out the country if that [illegible] so of salary passed. I believed it would result in greater evils if the whole failed, and an extra session came on. For a little while I was tempted to do what would rather be pleasing than what would be best in the long run. I believe it required more courage to vote as voted, than it would to have voted the other way, but I resolved to do what seemed to me right in the case, let the consequences be what they would. [Applause.] I may have made a mistake in judgment; I blame no one for thinking so, but I did what I thought was the least bad of two courses. My subsequent conduct was consistent with my action on the bill.

I did not myself parade the fact, but more than a year ago the *New York World* published a list, stating in chronological order, the Senators and Representatives who covered their back pay into the Treasury. My name was first on the list. [Applause.]

I appeal to the sense of justice of this people whether they will tolerate this sort of political warfare. It has been proved again and again that I never drew the back pay, never saw a dollar of it and took no action in reference to it except to sign an order on the Sergeant-at-Arms to covert into the general treasury, and this was done before the convention at Warren. I say more. Some of these men who have been so long pursuing me have known these facts for many months. During the stormy times of the salary excitement a citizen of this country wrote a letter to a prominent official in the Treasury of the United States wanting to know whether Mr Garfield drew his pay or not, and received a very full and circumstantial reply stating the facts. That letter is in this town I suppose, to-day, but those who have had possession of it have been careful never to show it. I have a copy of it here and if these men continue lying about it I will print it one of these days. [Sensation and great applause. Cries of "Let us have that letter read now, General Garfield."] I will not give the name of the party. The name I have not to whom it is addressed.

[The audience here absolutely insisted on having the letter read, some demanding the name and all positively refusing to allow the speaker to proceed without reading the letter in justice to himself and for the information of the audience.]

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
"WASHINGTON, June 9, 1873."

"DEAR SIR:—Your letter written early in May was forwarded to me at Youngstown, where it could not be answered for want of accurate data. When about to return to Washington I searched for that letter but could not find it. My recollection of its contents is that you inquired as to the repayment into the Treasury by General Garfield of the additional compensation due him as a member of the Forty-second Congress, under the provisions of the general appropriation act of March 3, 1873.

"The additional compensation due General Garfield was drawn by Mr. Ordway, Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives and by him paid into the Treasury as a miscellaneous revenue receipt. The money was drawn by Mr. Ordway on the order of General Garfield. The practice of the Sergeant-at-Arms is to take receipts from members in blank in anticipation of the sales at which they are to become due, and to pay their check on him by drawing the money from the Treasury on those receipts. In this way he is in a measure the banker of the members. General Garfield had given such receipts month after month at the beginning of the month, one of which was filled up by Mr. Ordway and presented to the Treasury. At that time I believe General Garfield was out of the city, but I happened to know that as soon as the 22d day of March this written order was delivered to Mr. Ordway if he had not drawn any money from the Treasury on his account to close the account without drawing it, and if he had drawn it to return it. Mr. Ordway then informed him that it was necessary for him to sign a special order on the Treasurer if he wished it drawn out and covered in, otherwise Mr. Gafield could draw it any time within two years; whereupon Mr. Garfield drew an order for $4,548, payable to the order of Mr. Ordway, to be by him covered into the Treasury. This was presented to the Treasurer and the money turned over from the appropriation account to the general account, so that no portion of it ever left the Treasury at all. It was simply a transfer from the appropriation account to the general funds of the Treasury.

Very respectfully,
ROBERT W. TAYLOR.

[Applause.]

Question.—What was the date of the adjournment of Congress?

General Garfield—Congress adjourned on the 3d of March.

Question—What was the date of your letter?

General Garfield—The 22d day of March was the date of my letter.

A voice—Give us some of the DeGollyer matter

General Garfield—We will take each particular thing at the proper time and place. A note is handed me which I will speak of in this connection. It is that "during the debate Mr Garfield answered a question of Mr. Hibbard of New Hampshire, who said, how about this plunder? How much plunder will it take out of the Treasury? And that Mr. Garfield's answer seemed to imply that he did not regard it as plunder. I believe there has as much been said on that particular reply of mine in connection with this salary business as anything else that has been said. Now I have already answered that in the general remarks I have made this evening, namely, when a Democrat from New Hampshire rose in his place and put a question to me enquiring how much money it would take out of the Treasury if this salary act passed and put it in the form of saying how much "plunder" it would take, I did not at first notice he used the word "plunder," and I answered it would take a million and a half dollars out of the treasury. Then Mr. Dawes rose and said, "Did my friend from Ohio notice the word 'plunder? Does he acknowledge this to be plunder?'" I then said, "No, I don't acknowledge that this is plunder. If any gentleman thinks that he is taking more than is justly due him in his conscience, let him call it plunder if he pleases."

Now an attempt has been made to make it appear that Mr. Garfield approved the salary act because he answered this man that he didn't regard it as robbery. I answer now, I do not regard it robbery and never have.

Now, one word more before I leave this question. I am glad the American people rose up in indignation against that salary increase There were some unkind and unjust things said by the people in their uprising, but they rose against it and rebuked it with a power and might that has been of very great service to the country during the last winter. It could not have been repealed but for the rebuke of the people, and I could not have led as I did lead in more than $20,000,000 reduction of public expenses, if I had not felt behind me the weight and help and reinforcement of the indignation of the people in regard to that salary increase. I say it was an indecent thing to do, to increase the salary thus, and it was a great conservative thing for the people to do to demand its repeal; and it was repealed. But let us, in discussing it, deal with the subject according to the truth. I now pause to inquire if any gentleman in the audience has any questions to ask touching this salary, or anything concerning it? If they have, I shall be very glad to hear it. [The speaker here paused, but, no questions being asked, he proceeded as follows:] If not, I pass to the subject my friend over yonder has seemed to be so anxious I should get to before I finish the last; and here I approach a question that in one sense is not a question at all, and in another sense it may be. I understand that several persons in the district are saying that Mr. Garfield has taken a fee for a so-called law opinion, but which, in fact, was something which he ought not to have done—which was in reality a kind of fee for his official influence as a member of the Committee on Appropriations; or to speak more plainly, that I accepted pay for a service as a kind of bribe, and that, too, in

THE SO-CALLED DE GOLLYER PAVEMENT

Now, I have tried to state that in the broadest way, with the broadest point forward. I ask the attention of this audience for a few moments to the testimony. In the first place, I want the audience to understand that the city of Washington is governed, and has always been governed so far as its own improvements are concerned, by its own laws and its own people, just as much as Warren has been governed by its own corporate laws and authority. I remember perfectly well what has been paraded in the papers so much of late that Congress has full power to legislate over the District of Columbia Well, Congress has full jurisdiction over the ten miles square of what is now called the District of Columbia, and Congress could, I suppose, make all the police regulations for the city of Washington; but Congress always allowed the city of Washington to have their city council, or a legislature, until the present time. We have abolished it, because we had a cumbrous machine. In the year 1871 a law was passed by Congress creating the board of public works appointing a governor, and creating a legislature for the District of Columbia. That act stated what the board of public works could do and what the other branches of the District government could do; and among other things, it empowered the Legislature to levy taxes to make improvements on the streets. The Legislature met the Board of Public Works, laid upon them an elaborate plan for improving the streets of Washington, a plan amounting to six million dollars in the first place, and the Legislature adopted the plan and provided that one third of the entire cost of carrying out that plan should be by assessing the front foot on the property holders, and the other two-thirds should be paid by money to be borrowed by the city government; in other words, by the issuing of their bonds. The city government of Washington borrowed money and raised by special taxation enough to carry on a vast system of improvement. When they got ready to execute their plan one of the questions that came before them was, what kind of pavement shall we put in, and in what way shall we go about the business of letting our paving contracts? In order to settle that question they went to all the principal cities and found out all the methods pursued by them and finally appointed from leading officers of the army—General Humphreys, Chief Engineer; General Meigs, Quartermaster General; the Surgeon General and General Babcock of the Engineer Corps; and those few men sat as an advisory board, having no power but merely to advise. They took up all kinds of pavement ever made, specimens were sent in, they looked over the whole, and as a result recommended this: "We recommend you instead of letting this work to be done by the lowest bidder, with all the scheming 'straw bids' that may come in, to fix a tariff of prices you will pay for different kinds of pavement, and we recommend as follows: If you put down concrete pavement you had better say you will pay so much per square yard for putting it down. We have looked the cities all over and find that it is the proper amount to pay; but for stone so much; for gravel so much; for asphaltum so much; and for wood so much." Now that Board of Public Works adopted the plan and that schedule of prices, and having elected if they put those various kinds of pavements down, they would put them down at that rate, they then said to all comers "bring in your various kinds of pavements and show us their merits, and when we have examined them we will act." Then the various paving companies and patentees all over the country who had what they called good pavement, presented themselves; but in almost all cases through their attornies. They sent men there to represent the relative merits of the pavements. A pavement company in Chicago, employed Mr. Parsons of Cleveland, as early as the month of April, 1872, to go before the Board of Public Works and present the merits of their pavements. Mr. Parsons had nothing whatever to do with the question of prices; they had already been settled in advance by the Board. Mr. Parsons was Marshal of the Supreme Court at that time, and was just about running for Congress. He asked the Chief Justice of the United States whether there was any impropriety in his taking that case up and arguing it, merely because he was an appointee and under his direction; and the Chief Justice responded "there was none in the world." He proceeded with the case until the 8th day of June, when for the first time I heard anything about it. This was two days before the adjournment of Congress. On that day Mr. Parsons came to me and said he had an important case; he had worked a good while on it but was called away. He must leave. He did not want to lose his fee in it—was likely to lose it unless the work was completed; He must go at any rate. He asked me if I would argue the case for him; if I would examine into the merits of this pavement and make a statement of it before the Board. I said "I will do it if I, on examination, find the patent is what it purports to be—the best wood pavement patent there is, but I can't do it until after Congress adjourns." Congress adjourned two days later, the papers were sent to me of patents, modeled specimens, and documents showing where pavement had been used were forwarded to me. The investigation of the patents and the chemical analysis representing all the elements of the pavement was a laborious task and I worked at it as faithfully as anything I ever worked at. I did it in open daylight. I have never been able to understand how anybody has seen anything in that in which to base an attack on me. I say I am to-day intellectually incapable of understanding the track of a man's mind who sees in this any ground for attacking me. I made the argument; there were two patents concerned in that pavement itself; there were some forty different wood pavements proposed, and to carefully and analytically examine all the relative merits of those was no small work. Mr. Parsons was to get a fee provided he was successful, and not any if he was not successful, and hence the sum offered was large—a contingent fee, as every lawyer knows.

Now, I understand that it is said by some of these gentlemen that that was in some way or other with the United States Treasury. How? That pavement was was to be paid for by the city of Washington, one-third of it assessed directly on the property holders, and paid just as you pay for a pavement here in Warren, and the rest was to be paid to the city of Washington in money that it borrows, and for which the citizens are ultimately to be taxed to pay. But I was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, you say, and the House of Representatives appropriated money for the District of Columbia. How? Whenever a pavement on any given street is laid in front of the United States Postoffice, or the Patent Office or Treasury, the government of the United States, as a mere matter of decent justice, paid its proper proportion in front of its own buildings as any other property holder would do, and that was all. Whatever was the legitimate, proper share of the United States to pay, it paid. Now does anybody see in what possible way that fact made it in any way improper for me to practice my profession in a location when I was not needed in the public service? But some one says "the pavement was a bad one, it was a swindle." Who told you that? Why, a man that went to Washington to testify, and that had a different pavement of his own; he was glad to say that the De Gollyer pavement was a bad one. Now I want you to understand, fellow citizens, that of the one hundred and fifty-five miles of pavement in the city of Washington, fifty-three miles of it only are wooden pavements, and of the 53 miles of wooden pavement laid in Washington, there were eighty thousand square yards of it only of the De Gollyer pavement There are one million five thousand square yards of wooden pavement laid in Washington, and 80 000 of it only was of this patent. There are 10 or 12 different kinds of wooden pavement in Washington and only one-twelfth of this is of this kind, and the price of this pavement was fixed by a board of engineers before Mr. Parsons or I had a word to say on the subject. I was only just a question which of the two or three or ten pavements will you adopt, and I am here to day to affirm that it is the best wood pavement that was ever laid. Now I do not believe much in wooden pavement as compared with concrete or some other forms of pavements and this board of engineers recommended concrete in preference to wood. But what were the facts? There were thirty-two different streets in Washington along which the people petitioned to have wooden pavement. They preferred wood pavement. It was cheaper than the asphaltum They wanted wood pavement and the American people generally believe in wood pavement; and the question was if these people want the wood pavement and are determined to have it, which pavement shall we give them, the best or not the best?

Now I have before me here, what I had when I made the argument, certificates from Chicago, St. Louis, San Francisco, and all the other cities where the pavement was laid, that it stood better than any wood pavement that had ever been laid, and in the report of this committee of investigation in Washington a letter was received from the Board of Public works of Chicago, dated October 31, 1874, in these words: "Since 1869 there have been laid here in Chicago one hundred and sixty thousand square yards of the De Gollyer pavement and thus far it stands well and is in good condition." There is twice as much of that pavement in Chicago to-day as there is in Washington.

Now I will tell you another fact about it. The testimony before this committee discloses the following: "That in the city of New York they paid $5.50 to $6.00 per square yard. In the city of Brooklyn they pay $5 per square yard, and in the city of Baltimore, for putting down Nicolson pavement (which is not so expensive), they paid $4 per square yard. Now all the De Gollyer pavement put down in Washington was put down at $3.50 per square yard under this tariff of prices fixed by the Board of Public Works upon the recommendation of the Board of Engineers. Well, now, fellow citizens, who has raised this storm of criticism about the De Gollyer pavement? Who? Early last winter several of us came to the conclusion that the Board of Public Works was an expensive machine; that it was costing the city of Washington too much; that it was overloading them with taxes and that we were bound to pay too much money out of the Treasury to keep up our end of the business. But we set on foot an inquiry into the cause of the large expenditure and a committee of investigation was appointed and they have published some 1,000 pages of a report. They have gone over the whole ground of the doings of that Board of Public Works and the city government. And as a result of it we have abolished that form of government and had the President appoint commissioners, and he has appointed Governor Dennison of our State as one of them, to manage the affairs of the District of Columbia until winter. That Committee of investigation went over the whole ground of this business in Washington. It was a committee that had Senator Thurman of this State on it for one; Judge Jewett of Columbus for another man, who is now president of the Erie railroad, both of them Democrats of the strongest stamp. We had on, from the House as chairman of that committee, Judge Willson, of Indiana, one of the strongest and ablest and best of our members; and they went over this ground most thoroughly and severely. Mr. Parsons went before that committee and told them all he knew about this pavement; told them what he knew of its merits, and told them he and I argued that case. It was early in the session when he told them that. Now, what has been said about that in washington? Don't you think some of the one hundred Democrats would have been exceedingly willing to hit me a blow on the head if they had discovered anything in that to find fault with? The committee made its report in full, and not only made no possible reflection on me, but when asked about it said there was nothing whatever in the case that reflected in the slightest degree upon Mr. Garfield.

Now in the midst of this tempest that was raised in the Painesville tea pot a few weeks ago, the Hon. George W. Steele of Painesville, wrote a letter to the Committee who had charge of that investigation, and he wrote back the following letter:

"CONNERSVILLE, INDIANA, Aug. 1, 1874.

"Hon. George W. Steele:

"DEAR SIR—To the request for information as to whether or not the action of General Garfield in connection with the affairs of the District of Columbia, was the subject of condemnation by the committee that recently had those affairs under consideration, *I answer that it was not; nor was there, in my opinion, any evidence that would have warranted any unfavorable criticism upon his conduct.*

"The facts disclosed by the evidence, so far as he is concerned, are briefly these:

"The Board of Public Works was considering the question as to the kind of pavements that should be laid. There was a contest as to the respective merits of various wooden pavements. Mr. Parsons represented, as attorney, the DeGollyer & McClelland patent, and being called away from Washington about the time the hearing was to be had before the Board of Public Works on this subject, procured General Garfield to appear before the Board in his stead and argue the merits of this patent. This he did, and this was the whole of his connection with the matter. It was not a question as to the kind of contract that should be made, but as to whether this particular pavement should be laid. The criticism of the committee was not upon the pavement in favor of which General Garfield argued, but upon the *contract* made with reference to it; and there was no evidence which would warrant the conclusion that he had anything to do with the latter. Very respectfully, etc.,

"JAMES WILSON."

Now, fellow citizens, it is not pleasant for me to be reading things of that sort concerning myself, that the man who had charge of the investigation in the District of Columbia, the man who wrote the report on the part of the House, who was the chairman of the committee, who knows all the facts in regard to it, says there was nothing whatever in the case that in the slightest degree reflected on me. It is left the excessively virtuous Judge of the Probate Court of Painesville, and perhaps the Judge of the Probate Court in Trumbull county, to discover that this "De Gollyer business" was a fearful business on the part of General Garfield. [Tremendous applause.]

If there is any gentleman in this hall who has any question to ask in regard to the De Gollyer pavement business I shall be very glad to hear it.

Question—Was the appropriation for the payments for the pavements made before or after it was accepted by the board?

Gen Garfield—I am very glad to answer that question By the first act of the Legislature of the District of Columbia, no contract was to be made, no work was to be done except upon appropriations already made. Congress had adjourned. The appropriations for the District of Columbia were made before I touched or had anything to do with this matter. It is true that the next year there were appropriations made for the District of Columbia, but the appropriation that Congress made never had anything to say about one pavement or another. Congress knew no more about the De Gollyer pavement or any other pavement than you in Warren did. It simply made the appropriation to pay for paving in front of its own building if it thought proper to do so, and that is all.

Question by Dr. Smith—Why didn't you make Dick (his) up in the Twentieth (his) up there give you $7 500 instead of (his) five thousand?

General Garfield,—I understand Mr. Parsons was retained by these parties in Chicago, and they paid him a retaining fee of $5,000 for his services whether he succeeded or not, and they were to pay him $10,000 as a contingent fee if he succeeded. Mr Parsons had done the bulk of the work. He came to me saying there were $10,000 depending upon his success, of which he would pay half in case I made the argument and was successful. I suppose that is a fair explanation. I understand some gentlemen think that is a large fee: well, it is a large fee, but it was nothing for that. Either all that was done went for nothing, or else it would be more. I don't know that those gentlemen said it was a large fee when Judge Trumbull made an argument in the Supreme Court and received ten thousand dollars out of the United States Treasury for it.

Question—General Garfield, allow me to ask one question. What question of law was submitted to you in that case? Was it a question of law or a question of the difference between the pavements?

General Garfield—There were questions both of law and of merit In the first place there were forty-two different kinds of pavements presented. If the government took one there might be a question of conflicting patents—there might be a patent law-suit growing out of it, and I felt it to be my first duty to inquire whether the two patents that extend into this pavement were valid patents that could properly be sustained. I made that examination as the very first step I took in the case. I understand that the Board of Public Works said that they did not care very much about that, on the ground that they probably would not pay a royalty in any case; but the fact was that the contractor himself—the owner of the patent—regarded it as a valuable franchise, and the validity of the patent was to him the first consideration.

Now, where there are forty patents or nearly that concerned, it is of some importance to know the relative validity of the patents

Question—Would it have made any difference to the tax payers of Washington or to the government treasury, whether Mr. Parsons received five thousand or twenty thousand dollars for his services?

General Garfield—Well, I suppose not. I never saw how it would.

If no further questions are to be asked I will conclude with a few general reflections on the whole subject.

Nothing is more distasteful to me than to speak of my own work—but this discussion has been made necessary by the persistent misrepresentations of those who assail me.

During my long public service the relation between the people of this district and myself has been one of mutual confidence and independence. I have tried to follow my own convictions of duty with little regard to personal consequence, relying upon the intelligence and justice of the people for approval and support. I have sought to promote, not merely local and class interests, but the general good of the whole country, believing that thereby I could honor the position I hold and the District I represent. On the other hand my constituents have given me the great support of their strong and intelligent approval. They have not always approved my judgment, nor the wisdom of my public acts. But they have sustained me because they knew I was earnestly following my convictions of duty, and because they did not want a representative to be the mere echo of the public voice, but an intelligent and independent judge of public questions.

Since my first election, twelve years ago, there have been some citizens who would have preferred some other man as their representative, and at several of the successive nominations that preference has been expressed. I have no right, and have never had the least desire to find fault with this. I have never criticised or blamed any one for opposing my nomination In the criticisms I am about to make I do not refer to these, but to

A SMALL KNOT OF MEN

in Trumbull county, and mainly in this town, who for many years have made their special aim to cripple my influence as a public man and create distrust and opposition in the minds of the people. If their criticisms and assaults had been made in a spirit of fairness and truth I should have no right to complain. But they have repeatedly resorted to personal slander and misrepresentation, and have seized every opportunity to magnify my errors, and to inflame the public mind against me. To them my successes have been a source of regret, and my failures and mistakes a source of pleasure.

Let me illustrate this: When the country was aroused to indignation by the salary increase of March 3, 1873, without waiting to hear a word, without waiting to inquire whether I had or had not drawn the back pay, they took occasion of a slimly attended county convention, in this place, on the 20th of March, 1873, to launch into that convention a resolution which pretended to speak in the name of the Republicans of Trumbull county, and to demand my instant resignation. That convention was not called for any such purpose. The people had conferred upon it no such jurisdiction over the subject. At the last moment and without deliberation, the resolution was hurried through, and then it was a message sent on the wings of the lightning all over the United States that the people of Trumbull county had arisen in their might and stamped the brand of infamy upon their representative The people of this district did and do strongly condemn the increase of salaries, but they did not authorise not consent to the assault made upon me by the framers of that resolution.

The class of assailants to whom I am now referring were unwilling to hear me. Happening to have a majority of the county executive committee that year they refused to announce meetings for me when asked to do so by the Republicans of various townships. This fall I appealed to the Republicans of this district, by offering myself as their candidate for renomination. The canvass was thorough and exhaustive on the part of those who opposed me. In many places they called public meeting and stated to the people their reasons why I should not be nominated. This they had a perfect right to do. I have never complained of it. I find no fault with any citizen for opposing my nomination.

There has never been so full an expression of the people at their primary meetings in this district as at the meetings on the 8th of August. It resulted in an overwhelming expression in my favor—a clear majority in every county. At the nominating convention most of those who had opposed me voted to make the nomination unanimous. But the class of men whose chief political object is to assail me assume a loftier virtue than the majority of the party and continue the warfare. This also they have a right to do. But they are bound by every consideration of honor to exhibit their virtue by adhering to the truth, and by giving it a hearing. This they refuse to do. The Republican county committee of this county again refuse to hear me. They were appointed for the purpose of carrying on the political campaign, and three, or two at least, of that committee refuse to grant the request of the townships that I should address them this fall.

Mr. Hoyt here arose and said: "I am one of that committee and I never was asked the question whether you should be invited to speak here, General Garfield. I do not say you have. I say two of the committee refused to make the invitation. That was my statement."

"I had you in mind, Mr. Hoyt, as the third."

T. J. McLain, Jr.—Allow me to ask whether the gentleman who has just had the floor (Mr. Hoyt) was not present at the meeting, and whether that did not seem to be his position, and as he he does not wish to be misrepresented, would it not be a good time now for him to say whether he does or does not desire Mr. Garfield to speak in this town?

Mr. Hoyt:—I said I was not asked by anybody on the question and I will be excused now.

General Garfield—Now I want to say in regard to that matter that I do not believe that the people of Warren have decided to strike before they hear, or that they will strike without hearing. I believe that even of the Democrats of Trumbull county; they strike me once in a while in their resolutions, but they are willing to hear me. These men have a perfect right to scratch my name from the ticket and vote for whom they please. But they have no right to claim that they speak and act for the Republicans of Trumbull county. They have a perfect right to bolt, and nominate a candidate of their own—but after the action of the District on the 8th and 13th of August—they have no right to assume that they represent the Republicans of any one of the five counties of this District.

THE BOLT.

Nine days ago sixteen men met here to induce the Democrats to take up some of their number as a candidate for Congress. The Democracy refused their offer, and the sixteen men proceeded to make a nomination. I do not understand that they were delegates from any community. They represented themselves. At least one fourth of them were men who have not recently voted the republican ticket

But they sent 2,000 words over the wires to New York, Chicago and Cincinnati, announcing to the country that there was a great uprising of the republicans in all the five counties of the district to repudiate Mr. Garfield. And this statement goes forth from men who speak in the name of superior honesty!

It is another of the many attempts they have made to injure me in the good opinion of the American people, to cripple my influence as a public man. I do not at all deny the right of these men who call themselves the "anti-Garfield committee," in Warren, to vote against me, and to call themselves by whatever name they choose; but I do deny their right to do these things as representatives of the Republican party. Let me further illustrate this pretense of superior virtue. I understand that Probate Judge Tuttle, of Painesville, came here a few nights ago, and in a public speech in this Court House assailed me on various points in my public life, especially in reference to the De Goiyer pavement. This he had a right to do. But I am told he made no allusion to the existence of the Wilson letter, which was published in Painesville early in August, and which completely exploded most of his criticisms on that subject. Does such conduct entitle him to be heard for his superior virtue and honesty? Has he not borne false witness against his neighbor by suppressing the truth?

Again, your Judge of Probate has a perfect right to join in a bolting movement, and to preside over a bolters' meeting. But by what title and superior virtue, whether public or private, does he assume to judge me as against the judgment of the people of this district. [Laughter.]

Judge Yeomans—I never have assumed to be your judge, General Garfield, or to have any other right than any citizen. Every citizen has a right to be your judge when you come before them asking for position.

General Garfield—Certainly.

Judge Yeomans—I have the same right, and no more.

General Garfield—I concede the right of every citizen to judge of the merits and official conduct of his representative. But I deny that those members of the Republican party who, while holding positions of trust by the suffrages of that party, join a hostile organization, have still the right to speak in the name of the Republican party in their assault upon its candidate.

In conclusion, I appeal from these men to the best men in the district—to men who are every way as worthy and every way as capable as they are to judge my conduct—nor do I hesitate to refer all inquiries to those noble men with whom I have acted during my public life. They have worked with me as representatives during all these years and know the character and quality of my work. I have sought to make myself worthy of an honorable place among them and have not sought in vain. They have placed me in many positions of large trust and responsibility; and in the present Congress I again hold the chairmanship of the committee of the second if not the first importance in the House of Representatives. I fearlessly appeal to the honorable members of the present Congress and of all the Congresses in which I have served, to say if my conduct has not been high and worthy—the very reverse of what those home enemies represent it to be. [Applause.] All this time it has been a source of great strength and confidence to know that here in this district there has been a strong, manly, intelligent constituency willing to hold up my hands and enable me more effectually to serve the country, and honor them by that service. While this has been true, a bitter few have long been doing all in their power to depreciate my work and weaken my support.

Mr. Wilkins—You are rising too fast. They are afraid of being eclipsed.

General Garfield—In all this I have relied upon the good sense and justice of the people to understand both my motives and the motives and efforts of my enemies. On some questions of public policy there have been differences between some of my constituents and myself; for instance, on the currency question. I have followed what seemed to me to be the line of truth and duty; and in that course I believe that the majority of the people of this district now concur. Whether right or wrong in opinions of this sort, I have believed it to be my duty to act independently and in accordance with the best light I could find.

Fellow citizens, I believe I have done my country and you some service, and the only way I can still continue thus to serve you, is by enjoying in a reasonable degree your confidence and support. I am very grateful for the expression of confidence which you have again given me by choosing me a seventh time as your candidate. It was an expression which I have reason to believe was the result of your deliberate judgment, based on a full knowledge of my record; and is all the more precious to me because it came after one of those storms of public feeling which sometimes sweeps away the work of a life-time.

And now, in conclusion, if there is any question on anything I have discussed, or that I have not discussed, which any gentleman desires to propound, I shall be very glad to hear it. [The speaker paused, but no questions being asked closed his remarks as follows:] I thank the audience for the very patient attention with which they have honored me. [Applause.]