# THE VITAL ISSUE.

## Federal Interference in Local Elections.

### How the Veto Power Was Used to Carry Out Party Edicts.

### The Doctrine of Federalism What the Republicans Are Fighting For.

**Eloquent Address of Gen. A. V. Rice, Delivered at Ottawa, Ohio.**

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: * * * We demand a free ballot and fair elections. We insist that the army shall be kept away from the polls, and that the Federal Government shall not exercise authority over elections held within the States in any manner by Federal Supervisors or Deputy Marshals. This, to-day, is the foremost question that can be presented, not only to the people of Ohio, but of the whole country. Before it all other questions are dwarfed into insignificance, because the question of suffrage is greater in a republic than all others, and if it is in doubt the life of the Government is in peril. Its solution is transferred from the halls of Congress to the tribunal of the people. It involves personal and civil liberty, and the perpetuity of our form of Government. It was thought to have been settled a hundred years ago, at the birth of the republic, but to-day it is presented to our view in all its hideousness. This question of franchise is the dearest prerogative of a freeman. It is the foundation of our system of government. Without a free ballot there is no such thing as a fair election, and without a fair election the will of the majority cannot be lawfully expressed, and on the will of the majority is the principle on which our political fabric rests.

The Forty-fifth Congress expired on the 4th of March last without passing two of the general appropriation bills—one for the support of the army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, and the other for the legislative, executive and judicial expenses of the Government for the same time. The House of Representatives was Democratic and the Senate Republican. The seventh section of the first article of the constitution provides that "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." Accordingly the House prepared bills providing the necessary appropriations for the above purpose, and to the Army bill attached a provision repealing certain laws, providing that Federal troops should not be used to preserve the peace at the polls; and attached to the Legislative, Executive and Judicial bill a provision repealing the test-oath, and providing for impartial juries in the Federal courts, and repealing the Election law of 1871, providing for Federal Supervisors of Elections and Deputy Marshals. The repealing provisions attached to both bills were in the interest of economy and germane to the subject-matter of the respective bills to which they were added, and consequently came within the rules of the House. The Senate amended the bills by striking out the repealing clause. Both bills were sent to conference committees, which failed to agree, the difference being as to the repealing provisions added to the bills. So the Forty-fifth Congress expired failing to make the appropriations named, and the President issued his proclamation convening the Forty-sixth Congress in extra session on the 18th of March last.

If, as the Democracy maintained, these laws sought to be repealed were odious, bad and unconstitutional, then the Republican members of the Forty-fifth Congress are responsible for the extra session, and whatever of blame there may be rests with that organization. If, on the other hand, these laws are right, just and constitutional and conducive to the well-being of the country, then the Democratic members of the Forty-fifth Congress were wrong in insisting on their repeal, and the condemnation of the extra session rests with them.

I insist that the House was right in the Forty-fifth Congress in demanding the repeal of these vicious measures, obnoxious to freedom and justice, and which, if permitted to remain in force, will be used more and more to destroy the rights of the States, to consolidate, centralize and make strong the Federal Government, and to perpetuate by force and fraud the power of the Republican party, even against the will of a great majority of the people of the country. If the Democracy was right in the position taken in the Forty-fifth Congress, then the majority in both houses of Congress in extra session were right in maintaining the same ground. The issues made up then by the extra session between the two parties as stated by the Democracy were:

1. The Federal army shall be kept from the polls.

2. Federal juries shall be impartially drawn, and the test oath repealed.

3. Federal Supervisors of Elections and Deputy Marshals shall not interfere with elections in the States.

In order that we may understand more clearly the position of the parties in regard to these measures, let us examine the action of Congress concerning the Army bill.

In a general law, passed the latter part of the war, Feb. 20, 1865, to prevent officers of the army and navy and other persons engaged in the service from interfering in elections in the States, occur the following sections of the Revised Statutes:

"SEC. 2,002. No military or naval officer or other person engaged in the civil, military or naval service of the United States shall order, bring, keep or have under his authority or control any troops or armed men at the places where any general or special election is held in any State, unless it be necessary to repel the armed enemies of the United States, or to keep the peace at the polls."

"SEC. 5,528. Every officer of the army and navy, or other person in the civil, military or naval service of the United States, who orders, brings, keeps or has under his authority or control any troops or armed men at any place where a general or special election is held in any State, unless such force be necessary to repel armed enemies of the United States or to keep the peace at the polls, shall be fined not more than $5,000, and suffer imprisonment at hard labor not less than three months nor more than five years."

By the first of these sections the use of troops at the polls is denounced except in two specified cases: "First, when it is necessary to repel the armed enemies of the United States, or, second, to keep the peace at the polls." The second section prescribes penalties for the disobedience of the law. This bill was introduced into Congress by its author, Senator Powell, of Kentucky, but without the words, "or to keep the peace at the polls," in either section—its object being to prevent troops from surrounding the polls and excluding citizens from voting, as was the case in many instances in the fall of 1864. But the Republican party, then as now unwilling to yield the supervision of elections by the military power through their President, caused the amendment, "or to keep the peace at the polls," to be added to the sections above referred to, and thus it is that this dangerous law, inimical to freedom and civil liberty, now disgraces our statutebooks.

The sixth section of the first appropriation bill of the extra session, for the support of the army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, alters the above sections 2,002 and 5,528 of the Revised Statutes by striking out from both sections the words "or to keep the peace at the polls." This is all. So that hereafter the army cannot be used at elections for any purpose, except to repel the armed enemies of the United States. The Army Appropriation bill having passed both houses of Congress as above, it was sent to the President. On the 27th day of April he returned it to the House of Representatives with his objections to its approval. In this message he reviews the existing laws on the subject and says "that there is no necessity for the enactment of section 6 of the bill before me to prevent military interference at elections." He adds: "But that part of section 6 of this bill which is significant, and virtually important, is the clause which, if adopted, will deprive the civil authorities of the United States of all power to keep the peace at Congressional elections." He states further in this message:

"The States may employ both military and civil power to keep the peace and to enforce the laws at State elections. It is now proposed to deny to the United States even the necessary civil authority to protect the national elections. No sufficient reason has been given for this discrimination in favor of the State and against the national authority. If well-founded objections exist against the present national election laws, all good citizens should unite in their amendment. It is the right and duty of the National Government to enact and enforce laws which will secure free and fair Congressional elections."

In order to meet the President's views of the non-interference with the civil authorities, and still to prevent the use of the troops at the polls, Congress next proposed the following bill, using the spirit, and almost the words, of the constitution in framing it:

"An act to prohibit military interference at elections.

"WHEREAS, The presence of troops at the polls is contrary to the spirit of the institutions and the traditions of our people and tends to destroy the freedom of elections; therefore

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That it shall not be lawful to bring to or employ at any place where a general or special election is being held in a State any part of the army or navy of the United States, unless such force be necessary to repel the armed enemies of the United States, or to enforce section 4, article 4 of the constitution of the United States and the laws made in pursuance thereof, on application of the Legislature or the Executive of the State where such force is to be used, and so much of all laws as is inconsistent herewith is hereby repealed."

The bill it was confidently hoped would meet his approval, as there was nothing in it to "deprive the civil authorities of the United States of all" (or any) "power to keep the peace at Congressional elections." But the President, on the 12th day of May, at the demand of his party, again interposed his veto. This last bill embraced this single idea: That in time of peace the presence of troops at the polls, being contrary to the spirit of our institutions and the traditions of our people, shall not be permitted. In his veto message the President uses the following language:

"Under the sweeping terms of the bill the National Government is effectually shut out from the exercise of the right and from the discharge of the imperative duty to use its whole Executive power whenever and wherever required for the enforcement of its laws at the places and times when and where its elections are held. The employment of its organized armed forces for any such purpose would be an offense against the law unless called for by, and therefore upon permission of, the authorities of the State in which the occasion arises. What is this but the substitution of the discretion of the State Governments for the discretion of the Government of the United States as to the performance of its own duties? In my judgment this is an abandonment of its obligations by the National Government; a subordination of national authority and an intrusion of State supervision over national duties which amounts, in spirit and tendency, to State supremacy."

Here is the doctrine of Federalism revived. The debasement of States and the consolidation of power in a strong centralized Government. As Mr. Foster puts it, "National authority shall be supreme; the State must be subservient thereto."

Failing in the two measures above recited to prevent by law the use of the troops at the polls, Congress, in passing the Army Appropriation bill, refused to appropriate any money for the "army of the United States to be used as a police force to keep the peace at the polls at any election held within any State." Still the law remains to disgrace the statute book. It is rendered inoperative by withholding supplies as above stated. It is for the people to say whether or not Congress did right.

But, fellow-citizens, what arguments were given by the Republicans for their fierce opposition to these measures, and what reasons for these extraordinary vetoes of the President? It is painfully true that during that long parliamentary struggle in Congress, the severest, perhaps, this country ever knew, which lasted for more than three months, in answer to the strong and logical argument put forth by the Democratic side in favor of civil liberty, constitutional law, the right of persons, the administration of justice and free government—citing the words of the fathers of the constitution of the United States, the laws of the States and country, together with the decisions of the Supreme Court in support of their positions, most frequently the answer came in bitter invective, in taunting denunciation, in the cry of revolution, Confederate Brigadiers, secession, solid South, etc. The constitution was disregarded, and the decision of courts unheeded. The great struggle was to retain these odious laws for party advancement; and failing in argument they sought to distract the minds of the people by appealing to their passions rather than their judgments, and by bringing up any question, no matter how irrelevant. Fellow-citizens, this will not do. The people of the country are not to be trifled with. Questions of too grave importance are at stake. Shall the free ballot be preserved? Shall civil liberty under the law be maintained? Shall the State Governments in all their rights be supported? Shall the General Government in all its constitutional powers be perpetuated? These are the questions that are addressed to the intelligence of the country, and are involved in the issues before us. If you would have them determined in the affirmative, these laws dangerous to the liberties of the people must be repealed.

Troops at the polls in republican America! An army of overseers and spies to control elections and arrest innocent men without warrant, all for partisan purposes, and paid out of the Federal treasury! Revolution to ask that these laws inimical to personal and civil liberty should be stricken from our statutes! How inconsistent with our ideas of free institutions. It has been the law in monarchical Great Britain for 200 years that troops should not be nearer than two miles of any polling place on the day of election. Shall the American citizen be less free than the subject of Her Majesty's kingdom? When it comes to this, that a great party in the country, on whatever pretense, can advocate such unrepublican and such undemocratic doctrines, then it may well give us pause. But when a President of the whole people so far forgets the functions of his high office as to lend himself for partisan ends to thwart the will of a great majority of the people of the country, may it not give us cause for alarm? Does he remember March 4th, 1877, when, having been raised to his high estate by such questionable means, having failed to receive a majority of the popular vote by more than 200,000, and having taken his place under the quiet, yet pronounced protest of a great majority of the people, including a very large number in his own party; having taken his oath of office, standing on the east front of the Capitol, and speaking to 45,000,000 of people, he proclaimed the sentiment that "he serves his party best who serves his country best." Did that sentiment occur to him, I ask, during the last session of Congress when he put forth veto after veto of the most partisan character?

In view of the sentiments promulgated in these extraordinary vetoes, which were probably shared by all the members of the Cabinet, I propose to submit the views of some of them touching the unwarranted use of the army. Secretary Sherman, in 1856, then a member of the House of Representatives, proposed an amendment to the Army Appropriation bill as follows: "Provided, never theless, that no part of the military force of the United States herein provided for shall be employed in aid of the enforcement of the laws," referring to the laws of the Kansas Legislature. Thus at that time the Secretary is on record against the use of the bayonet.

In a speech Hon. Carl Schurz, now a member of Hayes' Cabinet, said, in his place in the Senate:

"United States soldiers with fixed bayonets decided the case against them, and took them out of the legislative halls by force. * * I can not, therefore, escape from the deliberate conviction—a conviction conscientiously formed—that the deed done on the 4th of January, in the State House of Louisiana, by the military forces of the United States, constitutes a gross and manifest violation of the constitution and laws of this republic. * * If this can be done in Louisiana, and if such things be sustained by Congress, how long will it be before it can be done in Massachusetts or Ohio?

"He who, in place like ours, fails to sustain, or even justifies a blow at the fundamental laws of the land, makes himself the accomplice of those who strike at the liberties of the people."

In speaking on the same subject before the Cooper Institute indignation meeting, Mr. Evarts also entered his memorable protest against the military usurpation in Louisiana in the following language:

"When men vote, and when their chosen officers meet, and when, without violence and without demonstration of insurrection, they undertake to conduct the affairs of their political Government, no soldier can interfere.

"There are two very distinct, firm lines of limitation which, observed, will protect the machinery of the Government of the people to-day—that is that the sole intervention of the Federal power within the State authority shall be to suppress violence, and that their office after that shall not assume to go further, unless when invited to go further by the supreme authority of the State.

"What is the use to give the purse and the sword to the House of Commons if the King or the President, by military power, can determine what shall be the constitution of the House of Commons or the House of Congress? And that is what they fought for in England. * * And for this reason the people of the United States are justified in assuming that the supreme civil power shall dominate over the military, and that no merging of them or interference with them shall be permitted."

Another member of Mr. Hayes' Cabinet, Mr. McCrary, the Secretary of War, also strongly condemns the use of the army. In his book on elections (page 315) he says:

"An armed force in the neighborhood of the polls is almost of necessity a menace to the voters and an interference with their freedom and independence, and if such armed force be in the hands of, or under the control of, partisan friends of any particular candidate, or set of candidates, the probability of improper influence becomes still stronger."

Postmaster General Key, while a member of the Senate from Tennessee, and but a few weeks before he accepted a place in the Cabinet, not only denounced the unwarranted and dangerous use of the soldiers at the elections held in the Southern States in the fall of 1876, but in his place in the Senate, speaking of the testimony of Eliza Pinkston, and while arraigning John Sherman's connection with affairs in Louisiana, used this language: "And on this testimony, the falsehood of which is so apparent on its face, a State is to be disfranchised, and a President whom the people never elected is to be placed in office." The President, in his inaugural message, said: "Only a local Government, which recognizes inviolate the rights of all, is a true self-government." This language certainly condemns the use of troops at the polls. But if the President is not condemned by his own words, I submit that he is by the voice of his Cabinet. And have they not convicted one another? No greater crime against the constitution can be conceived of than their words portray, and yet they are all to-day upholding the same outrageous principle and defending it, a principle which their patriotic and burning zeal so eloquently denounced but a few years ago.

The President, in his first veto message, argues that the right of the House to grant supplies upon condition of the redress of grievances is a power that ought not to be exercised, and that it works a denial to the Executive of his share of legislative power. Section 1, article 1, of the constitution says: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives." The executive power is vested in the President, but he has no right to participate in legislation. He has the veto power, which is given him to prevent party or ill-advised legislation, but not to defeat the will of the people as the late vetoes of the President have done. But the right of the House to attach conditions to Appropriation bills cannot be denied. Section 7, article 1 of the constitution says: "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

Madison, the father of the constitution, in commenting on the powers of the House, thus defines them in the *Federalist:*

"The House of Representatives can not only refuse, but they alone can propose, the supplies requisite for the support of the Government. They, in a word, hold the purse, that powerful instrument by which we behold, in the history of the British constitution, an infant and humble representation of the people gradually enlarging the sphere of its activity and importance, and finally reducing as far as it seemed to have wished all the overgrown prerogatives of the other branches of the Government. This power over the purse may in fact be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which the constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure."

It was with this view that the constitution provided that moneyed bills should originate in the House of Representatives. And it was with a view of giving Congress complete control over the army, which is the creature of Congress, and not of the President, that the constitution allows no appropriations for the army under any circumstances, for more than two years at a time. The power of the House to grant supplies, with or without conditions, cannot be questioned.

I pass now to the consideration of the Election laws repealed, for Supervisors of Elections and Deputy Marshals. These laws are to be found in the Revised Statutes of the United States, sections 2,011 to 2,031 inclusive. They are too long to quote, but, to bring the subject more clearly before you, I will briefly state their purport. These laws were passed February 28, 1871. They never existed before, and, up to that time, it was conceded that the States were the only proper authority to control elections and protect their citizens. These vicious measures were passed when all branches of the Government were in the hands of the Republican party, and undoubtedly for the purpose of perpetuating that party in power.

Under these laws, on application of two citizens, in cities of 20,000 and upward, or of ten citizens in any county in any Congressional district, the Judges of the Circuit Courts of the United States are authorized to appoint two supervisors of Elections for each voting precinct in the United States; each to be paid $5 per day for his services.

These Supervisors are "authorized and required to attend at all times and places for holding elections for Representatives or Delegates in Congress, and for counting the votes cast at such election; to challenge any vote offered by any person whose legal qualifications the Supervisors, or either of them, may doubt," and to further take control, personally scrutinize and inspect the manner of voting, the ballot-boxes, the poll-books, tallies, etc., and, in the absence of the Marshal or Deputy Marshal, to make arrests, without process, of any one they believe, or pretend to believe, to have violated in any way the Election law. Thus you see at any election for member of Congress this law places the voters and ballot-boxes in the elections in the States for all offices, county and State, in the hands of the Federal Government. Could anything be more degrading and humiliating? Are not our local officers and judges of elections fit and competent to count and canvass the votes they receive? Have the people become slaves, that they must be yoked to Federal overseers? No, *no!* The monstrous provisions of this bad law will only have to be made known, when the people will indignantly rise in their might and demand its repeal.

But, bad and reprehensible as are these Supervisors of Elections, the Deputy Marshals and their functions are infinitely worse. These laws further authorize, in cities of 20,000 or upwards, on the written application of two citizens, the appointment by the United States Marshal for the district of any number of Deputy Marshals, to hold their positions for not over ten days for each election, and receive a compensation of $5 per day, or $50 for the ten days. Supervisors are limited to two to for each voting precinct. An unlimited number of Deputy Marshals may be appointed. These Marshals and Deputy Marshals "shall keep the peace, and support and protect the Supervisors of Elections in the discharge of their duties, preserve order at the polls, prevent fraudulent voting or fr audulent conduct on the part of any officer of election, and either before or after voting arrest and take into custody, with or without process, any person who commits, or attempts or offers to commit, any of the acts or offenses prohibited herein, or commits an offense against the laws of the United States." Could laws be framed more unrepublican? You will mark that the Supervisors are appointed by the United States courts and are limited. The Deputy Marshals are appointed by the Marshal of the district, and are unlimited. All are paid $5 a day for their services—the money to be taken out of the Federal treasury. This law is the grossest abuse of constitutional and personal liberty. It is worse than a disgrace—it is a crime to let it remain there. These Deputy Marshals are always partisans, most frequently bad characters, taken from the lowest classes of society, and sometimes criminals. They do nothing toward keeping the peace, but are generally unknown persons working for the election of the party in whose employ they are. The evil would be just as glaring if the Democratic party was in Federal power. Can any one conceive of a more monstrous wrong against the liberty of the citizen; subjecting him, no matter how respectable, even the officers of the election, to arrest and imprisonment, without warrant or process, on the suspicion, belief or pretended belief of one of these low Deputy Marshals, drawn from the lowest purlieus of society; to be hurried off to jail, or to a United States Commissioner for hearing, and thereby suffer humiliation and disgrace, to say nothing of the loss of his vote! And all for the pretense of securing the purity of elections and to guarantee the right to vote. Guarantee the right to vote! They do nothing of the kind, but the evil is that of just the opposite—prevents decent and reputable citizens from voting. They do not facilitate the right of suffrage, but suppress the elective franchise. The Supervisors remain around the polls, and, by challenge or otherwise, impede the elector's progress to the ballot-box, while the Marshals protect the Supervisors in their work, arresting and bearing off the voter, if the shallowest pretext can be found for so doing, the warrant purely being of the opposite politics to the officers. The Marshals and Supervisors being of the party in power, the law resolves itself into a machine for partisan purposes, paid out of the common treasury, from funds collected from both parties. This has been the practical working of it. It has borne most heavily on naturalized citizens, and its passage was meant as a blow to them, although at the time the law was enacted it was claimed to be for the ostensible purpose of protecting the freedmen in the South from the Ku-Klux and White Leagues. But it was shown by Judge Thurman, in his speech in the Senate on the 15th of May last, that these infamous enactments had their origin in the New York Union League Club, and their purpose was to control the elections in the cities of the North by using the Supervisors and Marshals as a body of elect sioneers in the interest of the Republican party, and to be paid out of the public treasury. The history of the elections in Northern cities since, notably in 1876 and 1878, and the report of the investigating committees, in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and lately in Cincinnati, show how well they have served their purpose.

In 1876 there was paid to these Supervisors and Deputy Marshals out of the Federal treasury $285,321.27; of this amount the single State of New York received $156,021.89, while all the Southern States received but $48,719.86; and yet it was claimed this law was passed to protect the poor freedmen in the South against the Ku-Klux outrages. I tell you that the intent of the law was and its use is to elect Republican members of Congress from the North and while doing that to interfere with all local and State tickets or elections in our State; for all elections are held on the same day, and the name of the Congressional candidate is printed on the same ticket with candidates for other offices, both State and county.

The Federal expenditures in payment of Supervisors and Deputy Marshals in 1878 amounted to $222,714.24; of this all the Southern States received $18,241.06, leaving for the North $204,473.18. This large sum was mainly expended in the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago. In Cincinnati, for the first time I believe, there was expended $2,078.23.

Now, these vast sums are used for party purposes and in the most corrupt manner. And I firmly believe that, if not prohibited by law, the Republican party, in order to carry the next House of Representatives and the country in 1880, will spend millions of the people's money under these laws. In their desperation to retain power they will do so: and this is the reason of their great opposition to the repeal of these measures. On this law and the use of the army they have staked all. Take away from the Republican party the power of sword and purse, and the day of its ascendency will soon be ended.

Congress sought to repeal these odious Election laws, and first attached the repealing measure to the Legislative, Executive and Judicial Appropriation bill, afterward to a bill making appropriations for certain judicial expenses of the Government, but the President interposed his veto to both bills.

Finally, Congress having made all legitimate appropriations for the ensuing year, except for United States Marshals and their general Deputies, a bill for this purpose was prepared providing, however, that no part of the money appropriated should be used to pay Supervisors and Deputy Marshals to attend elections. For the fifth time the President exercised the veto power, and again he thwarted the will of the majority of Congress by returning this bill to the House without his approval. Then Congress adjourned.

In the President's message of May 29, vetoing the first bill to which was attached the clause repealing the Election laws, he uses the following language:

"If this bill is approved, only the shadow of the authority of the United States at the national elections will remain—the substance will be gone."

Again:

"The passage of this bill has been urged upon the ground that the election of members of Congress is a matter which concerns the States alone; that these elections should be controlled exclusively by the States; that there are and can be no such elections as national elections; and that the existing law of the United States regulating Congressional elections is without warrant in the constitution."

And again:

"The constitutional authority to regulate the Congressional elections, which belongs to the Government of the United States, and which it is necessary to exert to secure the right to vote to every citizen possessing the requisite qualifications, ought to be enforced by appropriate legislation."

The President in this last message, as he did in others, discusses the subject of "national elections," arguing that the civil and military authority of the Government should be retained and used to control and protect them, and consequently these bad laws permitting the use of troops at the polls, and Supervisors and Deputy Marshals to control elections should not be repealed. If he were right in his premises his conclusions would not necessarily follow. But we deny the proposition and assert that under the law there is no such thing as a national election. The Federal Government has no voters of its own creation. Every man has a right to vote because of State laws and under State authority, not national. Suffrage is under the control of States. The Federal Government creates no voters. How, then, if there are no national voters, neither can be, can there be national elections? Can you have elections without voters—the first element of an election? Certainly not. It is claimed that the Fifteenth amendment to the constitution gives additional rights to the citizens of the United States. It only provides that the right of citizens of the United States shall not be abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." The right of suffrage is not given. The decisions of the Supreme Court are conclusive in this regard. In the United States vs. Cruikshank, 2 Otto, 555, the Supreme Court reaffirms the doctrine in these words:

"In Minor vs. Happesett, 21 Wall., 178, we decided that the constitution of the United States has not conferred the right of suffrage upon anyone, and that the United States have no voters of their own creation in the States. In the United States vs. Reese, et al., supra, page 214, we hold that the Fifteenth amendment has invested the citizens of the United States with a new constitutional right, which is exemption from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude. From this it appears that the right of suffrage is not a necessary attribute of national citizenship, but that exemption from discrimination in the exercise of that right on account of race, etc., is. The right to vote in the States comes from the States, but the right of exemption from the prohibited discrimination comes from the United States. The first has not been granted or secured by the constitution of the United States, but the last has been."

Then, as the constitution has not conferred the right of suffrage on anyone, there are no national voters, there can be no national elections, as the President claims, to be controlled by national authority.

No one will deny that the General Government is one of delegated powers, defined and limited by the constitution, while the great mass of powers reserved to local authorities—the States and the people. So jealous were the fathers of the interests of the people, that in 1791, but two years after the adoption of the constitution, the Tenth amendment was ratified, which provides:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

We have a dual system of government, preserving to the States and people all their reserved rights, and perpetuating the General Government in all its constitutional powers. In this grand system of Government, bequeathed to us by the intelligence, patriotism and foresight of the fathers, is the genius of our republic. It is fashioned after no form of government which has gone before it in the world's history. It is its own model. In preserving and guarding this dual system of Government in its primal purity, Democrats believe each State to control its own local affairs in its own way, subject to the constitution of the United States, and all yielding obedience to the General Government in all its delegated powers, lies the security and perpetuity of our institutions.

But, my fellow-citizens, if you would thus preserve the blessings of this dual Government, you must see to it that these pernicious laws are repealed. I have been thus minute in giving the history of these measures during the late session in order that the attitude of the two parties in regard to them might be fully understood. Both laws remain to-day to disgrace the statutes of our country. They are rendered inoperative for the coming year, because no appropriations are made to carry them into effect. Shall they remain on the statutes of the land, or shall they be taken off? The appeal is made to the people of the country. The verdict in my mind cannot be a doubtful one. Was the Democratic party right in demanding their repeal?

Why were they so strenuously opposed by the opposition, and why these extraordinary vetoes? Because it is the determined policy of the leaders of the Republican party to effect a change in the character of the Government. Its every step is towards centralization and the destruction of the States. Every veto of the President enunciates the doctrine of "national elections," and that national authority must be sustained by the use of the army to "preserve the peace at the polls," and Federal Supervisors and Deputy Marshals to control elections. It is a most dangerous and pernicious doctrine, and tends to produce consolidation, and the absorption by Federal power of that which properly belongs to local rule, and finally become destructive to our form of government. And this is the tendency of the Republican party.

History repeats itself. In 1800 Mr. Jefferson said of the Federal party: "Giving a little to-day and a little to-morrow; advancing the noiseless steps like a thief over the field of jurisdiction until all shall be usurped from the States, and all consolidated into one. To this I am opposed, because, when all Governments, domestic and foreign, in little as in great thing, combine to the right of suffrage, but suppress the elective franchise. The Supervisors remain around the polls, and, by challenge or otherwise, impede the elector's progress to the ballot-box, while the Marshals protect the Supervisors in their work, arresting and bearing off the voter, if the shallowest pretext can be found for so doing, the warrant purely being of the opposite politics to the officers. The Marshals and Supervisors being of the party in power, the law resolves itself into a machine for partisan purposes, paid out of the common treasury, from funds collected from both parties. This has been the practical working of it. It has borne most heavily on naturalized citizens, and its passage was meant as a blow to them, although at the time the law was enacted it was claimed to be for the ostensible purpose of protecting the freedmen in the South from the Ku-Klux and White Leagues. But it was shown by Judge Thurman, in his speech in the Senate on the 15th of May last, that these infamous enactments had their origin in the New York Union League Club, and their purpose was to control the elections in the cities of the North by using the Supervisors and Marshals as a body of electioneerers in the interest of the Republican party, and to be paid out of the public treasury. The history of the elections in Northern cities since, notably in 1876 and 1878, and the report of the investigating committees, in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and lately in Cincinnati, show how well they have served their purpose.

In 1876 there was paid to these Supervisors and Deputy Marshals out of the Federal treasury $285,321.27; of this amount the single State of New York received $156,021.89, while all the Southern States received but $48,719.86; and yet it was claimed this law was passed to protect the poor freedmen in the South against the Ku-Klux outrages. I tell you that the intent of the law was and its use is to elect Republican members of Congress from the North and while doing that to interfere with all local and State tickets or elections in our State; for all elections are held on the same day, and the name of the Congressional candidate is printed on the same ticket with candidates for other offices, both State and county.

The Federal expenditures in payment of Supervisors and Deputy Marshals in 1878 amounted to $222,714.24; of this all the Southern States received $18,241.06, leaving for the North $204,473.18. This large sum was mainly expended in the cities of New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago. In Cincinnati, for the first time I believe, there was expended $2,078.23.

Now, these vast sums are used for party purposes and in the most corrupt manner. And I firmly believe that, if not prohibited by law, the Republican party, in order to carry the next House of Representatives and the country in 1880, will spend millions of the people's money under these laws. In their desperation to retain power they will do so: and this is the reason of their great opposition to the repeal of these measures. On this law and the use of the army they have staked all. Take away from the Republican party the power of sword and purse, and the day of its ascendency will soon be ended.

Congress sought to repeal these odious Election laws, and first attached the repealing measure to the Legislative, Executive and Judicial Appropriation bill, afterward to a bill making appropriations for certain judicial expenses of the Government, but the President interposed his veto to both bills.

Finally, Congress having made all legitimate appropriations for the ensuing year, except for United States Marshals and their general Deputies, a bill for this purpose was prepared providing, however, that no part of the money appropriated should be used to pay Supervisors and Deputy Marshals to attend elections. For the fifth time the President exercised the veto power, and again he thwarted the will of the majority of Congress by returning this bill to the House without his approval. Then Congress adjourned.

In the President's message of May 29, vetoing the first bill to which was attached the clause repealing the Election laws, he uses the following language:

"If this bill is approved, only the shadow of the authority of the United States at the national elections will remain—the substance will be gone."

## FARM NOTES.

TO KILL burdocks cut the the plant off at the crown and pour kerosene oil upon it. It is sure death to the pest.

A WRITER in the *Indiana Farmer* says water made thick as cream, with fresh cow manure, and poured on melon vines will keep off the striped beetle.

GOOD feed, whether it be good grass in summer or good hay and gaain in winter, with pure water always within reach, will always give good returns, whether the outcome be meat, milk, butter or cheese.

M. BOUSSINGAULT found that a thermometer, plunged in snow to the depth of about four inches, sometimes marked nine degrees of heat greater than at the surface. Farmers up North may console themselves over the fact.

DRIVING AFTER EATING.—The digestion of a horse is governnd by the same laws as that of a man, and, as we know that it is not best for a man to go at hard work the moment a hearty meal is eaten, so we should remember that a horse ought to have a little rest after his meal, while the stomach is most active in the processes of digestion. Many a good horse has been ruined by injudicious haste in working him with a full stomach.

SELL THE OLD SHEEP.—It is folly to keep old sheep. They should be turned off to the butcher while they are in their prime. It does not take half as much to fatten them then. When they get old and thin, in order to put them in condition to slaughter, the whole structure must be rebuilt. Four sets of lambs are all any ewe should bear; this will bring her to five years, and this is an age when, with little extra care, she will round up to a full carcass. Exceptions may be made when the breed is scarce, and the blood is more desirable than anything else.—*New York Tribune.*

HOW TO GET RID OF RATS.—A farmer says: Four years ago my farm was fearfully infested with rats. They were so numerous that I had great fears of my whole crop being destroyed by them after it was housed; but having two acres of wild peppermint that grew in a field of wheat cut and bound with the wheat, drove the rats from the premises. I have not been troubled with them since, while my neighbors have any quantity of them. I feel convinced that any person who is troubled with these pests can readily get rid of them by gathering a good supply of mint and placing it around the walls or base of their barns.

BUTTER NOT GATHERING. — The food has a great influence upon the milk. So has the condition of the cow. When the butter will not gather, but remains in the condition of a thick emulsion, it may sometimes be brought into order by throwing into the churn a gallon of cold water in which a handful or two of salt have been dissolved, and then operating the churn slowly to gather the butter. The cream may be improved in condition also by stirring a teaspoonful of salt in the jar in which it is kept. But to give the cows a daily feed of bran, or meal, if only one quart, is perhaps the best remedy, and its cost will be returned in the increase of butter. It pays to give this extra food even when cows are on pasture.

THE *Fruit Recorder* says: The following preparation for destroying bugs on squash and on cucumber vines has been successfully tried for years. Dissolve a table-spoonful of saltpeter in a pailful of water. Put one pint of this around each hill, shaping the earth so that it will not spread much, and the thing is done. Use more saltpeter, if you can afford it. It is good for vegetables, but death to animal life. The bugs burrow in the earth at night, and fail to rise in the morning. It is also good to kill the grub in peach trees; only use twice as much—say a quart or two to each tree. There was not a yellow or blistered leaf on twelve or fifteen trees to which it was applied last season. No danger of killing vegetables with it. A concentrated solution applied to young beans makes them grow wonderfully.

TO PICKLE PORK.—In pickling pork the pieces should be so cut that they will lie flat in the tub, and each layer should be pounded down closely. But before the sides are cut up it is a good plan to rub them over with a mixture of white sugar and salt, putting one-third as much sugar as salt. Then place the pieces in the tub, rind downward, and sprinkle each layer with the sugar and salt. When the tub is well filled, put a layer of salt over it so thick as to exclude the air, and cover it closely for ten days; then look at it, and, if the brine is not formed enough to cover it, sprinkle in a little cold water. In three months the pork will be ready to cook, and it will keep good for two years at least, and the sugar will give it a finer flavor than saltpeter. In warm climates both sugar and saltpeter can be used as advantageously as in pickling beef. All housekeepers know that they can make corned beef more tender and better flavored by using a pickle of one pound of sugar to three pounds of salt and a teaspoonful of saltpeter.

### Comets.

The comets on record exceed 800 What are called "short-period" comets are: Encke's, whose time of revolution is 5½ years; De Vico's, 5½; Winnecke's, 5½; Brorson's, 5½; Bida's, 6½; D'Arrest's, 6½; Faye's, 7½; Mechain's, 13½; Halley's, 76½.

The long-period comets are those of 1680, whose time of revolution is 8,814 years; that of 1744, 122,683 years; of 1870, 75,314 years; of 1811, 3,000 years; of 1840, 13,864 years; of 1844, 102,050 years; of 1847, 13,918 years; of 1858, 12,000 years; of 1860, 15,864 years.

Bielas' comet divided into two parts in 1846, and in 1852 those parts were 1,250,000,000 miles apart, and had entirely disappeared by 1866.

Coggia's comet was discovered in 1874. It is non-periodical and was 133,000,000 miles from the sun when discovered. In July of that year it was within 62,000,000 miles of both earth and sun, and its tail was computed to be 12,000,000 miles in length.

Donati's comet, discovered in 1858, had a tail 40,000,000 miles long, and its main body very nearly collided with Venus. Although supposed to be vaporous, this comet was calculated by M. Faye to have the weight of a sea 327 feet deep and 40,000 square miles in extent.

Halley's comet has been identified as identical with the comets of 1531, 1607, 1066 and 1223. Its reappearance is prognosticated for 1912.

Gucke's comet possesses no tail, usually. In 1848, however, it presented two tails, one toward and one from the sun.

Lexell's, or "the lost comet," was caught or entangled among the satellites of Jupiter in 1770, reappeared in 1779, again became entangled, and has not been seen since.

The superstitions of all times and nations have regarded the appearance of comets with dread, as being omens of disaster. The spectroscope fails to show their chemical composition. It was shown by Schiapavilli, in 1872, that comets are sometimes connected with meteoric showers, and his discovery has been indorsed by noted astronomers.

Lycho Brahe discovered that comets are extraneous to our atmosphere, and Newton that they are subjected to the same principle which guides the planets.


**The Products of Indigestion.**

Inability of the stomach to act upon the food is productive of serious and speedy mischief to the entire bodily economy. The circulation languishes and grows poor; leanness, pallor, and a loss of muscular and organic power supervene; but, worse than this, the functions associated with and dependent upon digestion, such as evacuation and the secretion of bile, grow irregular, and the organs whose business it is to discharge those functions become badly disordered. This disastrous state of things is more readily and thoroughly rectified with Hostetter's Stomach Bitters than any known medicinal agent. The stomach being invigorated, the life-giving principles of the blood are increased, the system properly nourished, leanness and debility overcome, and the bowels and liver thoroughly and promptly regulated.

A COUGH, Cold, or Sore Throat requires immediate attention, as neglect oftentimes results in some incurable Lung Disease. "BROWN'S BRONCHIAL TROCHES" will almost invariably give relief. 25 cents a box.

If you are satisfied to have a poor organ, or run the risk of having a poor one, take any organ that is offered you. But, if you desire to be sure of having the very best, insist on having a Mason & Hamlin, and do not be persuaded to take any other.

$1,375.87 Profits in 30 Days.

What $10 has done in Wall street by legitimate stock speculations. Pamphlets containing two unerring rules for success mailed free to any person upon application.

Address, A. SIMPSON & CO., 49 Exchange Place, New York.

No Hotel in Chicago

Is more favorably known than the Tremont. With appointments in all respects finished and complete, with polite and genial attendants, and with a host who is truly a host—JOHN A. RICE—there is every reason why this hotel should be a favorite with the traveling public.

GAPS made in the flesh by abscesses and ulcers speedily disappear without leaving a scar, when HENRY'S CARBOLIC SALVE is the agent employed to heal them. This standard article cures the worst sores, eradicates cutaneous eruptions, relieves the pains of burns, banishes pimples and blotches from the skin, and has proved to be eminently successful in remedying rheumatism and soreness of the throat and chest. Sold by all Druggists.

THE reason why