countries under heaven; if you are a German, recollect that this country is kinder to you than your own fatherland; no matter what country you came from, remember that this country is an asylum, and vote as in your conscience you believe you ought to vote to keep this flag in heaven.

GEN. GRANT.

He Expresses His Honest Opinion About Gen. Hancock, Designating Him as a Man Crazed with Presidential Ambition, Who Has Had This Particular Bee in His Bonnet Ever Since 1864—The General Gives the Inside History of the Celebrated Order No. 40, Showing How Hancock Tried to Undo the Reconstruction Policy.

The Cincinnati *Gazette* prints the report of an interview between the Rev. C. H. Fowler, D. D., and Grant, which gives some startling points in connection with the inside history of Hancock's Order No. 40. Gen. Grant talked freely to Dr. Fowler, and, after the interview, gave his written consent to its publication under certain restrictions as to time. The conversation took place in Grant's library at Galena on the 21st of September. Speaking of Hancock, the ex-President said: "Down to 1864 he seemed like a man ambitious to do his duty as an officer. When McClellan was nominated, Hancock received one vote, and that greatly excited and changed him. He was so delighted that he smiled all over. It crazed him. Before that we got on well. After that he would hardly speak to me. I was working to enforce the laws of Congress, and he was working for the Presidency. Perhaps he thought I did not praise him enough; but, any way, he hardly spoke to me. It was on my nomination that he was made a Brigadier in the regular army, when I was made General. Stanton told me it was a compliment to me, and that I could name the men to fill the vacancies in the Lieutenant Generalship and Major Generalships caused by promotion. I nominated him for the vacant Major Generalship in the regular army. He acknowledged it manfully. He was a very fair corps commander, but was never thought of for any great place. When the army of the Potomac was hunting for a commander it took almost everybody, and even came over into the West for officers, but no one ever even suggested Hancock for the place. After he received that vote in 1864, he had the 'bee in his bonnet,' and shaped everything to gain Democratic and Southern favor. He has watched, and planned, and waited, till at last he has received the Democratic nomination."

"General, do you think he is in sympathy with the South?"

"He is crazy to be President. He is ambitious, vain, and weak. They will easily control him."

"Do you think, General, that his celebrated Order No. 40 represents the direction of his sympathies?"

"Well, I will give you the true inner history of Order No. 40. Congress was striving to prevent Andrew Johnson from undoing the Reconstruction laws. Whenever Congress passed a law Johnson bent his energies to defeat its enforcement, and would find pretexts to dodge round it Then Congress would pass another law to hedge him up there. So it went on till Congress had taken from him all control of the Generals commanding the seven districts of the South except the power to recall them and appoint others in their place. These commanders could remove any civil officer of any grade, Judge or Governor. When I was made General and they were determining my powers and duties, they gave the General—by accident, I think, or without seeing all it involved—co-ordinate power with these district commanders, and, as I was senior, it gave me authority. Gen. Sheridan was sent to the Department of Louisiana and Texas. He is very shrewd and very keen. He kept his eyes open, learning rapidly the men who were not worthy to occupy their places, and discovering competent and worthy men to put in their places. The Legislature of Louisiana passed a law authorizing the issue of $7,000,000 of levee bonds, ostensibly for the levee. They conditioned their sale on their bringing to the State not less than 80 per cent. of their face. The Governor and three Commissioners were to place the bonds on the market; but they soon found that the bonds would not bring more than 40 per cent. To avoid the law they invented the plan of borrowing money and using the bonds as collateral. They could borrow about 34 or 35 per cent. of the face of the bonds. Just at this juncture, to prevent these men from defrauding the State, Gen. Sheridan took off the heads of the Governor and Commissioners so quick that they did not know what ailed them, and appointed good men in their place. For some reason, the removed were very anxious to be reappointed. They employed Reverdy Johnson and another lawyer to work for them, agreeing to pay them $250,000 if they were reinstated. This is a great deal of money for four men to pay for positions, unless there is some special gain in the case. Reverdy Johnson came to me, but I was so stupid and stubborn that I could not be induced to reappoint them. He then went to Andrew Johnson and made his case, and Andrew Johnson sent for me and asked me to reinstate these men. I refused to do so. He said: 'Reinstate them, even if it is only for one day. I will promise that they will resign.' I thought Johnson might not know of the motive why they were so anxious to be reinstated, and, thinking I would do him a great service in keeping him from a great blunder, I told him 'one hour would do these men as well as one day,' and I unfolded their intent. But Johnson insisted on their being reinstated. I refused and excused myself.

"Johnson then removed Gen. Sheridan and appointed Gen. Hancock. He called Hancock to Washington to instruct him in defeating the laws of Congress concerning reconstruction. As soon as I learned that Hancock was in town I called at his hotel, instead of sending for him. I wanted to see him privately in his own room. I found him in his room, perhaps before he had his breakfast. I said:

"'General, you and I are soldiers—army officers. We have life positions; we serve under successive administrations without regard to party. It is our duty to enforce the laws of Congress. We are not responsible for the wisdom of the laws; Congress bears that responsibility. We simply enforce them.'

"He said: 'Well, I am opposed to nigger domination.'

"I said 'General, it is not a question of "nigger domination." Four millions of ex-slaves, without education or property, can hardly dominate 30,000,000 of whites with all the education and property. It is a question of doing our sworn duty.'

"He said: 'Well, I'm opposed to nigger domination.'

"I saw that my only chance to influence him was by the remnant of authority left in my hands. He was determined to please the Democratic party and the South. He went South and removed the Government and Commissioners that Gen. Sheridan had appointed.

"I instantly telegraphed not to appoint to office any men who had been removed, and give his reasons by mail for removing the men. He telegraphed in a long reply, costing the Government $250, his reasons. He again telegraphed about the same points, only not quite so long, costing only $150. He telegraphed that if he could not have freedom to act his 'usefulness would be destroyed,' and that he would have to ask to be relieved. I telegraphed him to revoke his order. He asked Johnson to relieve him, as no one else could.

"That is the inner history and spirit of his celebrated Order No. 40. This order resulted in the loss of many lives. I know of cases, and can give them. His statement that the civil authorities are supreme is a truth admitted by all in time of established peace; but I can demonstrate that he did not subject the military power to the civil, but that he used his military power to overthrow the civil."

In speaking of the Chicago Convention, Gen. Grant said: "There are three reasons why I would have accepted the nomination:

"1. On account of the character of the men who urged it. I esteem their spirit and confidence more than the nomination.

"2. I believe I could have broken up the solid South. Many life-long Democrats in the South had given the strongest assurances of their cordial support, believing that I could deliver them from the evils of a solid South.

"3. There is another partial reason. I believe that I could have induced, from my knowledge of our Consulates, the enactment of certain laws touching our commerce that would have given us control of much desirable commerce. For instance, in Mexico, instead of dealing with people who use only slave labor, and receive little or nothing but sterling on exchange."

Dr. Fowler, who held the above conversation with the ex-President, was until recently editor of the *Advocate*, the leading Methodist paper published in New York. He is now Missionary Secretary of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

AN APPALLING RECORD.

Yet This Is All the Democratic Party Have to Appeal to the Country On.

[From the New York Tribune.]

Why should the Democratic party be trusted with power? Its leaders give no answer, save that a "change is desirable?" What would be the character of that "change?" Let the record answer. We give below the evidence of that record on all the great questions of the canvass, resumption, public expenditures, rebel claims, pensions, and the treatment of Union soldiers. On every one the testimony is black, damning. To put the Government in the hands of the party which has made that record, not far in the past, but within the last five years, is not to vote for a change, but chaos. Read the facts; remember them; show them to your doubting neighbors:

RESUMPTION.

VOTE ON THE PASSAGE OF THE RESUMPTION ACT.

In the Senate Dec. 22, 1874.

	For.	Against.
Republicans	32	1
Democrats	0	2
Liberals	--	1
Totals	32	14

In the House Jan. 7, 1875.

	For.	Against.
Republicans	139	25
Democrats	0	71
Liberals	--	3
Totals	139	99

VOTES FOR THE REPEAL OF THE ACT.

In the House Aug. 5, 1876.

	For.	Against.
Republicans	10	56
Democrats	93	27
Liberals	3	3
Totals	106	86

In the House Nov. 23, 1877.

	For.	Against.
Republicans	29	92
Democrats	104	28
Totals	133	120

In the House Feb. 24, 1879.

	For.	Against.
Republicans	4	114
Democrats	106	27
Totals	110	141

APPROPRIATIONS.

LAST APPROPRIATION BY A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS.

Year.	Amount in Currency.	In Coin.
1876	$147,714,946.81	$129,693,718.03

FIVE APPROPRIATIONS BY DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSES.

Year.	Currency.	Coin.
1877	$124,122,010.92	$115,061,104.12
1878	88,356,983.13	86,236,415.53
1879	172,016,809.21	171,672,775.59
1880	162,404,647.76	162,404,647.76
1881	154,118,212.64	154,118,212.64
Totals	$701,018,663.66	$689,493,155.64
Average each year in currency		$140,203,732.73
Average each year in coin		137,878,631.12
Increase each year in coin over 1876		8,204,913.09
Total increase in five years		41,023,055.45

REBEL CLAIMS.

VOTE IN THE HOUSE ON A RESOLUTION FOR AN AMENDMENT FORBIDDING THE PAYMENT OF ALL CLAIMS MADE BY DISLOYAL PERSONS, JUNE 20, 1878.

	For.	Against.
Confederates	1	44
Border Democrats	4	12
Northern Democrats	38	5
Republicans	102	0
Totals	145	61
Absent and not voting		84

PENSIONS.

PROVIDING AN APPROPRIATION FOR THE PROMPT PAYMENT OF THE ARREARS OF PENSIONS FOR UNION SOLDIERS, FEB. 3, 1879—FACTS AND FIGURES RESPECTIVELY DEDICATED TO MR. FORGERY BELTZHOOVER

	For.	Against.
Confederates	3	31
Border Democrats	0	38
Northern Democrats	29	9
Republicans	108	3
Totals	140	81

THE SPARKS BILL IN THE HOUSE.

APPROPRIATING $25,000,000 FOR ARREARS OF PENSIONS, AND $1,800,000 ADDITIONAL FOR ORDINARY PENSIONS, FEB. 17, 1879.

	For.	Against.
Confederates	4	58
Border Democrats	8	5
Northern Democrats	53	3
Republicans	118	1
Totals	183	67

THE SPARKS BILL IN THE SENATE.

VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO EXCLUDE REBEL SOLDIERS, FEB. 28, 1879.

	For.	Against.
Confederates	0	11
Border Democrats	0	6
Northern Democrats	0	7
Republicans	24	2
Totals	24	26

VOTE ON THE AMENDMENT TO EXCLUDE JEFF DAVIS, FEB. 28, 1879.

	For.	Against.
Confederates	0	11
Border Democrats	0	4
Northern Democrats	0	5
Republicans	23	1
Totals	23	21

UNION SOLDIERS.

VOTE IN THE HOUSE ON A RESOLUTION GIVING PREFERENCE TO UNION SOLDIERS ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE FORCE MAY, 20, 1880.

	For.	Against.
Confederates	3	46
Border Democrats	4	12
Northern Democrats	7	20
Nationals	6	0
Republicans	75	0
Totals	95	78

VOTE IN THE SENATE ON A RESOLUTION FORBIDDING THE DISCHARGE OF UNION SOLDIERS FROM SENATE OFFICES EXCEPT FOR CAUSE, APRIL 17, 1879.

	For.	Against.
Confederates	0	18
Border Democrats	0	3
Northern Democrats	0	10
Republicans	25	0
Totals	25	21

VOTE IN THE SENATE ON AMENDMENT THAT NO CONFEDERATE SOLDIER SHOULD BE EMPLOYED IN LIEU OF A UNION SOLDIER, APRIL 17, 1879.

	For.	Against.
Confederates	0	19
Border Democrats	0	3
Northern Democrats	0	12
Republicans	26	0
Total	26	34

VOTE IN THE SENATE ON A MOTION TO REPEAL THE LAW WHICH PROHIBITS APPOINTMENT OF CONFEDERATE SOLDIERS, SAILORS AND OFFICE HOLDERS TO POSITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

	For.	Against.
Confederates	19	0
Border Democrats	6	0
Northern Democrats	11	0
Republicans	0	23
Total	36	23

A FREE BALLOT.

How It Is Secured in the South.

[From Evarts' New York Speech.]

There are two things that underlie the whole fabric of political society, its interest and its sentiment. One is the suffrage, which is the basis of it all. Another is the largeness and integrity of our country, which this people, for some reason or other, in spite of all the inculcation of Southern dogmas, are insisting upon thinking is greater than any of its parts. Our people know what the elements and traits of free suffrage are, and have resented any attack upon it in any form. What is the education of this people if it be not to value the liberties of others as well as their own? I never knew a King or a noble or priest or rich man that did not value his liberty, and I think some of them were willing even to carry their liberties to the extent of license, as we say. But the question is whether the strong value the liberties of the weak. The question is whether the proud value the liberties of the humble. The question is whether the man of great intellect, of great learning, values the liberties of the ignorant. And when a great section of this country talks about suffrage as an inviolable right, and then with all its strength, all its pride, all its learning, flaunts itself before this country, boastful that it can intimidate the weak and can deceive the ignorant, I don't think much of their love of liberty, except in the sense that Kings and nobles love liberty—for its license, at the expense of the poor, the humble, the ignorant and the weak. That is an old stage of politics in this world, but since the Fourth of July, 1776, it has not been the politics of the American people, and I don't think it will be next November.

Let us see how much the platforms preach, and, at the hustings, the orators palaver about the suffrage. The platform of the Democratic party speaks of it as the right preservative of all rights, and immediately proceeds to take it away from the blacks. Now, if that right is preservative of all rights, and you take it away from the blacks, cunning as you are, you take away their rights. Now, Gen. Hancock says, in the admirable letter of acceptance, of which his party is so proud, that a free ballot, a full vote and an honest count is what the people of the United States want. Now, here is a little table that has been used by an accomplished orator throughout the Western part of this country, in which he gives the following result of a free ballot, a full vote and a fair count in 1876:

	Hayes.	Tilden.
Green county, Ala	2	408
Walton county, Ga	2	1,893
Wilkes county, Ga	2	1,139
East Feliciana, La	none	1,736
Lawrence county, Miss	2	2,073
Tallahatchie county, Miss	1	1,144
Yazoo county, Miss	2	3,672
Brown county, Tex	1	2,525
Eastland county, Tex	3	1,787
Hidalgo county, Tex	4	1,629
Buchanan county, Va	2	1,330

Now, you see what the Democratic protection of the right of suffrage, preservative of all rights, and a free ballot, a full vote, and a fair count is. Here are eleven counties in six different Southern States that have produced twenty-one votes for Hayes and sixteen odd thousand for Tilden. Now, I think that, under a candidate that is better than his party, and with this printing in the platform, and this palaver at the hustings, the Republican vote in these eleven counties will probably be doubled from twenty-one to forty-two. But as the Democrats like to be included in all this talk about a free ballot, a full vote and a fair count, I suppose their aggregate will rise from 16,000 to 32,000.

Well, gentlemen, I don't know what the American people are made of. I don't know whether they like this palaver. I don't think it is creditable to a candidate that is better than his party to write such contemptuous imitation of principles as that. I don't think it is creditable to a party, even though it is worse than a candidate, to put forth such a solemn proposition of its love of that suffrage, "preservative of our rights." The only equal for this disparity between principles and practice that I have ever heard of was that of the man who broke his wife's head with a motto that hung in a frame at their bedside, "God Bless Our Home."

Now, as I say, loving the suffrage, we resent any interference with it. Now, this Democratic party says to us, "Oh, don't mind them, they are far off; they are not of your race; they are ignorant; they are feeble. Don't distress yourselves about this injury of the poor blacks in the distant parts of the country; that is our State rights, and we mean to exercise it." But when American liberty accuses the Democratic party of having made a deadly assault upon the foundation right of liberty and equality, the Democratic party undertakes to reply: "When have we made such an assault? Why, we have prophesied under the name of liberty, and under the name of liberty we have cast out Republican devils." The answer is: "Inasmuch as ye have done it to the least of these poor disciples of liberty at its feet, ye have done it unto me," and in the scales of justice and in the eye and the balance of the divine scrutiny this is a law of the moral government of the world, and, if this people looks with patience on this robbery of the suffrage from these poor freemen, it won't be long before we will have to debate what we shall do to protect the suffrage of these poor plebeians that Tarquin the superb robs of their franchises.

THE POOR MAN'S FRIEND.

Mr. Evarts Pays His Respects to the Democratic Candidate for Vice President.

In his speech at Cooper Institute, New York, Secretary Evarts said:

Now, gentlemen, we have candidates also called Vice Presidents, and I take Mr. English first. I have never seen any very open or public avowal of why the Democrats nominated Mr. English. He was not in our minds at all. I do not know that his countrymen were turning him over among the men that they thought the Democrats could nominate. It will not do to put it wholly upon the fact that he is a rich banker, so we look at the speeches he has made in Congress twenty years ago, when they talked about abolitionists and about the blacks and about the plebeians in the fashion that the old Democrat used to talk about our notions of befriending the people. There did not seem to be a reason for that, and I leave it to his neighbors, who have expressed their minds about him, whether there is anything in that large liberality of personal character which makes a man popular in spite of the badness of his political principles. I do not understand that there is a very large claim on that score. I do observe in his letter of acceptance that he seems to be of a very sympathetic nature—feels for the sufferings of others—because I observe that he expresses great interest in the toiling millions of his countrymen. Well, these are all trifling matters, perhaps, but they do show whether a party is sincere or not, and when I say that Mr. English had this yearning of heart for the toiling millions of his countrymen, I could not but think of a story that our excellent Judge—Judge Brady—is fond of telling at the expense of our profession—for there is one good thing about us lawyers, that we do repeat all the jokes against ourselves that we can pick up. Well, a young man who had lost his father and had a small estate of $50 from a solvent debtor that yet he needed to collect by law, waited upon a lawyer in the village who, he knew, was a friend of his father, and asked him to collect it. The lawyer received him as only a lawyer knows how to receive a client, and admitted frankly that he did know his father, that he loved him as a father, and nothing would give him greater pleasure than to collect that little bill. So, when the process had brought in the money, word was sent to the young man that the debt had been collected, and he would be glad to pay it him, deducting the costs, and so the lawyer handed out to the young man, who was full of gratitude, $15 out of the $50, at which he seemed a little dazed in counting it, and the lawyer said: "Why, is not it all right; are not the $15 there?" "Oh, yes," says the young man, "there are $15; I was only thinking how lucky it was for me that you didn't know my grandfather." And I could not help thinking how lucky it was for these toiling millions of our countrymen that only a few thousand of them were within the immediate friendship of Mr. English.

THE fund for the new professorships in Harvard's divinity school has reached $113,700.

HERBERT SPENCER will make the tour of the United States next year.