THE CHRONICLE.

D. F. WRIGHT, M. D., Editor.

Clarksville, Tenn., Mch. 20, 1880.

TERMS: $2.00 IN ADVANCE.

Speech of Hon. John F. House, Concluded.

levy this assessment of a thousand dollars on him. But it was too late —$1,000 of Tilden's salary went toward the payment of the returning-board judgment, and that much of it is lost to Rutherford B. Hayes and his heirs forever.

Think of Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Jackson, or any of the illustrious men who have filled the presidential chair, being placed in a position where a man who had committed a fraud to count them into office could boldly approach the White house and demand of them money for services rendered in such a cause. The bare suggestion is an insult to the the memories of those illustrious men, which every honest man with the instincts of an American citizen feels like resenting with indignation. Yet Casanave made this demand of Mr. Hayes as compensation for his services as a member of the notorious returning board of Louisiana, and Mr. Hays contributed $1,000 to relieve Cansanave's necessities. Why should he have done so? It will not do to say that it was simply an act of charity prompted by goodness of heart on the part of Mr. Hayes to relieve a friend in distress. I suppose there were hundreds, ay, thousands of men in the United States who voted for Mr. Hayes against whose property executions have been pending since his inauguration. To how many such unfortunate friends has he contributed money in their distress? When Casanave first went to him he refused to do anything. When Casanave first went to John Sherman he proffered a hundred dollars, and said he was a poor man, and it was all he could do. But when Casanave threatened exposure and demanded his reward the money was forthcoming. The act speaks for itself. No comment within the bounds of propriety could do the subject justice. Let the American people look on and make their own comment upon the acts of the man who fills the place that Washington once filled, and upon the party who is responsible to the country for having him there. But the beauties of civil-service reform, as illustrated in the State of Louisiana, are by no means confined to the members of the returning board. From J. Madison Wells down to the most insignificant liar that furnished his mite of perjury in an affidavit, or the most obscure rascal that brought his contribution of forgery in the shape of false returns, rewards in the way of Federal appointments have been bestowed with a lavish hand.

H. J. Campbell, recognized as the head of the affidavit factory that was set up during the count in the custom-house at New Orleans, when perjury was served out in quantities to supply the demand, was made United States district attorney for Wyoming. Nearly all the electors on the Hayes and Wheeler ticket found their services recognized by Hayes and his party in lucrative and comfortable appointments. The following is a partial list of the less conspicuous agents who figured in the fraudulent count. It is taken from the report of the Potter investigating committee, and shows with what care and industry Mr. Hayes provided for even the humblest man that took part in the scheme of fraud by which he holds his seat as President.

SUPERVISORS AND PERSONS CONNECTED WITH THE ELECTION.

James P McArdle; formerly State registrar's clerk, now in custom-house.

Michael Hahn; formerly State registrar, now superintendent of mint.

M J Grady; formerly supervisor at Ouachita, now deputy collector, internal revenue.

John H Dinkgrave; formerly manager at Ouachita, now in Legislature.

H C Atwood; formerly manager at Ouachita, now United States marshal.

W R Hardy; formerly district attorney, now inspector in custom-house.

Henry Smith; formerly sheriff of East Feliciana, now in custom-house.

Samuel Chapman; formerly sheriff of East Feliciana, now in custom-house.

James E Anderson; formerly supervisor of East Feliciana, now consul, Funchal.

A H Ferguson; formerly supervisor at De Soto now custom-house.

M H Twitchell; formerly supervisor at Claiborne, now consul, Kingston.

J E Scott, formerly supervisor at Rapides, now post-office.

B W Woodruff; formerly supervisor at St. Tammany, now post-office.

Victor Gradias; formerly Republican manager, Grant parish, now tax collector, New Orleans.

A J Brien; formerly Republican manager, second ward, New Orleans, now inspector, custom-house.

Patrick Creagh; formerly Republican manager, fifth ward, New Orleans; now clerk, custom-house.

J C Pinckler; formerly Republican manager, fifth ward, New Orleans; now clerk, custom-house.

W J Moore; formerly Republican manager, seventh ward, New Orleans; now clerk, custom-house.

Thomas Leon; formerly Republican manager, eighth ward, New Orleans; now clerk, custom-house.

H C Bartlett; formerly Republican manager, ninth ward, New Orleans; now clerk, custom-house.

T H Rowan, formerly Republican manager, tenth ward, New Orleans; now clerk, custom-house.

A W Kempton; commissioner, eleventh ward, New Orleans; now boatman, custom-house.

L Backus; formerly manager, eleventh ward, New Orleans; now police, custom-house.

Napoleon Underwood; formerly supervisor, twelfth ward, New Orleans; now inspector, custom-house.

P J Maloney; formerly supervisor, fourteenth ward, New Orleans; now in custom-house.

W F Loan; formerly supervisor, fifteenth ward, New Orleans; now chief of police.

Look upon these facts and read this list. Then re-read Mr. Hayes' lofty professions of civil-service reform as embodied in his letter of acceptance, his inaugural address, his first and last annual message, his civil-service order and the proceedings there-under. Can any position however exalted, can any charity, however multitudinous in its capacity to cover sins, rescue one capable of such professions and such performances from the contempt of every American citizen with virtue enough to admire an honest man and sufficient candor to despise a hypocrite?

But the visiting statesmen who went to Louisiana to assist in the fraud were not forgotten by the beneficiary of their labors when he had grasped the prize of the Presidency. John Sherman dared not deny under oath that he gave to Weber and Anderson, in New Orleans, while the count was going on, a written promise if they would stand firm he would pledge Mr. Hayes to make such provision for them as would enable them to leave the State. Anderson and Weber were the supervisors of East and West Feliciana, respectively. False protests, with their names affixed, were on file with the returning board. They gave symptoms of disavowing and repudiating those protests. At this juncture Anderson says he and Weber had an interview with John Sherman. Sherman assured them if they would let the thing stand as it was they should be amply provided for. This seemed to satisfy them for the time, but on reflection they concluded they ought to have something from Mr. Sherman in writing, and they addressed him the following note:

NEW ORLEANS, Nov. 20, 1876.

SIR: We have carefully considered the arguments advanced by you in our interview. Your assurance that we shall be taken care of is scarcely specific enough. In case we pursue the course suggested by you we would be obliged to leave the State. Will you, therefore, state in writing who we shall look to for the fulfillment of those promises. Respectfully,

D. A. WEBER.
JAMES E. ANDERSON.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN.

To this letter the following was received by Anderson and Weber in reply:

NEW ORLEANS, Nov. 20, 1876.

GENTLEMEN: Your note of even date has just been received. Neither Mr. Hayes, myself, the gentlemen who accompany me, or the country at large, can ever forget the obligation under which you will have placed us should you stand firm in the position you have taken. From a long and intimate acquaintance with Governor Hayes I am justified in assuming the responsibility for promises made, and will guarantee that you shall be provided for as soon after the 4th of March as may be practicable, and in such a manner as will enable you both to leave Louisiana should you deem it necessary. JOHN SHERMAN.

Messrs. D. A. WEBER and J. E. ANDERSON.

Mr. Anderson produced the above, which purported to be a copy of the original, before the Potter committee; objection was made by the Republican members of the committee to its being received as evidence. It was determined not to give the document publicity until the appearance of Mr. Sherman before the committee. The following telegram was sent to him at the Treasury department by the chairman of the committee:

SIR: A paper purporting to be a copy of a letter written by you to D. A. Weber and James E. Anderson has been produced before the committee, and the committee has suspended the reading of it until you can have an opportunity to come here, forthwith, see the paper, and state whether it be a copy of any letter written by you, if you so desire to do.

In response to this telegram Mr. Sherman made his appearance before the committee, when the following proceedings took place:

AFTERNOON SESSION.

On the re-assembling of the committee (at 1:30 o'clock, p. m.) John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury, appeared, and announced that he had come in response to a telegram received from the committee, which he handed to the chairman.

The Chairman (addressing Secretary Sherman). Do you desire to be sworn as to this matter?

Secretary Sherman. Certainly.

The Chairman. Will you be sworn now, sir?

Secretary Sherman. Yes, sir.

John Sherman (Secretary of the Treasury) sworn and examined.

The Chairman (addressing the witness) James E. Anderson, the witness testifying before the committee this morning, stated that he had received from the hands of D. A. Weber a letter purporting to be signed by you, of which that which I now show you is a copy. Will you state to the committee whether you ever wrote such a letter?

The Witness (after an inspection of the paper handed to him, the same being subsequently marked "Ex. D."). I can only say this, that I believe, upon my responsibility and the oath I have taken, that I never wrote such a letter. I have no recollection of ever writing such a letter. If this letter was written, it must have been, if I am not mistaken about the dates, on the day when the returning officers first convened to open the returns. I think it was on the 20th. This purports to be dated on the 20th. At that time I knew but little about the transaction; the papers had not been opened. I do not believe I ever wrote that letter. At the same time there are things in this letter that I would have written to these or any other men who were engaged in the performance of what I believed to be their duty, if I had been asked, but I do not believe I wrote that letter.

After some time (the witness having apparently concluded his statement).

The Chairman said: That is all for the present, Mr. Secretary.

The Witness. If you want me any further, gentlemen, I will come back at any time you desire.

During the time the committee were discussing the question as to the admissibility of the copy of the Sherman letter, and before the telegram was sent to Sherman, the following colloquy took place between two gentlemen of the committee, Mr. McMahon, Democrat, and Mr. Reed, Republican:

In the course of the discussion, Mr. Reed asked Mr. McMahon whether it was taken for granted that the original letter was not in existence.

Mr. McMahon. Not so far as we know.

Mr. Reed. Have you any better evidence of it than this; any other copy?

Mr. McMahon. No, sir; no other copy that we know of at the time.

Mr. Hiscock. The other copies are simply copies made from this one?

Mr. McMahon. They are made from this one. I have no other contemporaneous copies.

Mr. Reed. Is there any photographic copy of the original?

Mr. McMahon. If there is, I know nothing about it.

Mr. Reed. Then I understand you that this is the only copy that will be produced?

Mr. McMahon. I am not going to tell you everything.

Mr. Reed. My understanding of your answer is that there is no other copy to be produced.

Mr. McMahon. I have simply said that, so far as my knowledge extends, there is not.

Mr. Reed. You do not know of any such paper, by hearsay or otherwise?

Mr. McMahon. I am not on the stand. I have never seen a photographic copy of the letter.

Mr. Reed. Have you heard of one?

Mr. McMahon. Yes, often. I think that Mr. Sherman had better take the responsibility of answering that question.

The anxiety of Mr. Sherman's friends to ascertain whether the democratic members of the committee had in their possession the original or photograph copy, by either of which they would be able to confront Sherman's denial with the evidence of his own hand-writing, was most manifest. But they were left in doubt upon this subject, and under this fearful uncertainty Sherman took the stand. If he denied positively ever having written such a letter the original, or at least its ghost in the shape of a photographic copy bearing the *fac-simile* of his handwriting, might rise then and there to confront him. The situation had no terror for an honest or an innocent man, but for a guilty man it bristled with danger. Mr. Sherman met the question propounded as no frank, innocent man would have met it, and took the only possible avenue of escape that a shrewd guilty man could have taken. The substance of his reply may be embodied in a few words—"I don't *think* I wrote the letter, but I would have had no hesitation in saying to Weber and Anderson what the letter contains." Don't *think* he wrote it! An honest man ought always to be able to *know* whether he has been guilty of a corrupt act. The doubt in his own mind upon such a subject is evidence to every one else that he was capable of performing the act.—Nothing but the idea that the committee had or migt obtain conclusive evidence of his guilt would ever have forced Mr. Sherman to defend in advance the propriety and morality of such a letter. Plainly it was nothing more than a proposition to two rascals, if they would commit an act which might render it necessary for them to fly from a State whose people they had outraged, they should be taken care of and protected amply outside of the State. Mr. Sherman sees nothing wrong in this. He would have told any men this, he says, who were engaged in doing their duty. An honest man does not require, and no honest man will accept, a bribe to do his duty.

He could not offer such a bribe without believing the men corrupt to whom he offered it, and they could not accept it in remuneration for official acts without demonstrating their corruption. Mr. Sherman may think there is nothing wrong in offering a bribe to election officers in a State to do a certain thing This may be visiting-statesman morality, but outside of that extraordinary band of political wanderers such a transaction would be stamped, by universal consent, as corrupt and disreputable. That he wrote the letter I have not the slightest doubt; that he was capable of writing it his own words leave no man any room to doubt. Mr. Hayes, of course, in his labors to establish civil-service reform, could not overlook such services as these. Mr. Sherman was made secretary of the Treasory, and is a prospective candidate of the republican party for the Presidency. I do not desire to obtrude my advice upon them, but in my opinion, if they intend to carry out the peculiar notions of civil-service reform entertained by that party, they can find no one among their distinguished leaders upon whose shoulders the mantle of Rutherford B. Hayes could more appropriately fall. Edward W. Stonington was another one of the visiting statesmen who went to Louisiana. Anderson says that Stonington was in Moreau's restaurant on Canal street when he and Weber went in there to see Sherman. Anderson describes Stonington as "a gentleman with remarkable head of white hair. That is all I remember about him," he says. Perhaps the impression made on Anderson by Stonington does not differ so widely from that made on a good many others. But that was not all that Hayes "remembered" about Stonington. He remembered to make him minister to Russia on a salary of $17,500 per annum. Other visiting statesmen put in their work in Louisiana, and afterward received their reward from Mr. Hayes, but I do not care to further particularize on this part of the subject. But there is one other Louisiana specimen which I must not omit to mention, perhaps not eclpsed in brilliancy by any civil-service achievement of that State. I allude to the case of S. B. Packard. Packard, as is well known, was a candidate for governor of Louisiana in 1876. He received just 2,346 more votes in the State than were cast for Hayes electors. But Hayes was counted in, and Packard was counted out. Packard and his friends claimed that if Hayes had carried the State, *a fortiori* Packard would impeach the validity of Hayes's title.

No man can deny this logic or refute it. It required under the circumstances an amount of cheek rarely met with even in the broad domain of brazen effrontery to play the *role* which Mr. Hayes found himself under the necessity of assuming. He soon proved to those who thought him incapable of playing the part that they did not know him. He had seen how the new order instituted by Grant had worked, and he resolved to try some visiting statesmen on Packard. The aptness with which he caught and appropriated this Grant idea does great credit to his shrewdness. Hayes knew that Packard had not been elected governor as well as he knew he had himself failed to carry the State. Grant, just before the sun of his administration went down, (let us hope never to rise again,) had said that public opinion would not longer tolerate the proping of carpet-bag government by United States bayonets; and before his term expired he issued an order for the removal of the troops from Louisiana. By their own rottenness such governments had decayed and fallen in all the Southern States except Louisiana and South Carolina. Hayes was too well aware of the defect of his title and of the temper of the American people at that time to attempt to force Packard upon Louisiana as the governor of State. He organized a returning board on Packard and counted him out. But this count was an honest one, and the gentlemen engaged in it arrived at the truth. Packard was of course indignant, but was powerless. He had to submit. His lacerated feelings found a balm in fat office which Hayes held out to him and which he took. He was appointed consul to Liverpool on a salary of $6,000 per annum. Oh, civil-service reform, thy ways are mysterious and past finding out!

But this is perhaps the true solution of Mr. Haye's extraordinary crookedness on the subject of civil-service reform. He knew that he was inaugurated amid the smothered indignation and execrations of a wronged people, although for the sake of peace they stood by with uplifted hands and beheld the unspeakable outrage upon their rights perpetrated. Like all guilty men, he felt nervous and timorous. He knew that his title to the Presidency was immersed in fraud, and he feared that a full exposure of the crimes by which he had been seated might lead to the discovery of some methods by which the disgraceful decision under which he claimed would be reversed. There is no doubt that he felt great anxiety upon this subject. The perplexities of the situation suggested two things: First, to propitiate the people who had been robbed; or, failing in that, to make such terms with the robbers as to disincline them to disclose the means by which the great felony was committed. Hence with one hand he scattered promises of reform broadcast over the country and with the other distributed offices among the rascals that had committed the crime. Therefore, when this House ordered an investigation into the means by which the great fraud was consummated, the committee charged with that duty found the witnesses most conversant with the facts snugly ensconced in lucrative Government positions. They had been artfully bribed by a judicious distribution of executive patronage before they were called to testify. The difficulties that surrounded the investigation are thus tersely and truthfully stated by the majority of the committee in their report:

POWER OF PATRONAGE TO CONCEAL WRONG.

On the other hand, the power of an administration with the absolute disposal of one hundred and ten thousand offices, some of whose members are most interested in disposing of them so as to sustain themselves and their action, is enormous, as has been felt at every step of the investigation.

There is no form of continuing influence equal for convenience and control to that of an office. If a man be bribed by a sum down he may lose it or waste it, and then the control it gave over him will be gone. But an office which he holds at the pleasure of the person who appointed him he is under continuing control. While he is compliant and serviceable he receives a support; but when he falls in either regard, or confesses where he might have kept silent, his supplies are cut off and he is thrown out on the world without means and without character, ruined by his confession of the truth.

Patronage has, besides this, the further advantage that it affords the possibility of ascribing its bestowment to the just cause, so that while being used for the most reprehensible purposes, the motives of its use may be concealed.

It is the history of all State conspiracies that if the conspirators succeed the means by which they do so are rarely disclosed or published while the party remains in power.

How fully the Administration has profited by these examples, and how desperately used the Federal patronage, alike to reward and keep under control those who participated in the frauds of 1876, and to retain witnesses in its interest, will appear.

But not alone to Louisiana and Florida, whose electoral votes gave the Presidency to Mr. Hayes, has he confined his exploits in reforming the civil-service. Among the many imposing monuments that rise under his busy hand to perpetuate his extraordinary devotion to civil-service reform, not the least conspicuous is the one he has recently erected in the State of New York. The President and his Secretary of the Treasury announced to Congress and the country that the good of the public service required the removal from office of C. A. Arthur, collector, and A. B. Cornell, naval officer, at the port of Gew York. They set about to procure the removal of these officers, who although they had in some way incurred the displeasure of the President and Secretary of the Treasury, had a firm friend in the distinguised republican Senator from New York, [Mr. Conkling.] The war between the Administration and the lordly Senator became very warm. The Senator, it is said, took no pains to conceal his contempt of Mr. Hayes, and did not mince his words in his denunciation of that mischievous and meddlesome functionary who dared to interfere with his affairs in the State of New York. Secretary Sherman, in two lengthy communications, the one addressed to the President of the Senate and the other to the President of the United States, dated respectively, January 14 and January 31, 1879, had shown that the honest and efficient administration of affairs in the New York custom-house demanded that Arthur and Cornell should be removed and others appointed in their stead. In a message to the Senate of the United States, of the date of Jan. 31, 1879, Mr. Hayes uses this language in reference to the removal of Arthur and Cornell and the confirmation of the nominations he had made to succeed them:

The officers suspended by me are and for several years have been engaged in the active personal management of the party politics of the city and State of New York. The duties of the offices held by them have been regarded as of subordinate importance to their partisan work. Their offices have been conducted as part of the political machinery under their control. They have made the custom-house a center of partisan political management.

The custom-house should be a business office. It should be conducted on business principles. Gen. James, the postmaster of New York city, writing on this subject, says: "The postoffice is a business institution and should be run as such. It is my deliberate judgment that I and my subordinates can do more for the party of our choice by giving the people of this city a good and efficient postal service, than by controlling primaries or dictating nominations."

The New York custom-house should be placed on the same footing with the New York postoffice. But under the suspended officers the custom-house would be one of the principal political agencies in the State of New York. To change this, they profess to believe, would be, in the language of Mr. Cornell in his response, "to surrender their personal and political rights."

Convinced that the people of New York and of the country generally wish the New York custom-house to be administered solely with a view to the public interest, it is my purpose to do all in my power to introduce into this great office the reforms which the country desires.

With my information of the facts in the case and with a deep sense of the responsible obligation imposed upon me by the Constitution to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed," I regard it as my plain duty to suspend the officers in question and to make the nominations now before the Senate in order that this important office may be honestly and efficiently administered. R. B. HAYES.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, Jan. 31, 1879.

The President tells the Senate that, with a deep sense of the obligation imposed on him by the Constitution to see the laws faithfully executed, he regarded it as his plain duty to suspend Arthur and Cornell and to make the nominations then pending before the Senate for confirmation; and why? In his own language, "In order that this important office may be *honestly* and efficiently administered." According to this Arthur and Cornell had not administered their offices honestly, and the President wished men to take their places who would so administer them. Of course a democratic Senate could not take the responsibility of retaining in office men upon whom a republican President had put the brand of dishonesty, and Mr. Hayes' nominations were confirmed and Arthur and Cornell were compelled to retire. The administration scored a victory in the long and bitter war between it and the Senator from New York. The White House was wreathed in smiles. An extra quantity of lemonade was ordered and the Cabinet drank the health of their victorious chief, who with the scalp of Conkling, as he supposed, dangling from his wampum belt, strutted around the council board, cutting fantastic tricks before high heaven, as he is in the habit of doing. He felt that civil-service reform had triumphed, and he was happy. But his exultation was of brief duration. Conkling's picket-line was driven in, but he had only fallen back upon his reserves. Returning to New York, he summoned his clans. Cornell, whom Hayes and Sherman had turned out of office on the alledged ground that it was not honestly administered, was taken up by the republican party of New York and nominated for governor. Thus did New York's unconquered Senator fling defiance and contempt into the very face of the administration. How was the insulting challenge received? There was then witnessed a scene of abject humiliation and self-abasement on the part of the administration destined to stand, it is fondly hoped and believed, without a parallel in our history. William M. Evarts, Mr. Hayes's Secretary of State, and who is supposed to have great influence with the more respectable element of the republican party in New York, went to that State to persuade the people that the man Hayes had turned out of office for a dishonest administration of it ought to be supported for governor by the honest men of the State.

John Sherman, the Secretary of the Treasury, also went to New York to make speeches for Cornell and to give him a good character. When asked by a voter in his audience how he could advise honest men to support a man for governor of a great State whom he had caused to be removed for official misconduct, he had the audacity to state, in the face of his own letters and the message of the President, that Cornell was not removed on account of anything affecting his official integrity. Mr. Hayes stated in such a manner as to get it in the newspapers that if he were in New York he would support Cornell for governor.

The triuph of Conkling left nothing to be desired, even by that haughty and imperious despiser of Hayes. Achilles, with the dead body of Hector lashed to his victorious chariot, would fitly represent the scene, but for the inability of the Administration to sustain the character of Hector. Cornell himself must have felt a touch of pity and forgiveness when he beheld the debasement and abject humiliation of the Administration.

Not only has Mr. Hayes ignored, disregarded, and unblushingly violated all his promises made before and since his inauguration relative to the character of men to be appointed to office and the rules by which he would be governed in making the same, but he has surrendered every civil-service reform principle announced by him when the success of his party and the requirements of its stalwart leaders demanded it to be done. His celebrated civil-service order was an infant of feeble promise at its birth. It struggled only for a moment in the arms of its fond father and was then laid away in its little grave to rest. The order expressly forbade any officer of the Government to take part in the management of any caucuses, conventions, or election campaigns, and it was expressly stated that the order applied to every department of the service—no exceptions—every officer, high and low, was prohibited from engaging in such work. Yet in every political campaign since that order was issued members of the Cabinet have openly and notoriously engaged in election campaigns. In his last annual message Mr. Hayes undertakes to justify the action of himself and members of his Cabinet in traveling over the country to deliver partisan harangues in utter contempt and oblivion of his civil-service order. If the following awkward and not very perspicuous extract from his message is not intended as an apology for their conduct I am at a loss to understand its meaning:

When the people have approved a policy at a national election, confidence on the part of the officers they have selected, and of the advisers who, in accordance with our political institutions, should be consulted in the policy which it is their duty to carry into effect, is indispensable. It is eminently proper that they should explain it before the people, as well as illustrate its spirit in the performance of their official duties.

Now, it is a notorious fact that members of Mr. Hayes's cabinet and Mr. Hayes himself during the last election in Ohio went to that State and made political speeches in order that the influence of their might be thrown in aid of Foster's election and in securing the State to the Republican party. These campaign speeches are called explaining the policy of the administration to the people, in order that they may have confidence in those they have selected to carry that policy out. This, Mr. Hayes says, is eminently proper. Why a heated political campaign is chosen as the time and occasion for explaining this policy to the people and invoking their confidence does not appear very clear to any one, except, perhaps, to Mr. Hayes himself. I would suggest to him that if he and his cabinet wish to make public speeches in order to explain their policy to the people, it would be better not to select the noise and confusion of a fierce party conflict in the midst of which to make their explanations. When a close and doubtful contest is raging between their party and their antagonists, the President and his cabinet, in going to a State where such contest is raging to make their speeches, might be suspected more of a desire to help their party than to explain their policy to the people. They cannot obtain the confidence of the people under false pretenses. But there is one portion of this civil service order that promised to be very troublesome to the Republican party, if it meant what it said and its author had any intention of carrying it out,—and that is the portion which forbids assessments being made for political purposes on officers and employes of the Government. It is a notorious fact that the Republican party for years have derived a large portion of their campaign funds by levying a tax on the poor and defenseless clerks and employes in the Departments and elsewhere. To stop the supplies from this source was a very embarrassing impediment to their successful manipulation of elections. They therefore determined to flank this part of the civil-service order and find their way to the Departments and to the salaries of Government employes. The process was a very simple one. They merely resolved to call the process of collecting the money "voluntary contributions," instead of "assessments." They prepared a circular to this effect, and lest some poor clerk might seize upon that portion of the civil-service order as a shield to protect himself against their exactions, they conceived the idea of getting the President's consent to what they wished to do. The following is the circular that was issued:

HDQRS. Republican Cong'l Committee, 1878
1319 F. Street, Northwest,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1879.

SIR: This committee, charged with laboring for the success of the Republican cause in the coming campaign in the election of members of Congress, call with confidence upon you, as a Republican, for such a contribution in money as you may feel willing to make, hoping that it may not be less than $50.

The committee deem it proper, in thus appealing to Republicans generally, to inform those who happen to be in Federal employ that there will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution.

The importance of the pending struggle cannot easily be exaggerated. That the Senate is to be Democratic after the 4th of March, 1879, is very nearly a certainty. In view of this, the election of a Democratic House of Representatives would precipitate upon the country dangerous agitations which would inevitably add to present distresses. Foremost among their schemes the opposition already announce their intention to attempt the revolutionary expulsion of the President from his office.

If by the presentation of three candidates for the Presidency in 1880, the people should fail to chose, the House must elect, each State delegation casting one vote.

From what is now known, and with the growing dissensions in the camp of the enemy, the committee have good reason to enter upon their work with courage.

Please make prompt and favorable response to this letter, addressed to Gen. A. H. Jones, National Bank, Washington D. C." By order of the committee.

GEO. C. GORHAM, Sec'y.

This circular is artfully drawn. Its authors knew that Hayes was nervous and demoralized on the subject of title. He dreamed of democratic conspiracies to expel him from a place to which he knew he had no right. The investigation ordered by the House of Representatives, and the appointment of the Potter committee to inquire into frauds by which the people's choice was set aside and a man not elected was installed in the office of President, threw the occupant of the White House into a panic. The circular brought the attention of Mr. Hayes to this subject in the following words: "Foremost among their schemes the opposition already announce their intention to attempt the revolutionary expulsion of the President from his office." In the presence of such an alarming movement Mr. Hayes was prepared to adopt any method calculated to defeat it. He willingly yielded to the demand of his partisan committee, and gave them free access to the employes of the department to raise money with which to elect a republican majority to the House of Representatives, and thus put it out of his power if Congress to molest him in his seat. Hence, there appeared in the circular an announcement to the effect that no clerk or employe need have any fear in contributing money to the success of the republican party. "There will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution." These words were inserted in the circular by the hand of Rutherford B. Hayes, the author of the civil-service order! It seems that such can be the fact—not strange either, when considered in connection with his orther performances in the line of civil-service reform and the pressure under which he acted. That I may do him no injustice, I will quote from the testimony of George C. Gorham, secretary of the committee, taken before a select committee of the Senate:

By Mr. MCDONALD:

Q. What sources outside of the committee were consulted in regard to the first circular and its tone in reference to the request for contributions?

A. We were very desirous of consulting the proprieties of the matter, to not call on the appointees of the President for contributions in any manner that would be distasteful to him—

Q. What authorities outside were consulted?

A. I was making that statement; and therefore one member of the committee was selected to present this to the appointing power, and I presume he acted upon knowledge, and he made a slight modification of the language which referred to the matter.

Q. Then this circular, as published, was presented to the President?

A. I do not think the whole of it was. I think this portion of it was; of course, I do not know the fact, but I believe it to have been submitted by one member of the committee to the President. "The committee deem it proper, in thus appealing to Republicans generally, to inform those who happen to be in Federal employ that there will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution. This was the part submitted. In the original it was written to the effect that "voluntary contributions would be approved by the executive department," and that was modified and a written memorandum returned by the member of the committee who made the inquiry, and these were the words that were submitted: "That there will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution." These words I understood to have been approved by the President.

Q. Was not the entire circular, as it is there, with the modification you have suggested, presented at the same time?

A. I do not believe it was. I may be incorrect in my recollection, but as it was in manuscript and I did not want to stop to copy the whole, I think I copied that paragraph alone, as I did not want the circular to be issued in a form that would meet the disapproval of the President in this respect, and that that was the part submitted. My impression is that the residue of it was not.

Q. That the rest of the circular was not submitted?

A. I think not, but I am not certain.

Q. Was it submitted to any of the heads of departments?

A. Oh, no. I do not think anybody had any hand in it at all outside of our committee, except in that one particular as to how the executive branch of the Government would view this soliciting of contributions.

Q. How the phrase should be put in reference to the executive mind?

A. Yes, sir; what assurance we could give a man that he would not be turned out of office if he contributed to the success of the Republican party. We wanted some assurance of that sort, and we wanted to put it in language that would not be distasteful to the Executive, and therefore the matter was referred to one of the committee, who brought this report: that this language would not be indecorous or distasteful.

Gorham first wrote it, "voluntary contributions would be approved by the executive department." This was putting it rather strongly and pointedly to the author of the civil-service order, and so Mr. Hayes seems to have thought, and therefore he concluded to couch his emasculation and virtual abrogation of his civil-service order in the language: "There will be no objection in any official quarter to such voluntary contribution." If he meant to do the fair thing by the poor employes of the Government, why did he not also add: "Nor will there be any objection in any official quarter to a refusal to make such contributions?" He knew when he thus, with his own hand, nullified his own order, that he thereby turned loose upon the departments and the employes of the Government a set of political constables who would fleece them of their earnings. He knew when he said that he and those under him had no objection to such contributions, it would be construed as equivalent to saying they would like to see the contributions made. He knew that a partisan committee asked him to do this with a view to raising a campaign fund in aid of the Republican party. He knew in thus rescinding his order against assessments for political purposes, he was tearing down the only defense that the hard-worked employes had against the political vultures that hovered over their salaries: "Such contributions in money as you may feel willing to give, *hoping that it may not be less than $16.*" No "assessment" about this! O, no! All "voluntary." It would seem to anyone not a member of a Republican campaign committee that if the contribution was to be purely voluntary, the *amount* to be given ought also to be left to the discretion of the donor. But the amount that each employe was to give was, doubtless, inserted in the circular, through fear that the poor clerks, in their readiness to give to the Republican party a portion of their small salaries, might overstep the bounds of prudence and distress themselves by an excessive and lavish subscription. This tender concern of the committee to guard these employes against the consequences of their own rashness and zeal is one of the most touching and beautiful manifestations of disinterested benevolence to be found in all the history of party struggles. Under this process they collected from the employes of the Government, according to Secretary Gorham, nearly $100,000! To what plethoric dimensions that campaign fund would have swelled if the paternal forethought of the committee had not saved the department clerks and postmasters of the country from a reckless waste of their money by suggesting to them a reasonable amount, must be left to the imagination.

Into some of the Departments—notably into the Treasury Department—they sent a collecting-officer, armed with a subscription-book. Mr. H. M. Baker was the man sent into the Treasury Department. He gives the following account of the manner in which he proceeded:

Q. Did or did not the chiefs of divisions in the Secretary's office and the heads of bureaus assist you in obtaining these moneys?

A. I do not think they did anything that could be called assistance. I generally went to the chief of the division first, and he did as he pleased about subscribing, and then I said I wished to pass along to the other clerks, and he said very well, or something of that sort. That was the extent of it.

Q. Had you subscription-books?

A. I had one subscription-book.

Q. By whom was it headed?

A. It was headed by John Sherman, Secretary of the Treasury.

The plan of these collectors was to go first to the head of the Department, who of course subscribed, and then the subordinates were afforded an opportunity to "voluntarily" follow the example of their chief. They seem, with singular unanimity, to have reposed confidence in his judgment as to what would be a profitable investment.

Mr. Gorham gives the following account of the amount collected under this beautiful civil-service-reform proceeding, projected by him and his committee, with the finishing touch given to it by the President himself:

By Mr. BAILEY:

Q. I understand that altogether the subscriptions to your fund amounted to about $106,000?

A. Yes, sir; as near as I can get it.

Q. Of which $60,000 came from the officers?

A. From Senators, Representatives, and others.

Q. How much of that came from Senators and Representatives?

A. I cannot state now. I think that their subscription was pretty general. There were, as we know, thirty-nine Republican Senators, and they gave, as a general rule, $100 apiece. There may have been some exceptions; I do not remember. The Republican members of the House gave us $50 apiece.

Q. All of them, or only a portion?

A. The great body of them. The intention of all was to do it. There could have been a case here and there where it was not convenient.

Q. All the remainder of the $93,000 came from those in the civil-service of the Government?

A. Yes; I think so.

Q. And from all the Republican party outside of those who were employed you received but $13,000?

A. That is all. I am sorry to say that is all we got from them.

Q. Then your treasury—I mean the treasury of the committee—was recruited chiefly from the employes of the Government?

A. It would appear so from my last answer.

Q. And they bore the expenses of the Republican campaign chiefly, with the exception you have named?

A. That would be the inference from the last question and answer.

Q. Were these circulars addressed alike to Democrats and Republicans who were in the service of the Government?

A. We made no distinction.

The money thus wrung from the employes of the Government was sent to doubtful Congressional districts to influence the elections and obtain, if possible, a Republican majority in the House of Representatives. The salaries of these officers are paid by taxes collected from the entire people, Democrats as well as Republicans. Yet, under the transparent guise of voluntary contributions, these salaries are drawn on by the Republican party at each election to keep themselves in power. These men in subordinate positions know that the retention of their places may depend upon their honoring the drafts made upon them; they dare not refuse. The bread which feeds their wives and little ones depends upon their keeping their place—that lost, the wolf is at the door. Could there be a more degrading slavery than this; a greater scandal to the public service or more disgraceful to a republican Government? A man thus situated pays over the amount demanded of him with about as much volition in the premises as the highway traveler on the highway surrenders his purse to the masked robber under the cold and deadly eye of a revolver.

The bill now pending before the House, or rather the substitute reported from the Committee on Civil Service Reform, is intended to remedy this growing evil and to eradicate this shameful abuse, and to relieve the poor employes of the Government, who are unable to protect themselves, from the extortions of political malagers. It positively prohibits them from making contributions for any political purpose or to any political party under the penalty of being discharged from office; and each head of department is required to post in conspicuous places in his department a printed prohibition. Armed with this law, the employe can point to the printed rule in his department and defy all the collecting agents that may be sent to rob him of a portion of his salary. But it is said that this is depriving the freeman of his liberty. Not so, Mr. Speaker. It is striking the chains from the limbs of men whose circumstances place them in the power of a party and enabling them to give to their families the full benefits of their hard-earned salaries. Does any man with sense enough to put two ideas together believe that the $100,000 which Gorham and his confederates collected in 1878 from employes of the Government were the free-will offerings of those hard-worked men, many of whom are barely able to support themselves and families on the compensation they receive? I do not expect the Republicans to support this bill. It would, perhaps, be making too large a draft on their patriotism to require them to support a measure which deprives their party of the money with which they control elections. Their anxiety lest it would pass during the extra session was but poorly concealed. Elections were coming off in Ohio, New York, and Maine, and if the source from which they derived their campaign money should be cut off, they feared the fate that awaited their party in those States with unbought ballots to control the result. Hence, day after day, they made dilatory motions to prevent a vote on the bill. It was pending in the morning hour; and, as is well known, two dilatory motions with a yea-and-nay vote will consume the hour. They at first pretended that they objected to its being considered in the morning hour, and wished ample time to debate it in Committee of the Whole. The gentleman who had charge of the bill proposed to let it be considered in Committee of the Whole, with the amplest opportunity for debate, if the Republicans would pledge themselves not to resort to dilatory motions to prevent its coming to a vote. This they refused to do. They wanted the money from the employes of the Government to run their campaigns in Ohio and Maine and New York. I think they feared if the bill passed Congress they might fail to coerce the President to veto it as they did in reference to the appropriation bills. But their fears were groundless. I think he would have vetoed the Ten Commandments without the least hesitation if the stalwart leaders of his party had ordered him to do it. But so it was. They defeated the consideration of the bill by what is familiarly known here as filibustering. The elections came off in Ohio, Maine and New York; and, if current reports are to be credited, the employes in the departments were called on more than once during those hotly contested campaigns for money to aid the imperiled fortunes of the party.

Mr. Hayes in his last message has laid the groundwork for vetoing this bill, and they now feel easy about it. He says:

Reasons of justice and public policy, quite analogous to those which forbid the use of official power for the oppression of the private citizen, impose upon the Government the duty of protecting its officers and agents from arbitrary exactions. In whatever aspect considered, the practice of making levies for party purposes, upon the salaries of officers, is highly demoralizing to the public service and discreditable to the country. Though an officer should be as free as any other citizen to give his own money in aid of his opinions or his party, he should also be as free as any other citizen to refuse to make such gifts. If salaries are but a fair compensation for the time and labor of the officer, it is gross injustice to levy a tax upon them. If they are made excessive in order that they may bear the tax, the excess is an indirect robbery of the public funds.

This part of the message was intended both as an apology for the part he took in the Gorham circular and as a groundwork for vetoing this bill. "An officer should be as free as any other citizen to give his own money in aid of his opinions or his party." He comes forward as the champion of the liberty of the citizen, and yet he issued