understand the financial rule I have just referred to.

REPUBLICAN EFFORTS TO PREVENT THE CIRCULATION OF SILVER.

The Republicans now claim that they have brought the silver dollar from its hiding place. I have tried to show you how they retired it to its hiding place, and I now propose to show you how they are endeavoring to keep it there. The Republican party, as I have stated, is wedded to the doctrine of having nothing as money but gold. Ever since the remonetization of silver by the Democratic party in 1878 the leaders of the Republican party have sought in every way possible to prejudice the people against its use. John Sherman, when in the Senate of the United States, opposed the remonetization of silver as bitterly as did Mr. Garfield, and since Mr. Sherman has been Secretary of the Treasury, he has allowed no opportunity to pass in which he could impress upon the minds of the people the impracticability of using silver as money. He combined with the bankers of New York against it. He had his Assistant Treasurer made a member of the Clearing House Board of New York City, and then, according to a resolution passed by the Board (the Assistant Treasurer of the United States being a member thereof), silver was not to be offered in payment for any balance due any member of that Board, and was not to be received in bank only to be paid back in kind. All this tending to embarrass the business community in handling it.

A business man wants to deposit in bank what he receives, and check out of bank as his necessities require. It was well known to Mr. Sherman that an arrangement of that kind was calculated to bring about great opposition to the use of silver as money; and that accounts for the prejudice among business men of the East against silver. He has constantly refused to hand out silver in the payment of our bonded debt, while the silver he has on hand is a legal tender for every dollar that we owe. But he prefers to issue new bonds, bearing interest, and sell them to buy gold with, instead of paying out the silver he has on hand. If he would pay it out on the bonded debt of the country we would save the issuing of new bonds just to the amount of silver that he has on hand, and the interest upon the bonds also.

Mr. Sherman has never lost hope of bringing the law into contempt; he even showed a disregard for the law making silver a legal tender. Although he is our direct man, and his only business is to carry out the laws passed by Congress, instead of carrying them out he sets the law at defiance. Not being aware, apparently, of the intelligence of the people he was talking to, he has on many occasions asserted that he could not pay out the silver. If any business man had an agent employed, as we have Mr. Shermrn, to pay out money in bank on indebtedness, which was a legal tender, for every debt he owed, were the agent to keep the deposit in bank and issue new notes bearing interest in settlement of the debts and in payment of the old notes of his employer, he would be discharged instantly. Any man can pay out money that he has on hand if he owes debts far in excess of the money he has on hand. That is the condition of the Government.

Mr. Sherman says that the silver money when paid out immediately comes back. That is the office of money, and that dollar which passes the most rapidly in performing exchanges, is the dollar we want. If the silver dollar comes back rapidly to Mr. Sherman in the payment of debts due us, after having been paid out on debts we owe, it is then ready for another payment, and that is just what a business man wants—when he pays out a dollar on debts that he owes, to receive it back on debts due him. There never was such an effort made since the formation of the Government to set at defiance the law of the land as there has been made by the Republican party to discountenance silver, and banish it as money. Yet, on the eve of an election, in the face of the record, and in the face of the message of Mr. Hayes, and his vetoing of the silver bill—the bill for the remonetization of silver, and in his late message recommending Congress to stop the coinage of silver dollars, many Republicans now claim, as did Mr. Porter in his late speech, that they are the especial friends of silver.

A REPUBLICAN BUGABOO.

Mr. Porter also, in his late speech, took great pains to try and get up a sensation because of the introduction of a bill in the Lower House of Congress to have the number of Supreme Judges increased, as he says, to twenty-one. I know of no one, except himself, who professes any fear of the passage of such a law. The simple introduction of a bill in Congress amounts to nothing. Unless it can be shown that there was some favorable action taken on such a bill, I am somewhat astonished that he should refer to it. If such a bill was introduced and no action taken thereon, there is no evidence that it embraced the views of more than one man. In a body of 300 members, if one of them should introduce such a bill, why should there be any fear expressed, and why should the attempt be made to raise unnecessary alarm?

ANOTHER WAVE OF THE BLOODY SHIRT.

Mr. Porter and other of our Republican friends still appear to have great dread of the Brigadiers of the South. I mean the Democratic Brigadiers from the South. Republican administrations, ever since the war, have never failed to take into their embrace and their confidence a Brigadier from the South who was willing to support the policy of the Republican party. Whenever such a man expresses a willingness to support it, he is immediately reconstructed, and becomes at once a new man. And Republican administrations have taken into their embrace and given lucrative appointments to Southern Brigadiers who were not engaged in honorable warfare. I refer particularly to one Mosby, who was engaged in a guerrilla warfare against unarmed persons. They brought Mr. Keys into the Cabinet, where he was the commander of about 24,000 postmasters; and General Longstreet, who was placed in a lucrative position in New Orleans, has recently been appointed to a profitable foreign mission. All but one or two of the seventy odd conspirators who figured in the manufacture of forged testimony, upon which the inauguration of Mr. Hayes was consummated, have been placed in profitable positions by the fraud that they carried out—I mean the fraudulent President they inaugurated. Hearing Republicans express dread and fear of Brigadiers who are Democrats, and knowing their course, as I do, in immediately placing in profitable official positions Rebel Brigadiers who are Republicans, my curiosity has been somewhat excited as was the Irishman's I once heard of. A chemist had invented and was showing a liquid that would consume not only glass and iron, but anything that was put in it, when an Irishman, standing by remarked very earnestly: "Faith and be jabers, sir, I would be pleased to know what it is made of." I, too, would be pleased to know what this Republican party is composed of, that it has such alchemistic power as to completely and instantaneously reform everybody who comes within its organization.

INDIANA AFFAIRS—DEMOCRATIC ECONOMY.

As the Democratic candidate for Governor of your State you may expect me to give you some reasons why the Democratic party should be retained in power in this Commonwealth, especially. For nearly eight years past the State of Indiana has had the benefit of a wise, economical and conservative administration under Governor Hendricks and Governor Williams, while in the legislative department we have had but little power. Two years ago, in our State platform, we promised the people a reduction of interest. We were successful in electing a majority of the members of the last General Assembly, and that pledge was promptly redeemed by that Legislature. A reduction of 2 per cent. was made in the legal interest of the State. I was again somewhat surprised at the claim set up by Mr. Porter for the Republican party that it had reduced the rate of interest in this State, in the face of the fact I have just stated.

We also promised the people an economical expenditure of their money. By comparing the expenses incurred under the management of the Republican party in maintaining the State Benevolent Institutions and for public printing, to say nothing about the reduction of expenses in the management of other departments (which have been great), it will be found that there has been saved to the people during last year in the Insane Hospital alone the sum of $41,466.68; in the Deaf and Dumb Asylum $8,257.60, and in the Blind Asylum $8,160.42. We have had exclusive control of the Asylums for but one year. While we have had exclusive control of the State printing for six years. The books show that the saving to the taxpayers of the State in that simple item of expenditure, as compared with the eight previous years under Republican control, amounts to the enormous sum of $36,909.35 per annum. The Democratic party in the last six years has saved the taxpayers of Indiana in the one item of printing alone, the enormous sum of $221,454.10.

While the expenses of the Benevolent Institutions of the State have been largely diminished, as I have stated, it should be remembered that the inmates have been increased in number, especially in the Insane Hospital; and also that the cost of living has been greater the past year than during years immediately preceding; and in the Insane Asylum the Superintendent's report shows that the disbursement for food was $44,474.31 or 14 per cent. more than for the year previous, computed for the same number of inmates; and yet the present Democratic officials have shown such extraordinary economy in the other expenses of that institution as to save the taxpayers $41,466.68 in the year 1879, as compared with the annual expenditures under Republican officials. No man can say that the Benevolent Institutions of the State have not been as well managed and cared for as they were under Republican rule; and no one will deny but that the State printing has been as well done. Indeed, no department of the State Government has suffered in the least in efficiency.

Peace and order have generally prevailed. It is true we have had some labor troubles, but they have been settled by wise counsels, and the laws have been enforced by the civil authorities. Not a gun has been fired during the eight years of Democratic executive control. No property has been destroyed by violence; and the persons and property of our citizens have been protected. I am convinced that in this enlightened age, with prudent and wise management, our laws can be enforced by civil authority without resort to arms. And I think a great deal of this desirable state of affairs is due to our wise system of common-schools. Intelligence and reason have taken the place of violence and passion. During the labor strike in 1877 many persons thought a resort to arms was necessary. I then differed with them, and believing as I did that our trouble, which was then great, could be settled by compromise and argument, I hastened to the office of the Mayor of Indianapolis, and moved the appointment of a Citizens' Committee of Conference. My motion was kindly entertained by the Mayor, a good and efficient Committee was appointed, and my highest expectations were fully realized by the work of that Committee. Pittsburg, Pa., and Columbus, O., by pursuing a different policy, and hastily resorting to arms for the settlement of the same trouble, lost many valuable lives and millions of property. This is a lesson that should be remembered by all, and all should profit by it. Should I be your Governor, there will not be a gun fired in Indiana for the purpose of preserving law and order at home until every means shall have been exhausted to restore law and order through the civil authorities, and no man would be intrusted with one in command of any force—should it be necessary to call out the militia—with power to decide the question himself as to the inability of the civil authorities to restore order. If I am your Governor I will assume the responsibility myself; and if we have to resort to the military of the country to restore order, I will decide that question myself.

CONCLUSION.

And, now, my fellow-citizens, I trust I have convinced you not only that the policy of the Democratic party has ever been in direct opposition to the charge made against it by Mr. Porter and others that a State has the right to withdraw from the Union at will, but that the policy of the Democratic party is and ever has been in favor of the maintenance of the rights of the States under the Constitution, to manage and control all their domestic affairs without any interference by the Federal Government, while conceding to the Feneral Government the legislative powers provided by the Constitution of the United States. I trust I have also convinced you that secession was not a State right, but rebellion; that the Republican party, since the close of the war, has endeavored to pervert our form of Government from a Government of thirty-eight free and independent States into a Government of consolidated power; that the right of a State to manage and control her elections without Federal interference is necessary to the perpetuation of free government; that the right of the States to maintain Courts for the trial of all offenses against State laws is imperatively demanded; that the Republican party has consolidated the wealth of this country in the hands of a few, in the same way it has consolidated the powers of the States in the hands of the Federal Government; that its policy was one that bankrupted all the debtor class, and increased the enormous fortunes of the creditor class, thereby paralyzing the industries of the country, so that bankruptcy was the rule and not the exception; that the Democratic party has, by the passage of a law through Congress for the reissue of greenbacks, checked the decline in values, which had destroyed confidence in any kind of investments; and, by the remonetization of the silver dollar, gave the manufacturer and the capitalist an assurance that there would be more money, encouraged investments, restored confidence in future values and relieved the country of the paralyzation and bankruptcy which had been brought on by Republican policy.

Bill English's Religion.

Our Republican neighbors have made grave charges against Hon. William H. English upon almost every conceivable subject. They charge that he pays his debts, which has not been very fashionable in business circles for some years under Republican rule, and exacts payment when he can honestly. They even say that he is not religious.

Professor Wayland, of Trigg County, a graduate of Hanover College, in Indiana, was asked what were Mr. English's religious convictions. He replied that he did not know. All he knew about his religion was gathered from a little incident that occurred in college life. An old man who lived in the vicinity of the college had incurred the displeasure of a number of the students, and one night, to the number of about thirty, they assembled and proceeded to the man's cabin to wreak their vengeance upon him. Wayland, hearing of the affair, repaired to the scene to see what he might see. It appears that Bill English had also heard of the affair; for when Wayland got there he saw English standing in the doorway in front of the old man in his shirt-sleeves and the sleeves rolled up, exposing his brawny arms. In front of him were about thirty of his fellow-students, whom he defied with oaths and expletives more expressive than polite, and dared them to cross the threshold of the cabin. The Professor said that was all he knew of Mr. English's religious views.

Republican Opinions of Mr. English.

[Indianapolis Sentinel.]

It has not been a year since the Republican papers of Indiana were speaking of Hon. Wm. H. English as one of the strongest men in the State. The Terre Haute *Courier* (Rep.) said:

"We warn our Republican friends now, that if the Democratic party puts Mr. English in the position to make a leader of him in this State next year, there are breakers ahead for us. *He is one of the strongest men in that party.*"

The Indianapolis *Journal*, the recognized organ of the Republican party in Indiana, said only a few months ago:

"*There is not in the Democratic party in Indiana a better politician, a better organizer or a man possessing more of the qualities of real statesmanship than William H. English.*"

It will be observed that since this was said there has been no change in the proprietorship of the *Journal*. Now in view of these declarations and the fact that Mr. English has never been defeated before the people, the present gabble of these same Republican papers about Mr. English being a weak man and unpopular, is contemptible in the extreme. They know it is not true and say it only for effect abroad. Hancock and English will receive the cordial support of all the Democrats in Indiana, and many others who have not heretofore belonged to that party.

HENDRICKS.

Governor Hendricks' Brilliant Opening of the Campaign at Marion, August 12th, 1880.

Garfield's Fine Italian Hand in the Returning Board Rascality of 1876.

A Clear Presentment of the Issues of the Day.—A Short, Crisp Speech.

Governor Hendricks' Speech.

As Governor of the State, I recommended to the Legislature that the Constitution should be so amended that the general elections should take place in November instead of October. We would then vote on the same day with most of the other States, and avoid the double election in the Presidential year. For many reasons I thought the change desirable. I also recommended that a residence for a short and fixed period in the voting Precinct should be made a qualification of the right to vote. The voters would then come to know each other when meeting on election day. The Legislature passed upon these propositions, but amended them by annexing conditions requiring registration laws to be passed and maintained. I think that was unfortunate. It should be left to the discretion of the Legislature what registry of the voters shall be made. A very large body of the people opposed the amendments on that account. The vote upon them was had last April. A plurality was for the amendments, but not a majority of the voters of the State—not a majority of the voters who voted at that election. Upon a case that came up from Floyd County the Supreme Court decided that the amendments had not been adopted. Upon the question of law the Democratic Judges were equally divided, and the decision was pronounced by Judge Biddle, who is not a Democrat, but independent in politics. The Republican leaders have hoped and labored to make political capital out of that decision, in the hope that the Court in the proper tribunal, under our Constitution and laws, for the settlement of such questions. In the cause of good and stable government the people will sustain the Court. I think the Court was right. Do you not think so? Are you willing that our Constitution and form of State Government shall be changed by less than half the people? The Legislature, that represents all the people, can not put over us any law except by a vote of a majority of all the members elected. Of the 100 members of the House, full fifty-one, and of the fifty Senators, full twenty-six must vote for a law before it can be over us. A full majority of all the people, through their representatives, must assent before a law can be made or changed. Would you have the State Government itself liable to change by a less expression of the will of the people? The Constitution protects our magnificent school fund from any loss. Can that be changed by less than half the people? By constitutional provisions we are made secure in all our personal and domestic rights. Who demands a modification unless full one half the people consent? In the Constitution of the United States our fathers expressed their appreciation of the high importance of stability and permanence of Constitutional law. That great instrument can be amended only by two-thirds of both branches of Congress, and by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States. No change in either the State or Federal Constitution should be possible, except upon the mature judgment and deliberate action of the people. It is better that we bear, for a while, the inconvenience of frequent elections rather than impair the stability of our institutions. If a proposed change of government is not of sufficient public interest to command the approval of at least one-half the voters, the necessity for its adoption can not be very pressing. Take time for deliberation. Strike off objectionable provisions. Allow the people to consider it again. If then adopted it will almost certainly be right. In this case thousands of the people are afraid of the registration law. They have heard that in other localities that law is used as an instrument of fraud and corruption, and they would rather not imbed it in the Constitution, but leave it to Legislative discretion.

Fellow-citizens, upon party platforms we may be misled. They are sometimes adjusted to suit the tendency of public opinion rather than to express the convictions of their authors. I think that was true of the Chicago platform. But we need not be misled if we carefully consider the opinions and conduct of the candidates. What does General Garfield's nomination signify? Above and beyond all else it means the indorsement and approval, in the most positive and offensive manner possible, of the Presidential fraud of 1876-7. He had more to do with it than any other man. He is the only man who occupied toward it and in it a double relation.

Immediately after the election he went to New Orleans—not by virtue of any law or rightful public authority, but as a party man. General Grant's request was without authority of law. He went to assist his party in making up the case. I say he went for that purpose, because when there he did that work. When his work was compl ted in New Orleans he and his associates returned to Washington, and he alone, of all the men engaged in making up the case, took his seat upon the commission to decide it. What think you, gentlemen, of a man who has formed his opinion, who has indeed helped to prepare the case for trial; who has sought and prepared the evidence, taking his seat as a juror? By the laws of the United States, by the laws of every State, such a man s excluded from the jury box. By every sentiment of justice and fair play such a man is excluded. That he did this work at New Orleans no man can question. There was a pretense that he and his associates went to see hat the canvass of the votes was fairly made. For that pretense all respect disappeared after they refused to join the Democrats from the North in seeing that the count was in fact fair. He has made a sworn statement of his conduct at New Orleans, and by that he must be judged. His testimony commences at page 789 of Doc. 31, accompanying report No. 140, House Representatives, 3d sess., 45th Congress. Somewhat by designation and somewhat by choice, the Parish of West Feliciana came into the charge of General Garfield for examination. He received copies of all the official papers, which had been delivered to the Returning Board, touching the election in that Parish. For his work one of Packard's inner rooms in the Custom House was assigned to him. This room he occupied alone. On page 801 he says: "Occasionally some of the men, who were getting up statements about other Parishes, came in there, but the room was assigned to my use." In that room he examined the affidavits that had been taken, and made out a list of half or three-fourths of the witnesses, and procured interviews with them. When the affidavits were not, as he supposed sufficiently full, he prepared, or had prepared, additional interrogatories, so as to bring the evidence in better shape before the Returning Board. The most remarkable testimony which General Garfield assisted in preparing was that of Amy Mitchell, a colored woman whose husband was killed in West Feliciana Parish. He prepared the interrogatories after a private interview with her, and her testimony went before the Returning Board in answers to the interrogatories. She had before then made an affidavit, but he thought it was not sufficiently full. Her account of the murder was shocking indeed, almost as horrible as the story told by Eliza Pinkston. But it turned out afterward that the greater part of it was untrue; and before a Committee of Congress, when examined and cross examined, she herself withdrew it, declaring the greater part to be untrue. Her testimony is found on page 471, Document 31, part 3. In that inner room of the Custom House he spent days examining the election papers of West Feliciana, holding interviews with the witnesses and draughting, as he says, "interrogatories to draw out more fully from some of the witnesses the testimony which they had given either in brief, and some of the interrogatories which subsequently were appended to the testimony of these witnesses were of my draughting." The testimony so revised by Garfield went back to the Returning Board, and the result was that West Feliciana, with its Democratic majority, was rejected. All this preceded and was to control the returns. That was his work down there, but at Washington his vote was that Congress could not go behind the returns so made. As agent for his party he helped to make the returns by manipulating the evidence; and as juryman for the Nation, he held such returns conclusive and binding. His associates were occupied upon the other Parishes, for he testifies that the work was distributed among them. After spending eighteen days in such labors he and his associates left for the North "in great anxiety as to what the result would be," as he says. Under oath he conceded that when he got there the State had gone for the Democrats, unless some votes were thrown out, or some votes not cast were counted. When he got there more than 6,000 marked the difference, and the Hayes electors were that much behind. But when they left the work was done though the result was not announced. But two days had passed, and they were yet upon the cars, when a message overtook them that allayed their anxiety. It told them that the crime was consummated; that the elected were counted out and the defeated were counted in. It then remained only to assert and maintain that the work of the Returning Board, brought about in part as I have described, when covered by the Governor's certificate, should bind Congress. The Commission settled that, and Garfield was upon the Commission, and voted upon it—one of the eight. Gentlemen, what think you of this? Ought he to have gone upon the Commission? Not only with opinions formed and avowed, but with purposes determined upon, he took his seat—he took the oath! He took his seat to decide not only the rights of the Nation, but also the rights of the men who had been elected.

In respect to the action of Congress upon this question I have thought and said that the wrongs done to individuals were swallowed up and lost in the greater wrong and outrage upon the people and their institutions. But in respect to James A. Garfield other considerations arise. He accepted (perhaps sought) a place upon a tribunal that was to decide, not only questions of public right, but also the claims of individuals to great offices. He did that when he had formed a purpose to decide against those whose claim was supported by the preponderance of the vote. He was disqualified by his formed and avowed purpose, and also by his participation in the preparatory work. For that I challenge him before the bar of public opinion; and I do this in the name of public and private right; in the name of justice of fair play and of universal law. When mentioned for the position, it would have been grand and Roman-like if he had risen in his place in the House of Representatives, and announced that the services that his party had required of him had disqualified him, and that he could not accept and would not serve. Would either of you take a seat upon a jury with opinions already formed, without informing the Court and parties, and asking to be excused? I think the great body of the people now think and know that the incumbents of the offices of President and Vice President were not elected, but that they were inaugurated without right. Are any of you willing to indorse the great wrong? By your vote will you say that General Garfield did right? Shall it be made an honored precedent or a condemned crime?

I have but one more suggestion connected with this subject for your consideration. The Administration and the party have rewarded with public offices all the parties directly connected with the fraud. I say all, because the exceptions are but one, two or three. The members of the Returning Boards, their clerks, sons and brothers, electors, supervisors and visiting statesmen, almost all have lucrative public employment. They number a full hundred, and their compensation is estimated at more than $250,000 per year, and above $1,000,000 during the four years of the Administration—half of the cost of our new State House, and the full cost of the State administration for one year. I will not comment upon the wrong and indecency of making such a use of the President's patronage. Surely we all understand that the people's offices ought not to be given in payment for such services. If Mr. Hayes desired to compensate the men who put him in office, he should have done so out of his own estate. Are you willing that they shall stay in? Shall they become pensioners—Wells and his two sons, and the rest of the hundred? General Garfield, if elected, can not and will not turn them out, for he was with them and of them. Gentlemen, will your ballots go to indorse what was done, and the men who did it? In our platforms, State and National, we have declared our opposition to centralization, and our purpose to stand with all our might by the constitutional rights and powers of the United States, and with equal fidelity by the rights and powers of the States as reserved to them in the Constitution. The purpose and policy of the Republican party has been to weaken the States and to strengthen the Federal authority. General Garfield is in strong sympathy with his party in that respect. He has favored legislation having that tendency. And did you observe that in his speech in response to a serenade, the other evening, he made Alexander Hamilton the one great statesman and leader of thought in the Revolutionary period? To him he attributed the development of every germ in the Constitution of the United States. Without any reservation, I would do great honor to the exalted qualities of Alexander Hamilton—to his brilliant genius, his great accomplishments and his exalted patriotism. But in these times, when principles and habits to which the country has long been accustomed are pushed aside, and things new and striking are substituted; and when grandeur and power are the qualities of government specially admired, I would not support for any important office any man whose opinions and conduct are likely to come under the influence of the political principles of the great leader of the Federal party. I had not looked for it, that so careful a student as General Garfield should rank Alexander Hamilton as the statesman of his day—the great leader of thought, and the author of every germ of the Constitution of the United States.

A very hasty examination of the plan of a constitution prepared by Mr. Hamilton in 1787, will discover the many important and leading features presented by him, which were rejected from the Constitution. He proposed that the President and Senators should hold their offices for life, unless removed upon impeachment. He proposed to subordinate and subjugate the States to the United States by this remarkable provision. Article 8, section 1, says: "The Governor or President of each State shall be appointed under the authority of the United States, and shall have a right to negative all laws about to be passed in the State of which he shall be Governor or President, subject to such qualifications and regulations as the Legislature of the United States shall prescribe." He proposed to define the legislative power of the United States by these words: "The Legislature of the United States shall have power to pass all laws which they shall judge necessary to the common defense and safety, and to the general welfare of the Union." Under such a provision the limit of power would be the judgment and pleasure of the Legislators. The preamble to the constitution, as adopted, declares one of its objects to be to "provide for the common defense,' and to "promote the general welfare;" but it is not made a definition of power; and section 8 of article 1 confers upon Congress the power to raise revenue for the purpose of providing "for the common defense and general welfare of the United States." Then follows an express enumeration of the powers conferred upon Congress. Under Hamilton's plan the powers would have been general, and almost without limit or restriction. In the constitution, as adopted and amended, the powers are delegated, else they are reserved to the States and the people. I can not now go further in this comparison. I have said enough to show the important respects in which Hamilton's plan was not the plan adopted, and to show also, as I think, that he favored a system in which the States would have become insignificant, almost contemptible, whilst the Federal Government would have been aristocratic in its structure and dangerous in its powers. It was not his thought under which the States retained the rights and prerogatives essential to the domestic safety and welfare of the people. To other great statesmen of that period are we indebted for that system of Government which has proved to be the best possible for a large population occupying a country of vast extent and having diversified interests and great varieties of productions. For such a people it was essential to good government to preserve the idea of the regulation of domestic interests and the management of domestic matters by domestic authority—local government for local interests. The contest of that day is renewed in our day. It is now, as then, the struggle between the aristocratic and the democratic idea of government. Now, as then, they tell us we must have a strong government. We agree to that; it must be the strongest in the world—not in standing armies and in the pomp and ceremony of an aristocratic establishment, but strong in the support and devotion of a great people whose allegiance is intensified by love and gratitude for a just and careful protection and preservation of their rights. Have we degenerated, and are we harder to govern than our fathers were, that stern and extraordinary powers must be invoked for our control? Why now must the voting places be surrounded by the military? Why shall the partisan official lay in stealth for the voter? It was not so heretofore. The people of all opinions and parties came together, and with mutual respect and kindness preserved the peace and maintained the purity of the elections. We will go back again to the ways of the good old times.

Why is it that under Federal laws the people are required to respond at distant places to charges that should be heard at home? Oftentimes the defense followed by a quittal is more ruinous to parties and their families than conviction would be at home. If you hold a note against a citizen you must sue him in the County in which he resides. If he have a defense he may then make it at home.

But if you assign that note to a National Bank, the bank may sue him in the United States Court. There he can not afford to defend. He must submit to judgment—it may be to execution and ruin. I cite you these cases for illustration. The Republican candidate believes in these aggressions upon State authority; he believes in the aggrandizement of Federal power. I pray you strike a blow on election day for the plain and efficient ways of the olden time.

I now come to the inquiry, What does the nomination of General Hancock signify? He is a warrior of great distinction. In but one respect does that circumstance commend him to our support for a civil office. The war of the rebellion is over. "Like the dew on the mountain," the great armies are gone, "and forever." The earthworks that marked the fields where dreadful battles were fought have sunk away and disappeared. Nothing remains of the encampment, the march and the battle to arrest the attention of the traveler. There are no battle scars upon the earth's face. But a restored Union remains, and the integrity of the country. There were deep and bitter passion—distrust and hatred, but with the years they were passing away. In that was the disappointment of party ambition. Sectional strife only could give assurance of Radical success. The men of the North were addressed in the language of malignant hatred to stand by the colors and the memories of the war. Hancock's nomination defeats these appeals. Why, he fought in the war; he won battles; he took prisoners; he fell wounded. What more could there be? Many of the men most eloquent in the pretense of anxiety about the honor of the soldier and the results of the war did not fight at all. Presented by two States of the South, and accepted by States of the North, Hancock's nomination means restoration and fraternity. When restoration and fraternity shall once more bind the sections together, the true purposes and results of the war are attained. His election and successful administration will complete a personal record of the greatest and rarest interest. In war he overcame physical resistance and compelled a recognition of public authority. In peace he will overcome the malign influences that distract and divide, and will place the sections in absolute harmony upon the Constitution and the laws. On his shield will then be inscribed: "Peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war."

In his difficult position at New Orleans General Hancock displayed in a high degree the qualities of a civil ruler. He respected, enforced and obeyed the Constitution and the laws. From his youth he has been in the military service, yet he recognizes the supremacy of the civil over the military authority. His letter to General Sherman, recently published, has given great satisfaction to the Democracy of the country, and I believe its sentiments are approved by many of the Republicans. As a candidate I am sure he is highly acceptable to the Democracy of Indiana, and I am confident he will carry the State.

Mr. English, the nominee for Vice President, is a native of this State. He has been much connected with public affairs, and has shown the qualities of deliberation, prudence and strength. He is not extravagant in hope or prodigal in promise, but he does what he undertakes.

The ticket is well received throughout the country, and I think will be elected.

And, my countrymen, do you not think it ought to be elected? Is it not time there should be a change? For twenty years the same party, and largely the same men, have been in power, controlling the offices, collecting and paying out the public moneys, keeping the books and making the reports. The tendency of legislation, until the Democrats obtained control of the House, was to extravagance and favoritism. Class and party have governed. Proscription of all else has been remorseless and relentless. The offices of the country have been used in pay for political services. Largely more than half the white people have been excluded from all positions of honor and emolument, because they are Democrats. The public records should go into new hands for examination. And the policies, habits and practices that have prevailed should be revised and approved. The Constitution forbids the re-election of our Governor at the close of his term; a new man succeeds. Thus the affairs of our State are under constant examination and scrutiny. It is impossible to lose sight of or hide any wrong that may be done.

The bitterest argument made by Carl Schurz in his able speech at Indianapolis was that if successful the Democrats would seek the public offices. And why may they not share the honors and profits of public employment? Are they not citizens, and do they not help to support public authority? Are they not taxed to pay the salaries and other expenses of government, and do they not go forth in war? Are they not patriots? and have they not children whose welfare is identified with the public welfare? But his argument went further, and reached the proposition that the public service is improved by retaining experienced officers. The conclusion is that changes, except for cause, should not be made.

I think he would not make that argument if he and his party were out and another party in. His argument does not rest upon American idea and habit. Our sentiment has been rotation in office; first, because it takes the public service out of ruts and grooves and promotes its purity; and second, because it is fair play. In all countries it is esteemed an honor to be employed in the public service.

It is an honor that should be open to all; qualifications and merit should be the test. I would not displace all. Faithful and efficient officers who attend to duty and not to politics might be retained. But the sentiment once in office always in office is to be repudiated. Would you say that the young men you need not hope? There are no aspirations for you? When those who are now in shall die their sons are ready to take their places? It is politic as it is just, to say to all, merit shall be rewarded. It is well that sometimes fresh blood shall flow into the veins and arteries of the public service.

We now have the hope and prospect of good times again. The Republican leaders claim the credit for it. I will close my address by reading the devout and reverential acknowledgement of God's blessing upon our country made by the late Democratic Convention of this State:

During the past few years our country has been blessed in a high degree with favorable seasons, and the production of our valuable staples has been enormously in excess of our own consumption. We have sold to foreign countries many hundred millions more than we have purchased from them; gold and silver has come to us; business confidence has been restored, and we have the hope and promise of good times again. In all this we recognize the blessing of God upon our country, and we denounce it as false and blasphemous when partisan leaders claim that this is the work of their hands, and that the people should be thankful to them and not grateful to Heaven for our returning prosperity.

The Indianapolis correspondent of the Cincinnati Enquirer says:

"The records of the Justices of the Peace are being ransacked for the lists of ejectments brought by William H. English against non-paying tenants."

And he might have added that Republicans are visiting or writing to all persons with whom Mr. English has had business relations for the last forty years, hoping to fish up something against him. In some instances ignorant parties have been told that money could be made out of Mr. English by the proceedings, the Republican attorney offering to undertake it on the shares, all of which is very contemptible, and will not lose Mr. English a single vote.

He was born in the State, has lived in Indianapolis nearly twenty years, and everybody knows that any just claim could have been made off of him at any time. It is known he pays his debts promptly, and exacts payment of others, just as all men must do who are largely engaged in business.

As for the rent business and ejectment suits, he has not collected a cent of rent, or brought an ejectment suit for five years. His agent, a very worthy Republican, has exclusive charge of that business, and is entirely responsible for whatever is done.—Indianapolis People.

Mr. English and Our Foreign Born Citizens.

[Cincinnati Enquirer, August 12, 1880.]

Citizens of foreign-birth have particular reason to be proud of Mr. English, and to give him their support. It is to him hardly less than to any other man in the country that they owe the full and final recogition of their equal rights with native-born citizens to all the blessings of our institutions. It was he who was foremost in the struggle against that worst and narrowest of ideas, Know-Nothingism. He was the friend of the foreign-born citizen when prejudice and passion were strongest against him—when they were lashed into fury by scheming demagogues, and when the idea had taken a hold upon the people of the country, the strength of grip of which has never been equaled by any other idea. Men who were liberal in other matters were bigoted in their treatment of the foreigner. They professed to see in the rapid peopling of the country from foreign shores latent and terrible dangers, and in their zeal they were carried to the most extreme lengths. Voters of this generation can hardly understand the intensity of the opposition to foreigners which raged from 1852 to 1858. Public men surrendered to it and essayed to lead it for their own advancement. Whole States threw off their allegiance to the old Whig party to give in their adhesion to this most pernicious of ideas. In Indiana, especially, this sentiment became most fierce. The secret, oath-bound organization was everywhere. It pervaded every town and ward and voting precinct. It formed mobs to inflict the worst personal violence upon unoffending men, whose only crime was birth in a foreign land. It burned down dwellings over the heads of innocent women and children. Its frenzy did not even stop short of wanton, unprovoked murder. Foreigners were assaulted when quietly at work, on the highway, or in the shop—or manufactory. They were denied work for no other reason than that they first saw the light in Ireland, or Germany, or France, or some land beyond the seas. It was this condition of affairs into which Mr. English was projected soon after his entrance into public life. And he met it as he has always met every public question, boldly, manfully, and without evincing the slightest desire to dodge or equivocate on this question. He attacked it as a dangerous, damnable heresy. He denounced it as utterly un-American in inception and idea, and as unworthy of any true man. He did this, too, in the face of the almost universal success of this doctrine in every section of Indiana. He made the canvass against Know-Nothingism when to do so was dangerous. It required physical bravery of the highest order. He went into the canvass, carrying his life in his hands in this much-vaudent, peace-loving North. But it required a higher order of bravery; that moral courage which dares to face a mob, to meet the advocates of public ideas, and, meeting them, to tear down their every argument, to present public questions upon their merits and to battle for a principle. And he made the contest strong and fierce, and he made it to win. When every other Democratic member of Congress in Indiana, save one, was subjected to defeat by the adherents of this heresy, Mr. English was re-elected again and again by increased majorities. His constituents appreciated the fact that he had fought boldly against the most dangerous idea which had ever acquired a hold upon American soil. It was his bold fight over this question which first drew attention to him as a strong, bold, well-balanced man, who never surrendered to a pestilent idea—a man who possessed that conservative spirit, and yet that devotion to the principles which underlie our form of government, which go to make the statesman. It is well that our people should be reminded again of the struggle he made for an idea in the past. It is but a promise, an earnest of what the man will do in the future.

English and His Detractors.

[Irish Citizen, Cincinnati, Aug. 7, 1880.]

The Republican press, since the Cincinnati Convention, has concentrated most of its artillery upon Mr. English, and for the reason that he has become wealthy through strict attention to his business. In most other men, this would be deemed evidence of capacity and trustworthiness, for it is to be presumed that he who attends diligently to his own affairs is not likely to be indifferent or remiss, when invested by his fellow countrymen with an office second only to that of the highest in their gift. In epithets which they have hurled at him, they have not scrupled to falsify facts, with the most unblushing effrontery. The story of his donation of one dollar to the Chicago suffers ran the round of the Republican press with characteristic comments, and when it was fairly proven by those who had received the subscription that he had donated $100, there was not one of them who had the candor or manliness to contradict the calumny. They have not touched upon his congressional record, for they know too well that no representative in Congress was more assiduous in attending to his duty and the interests of his constituents; no contracts in the nature of the De Golyer transaction or Credit Mobilier fraud can be urged against him; the wealth he has acquired has been gained in legitimate business pursuits, whereby, in the natural course of trade, others as well as himself have been benefitted. Had he been so minded, he could have represented his District in Congress to this day, and the charge of unpopularity which they have urged is as unfounded as the most baseless of their inventions. No man in Indiana could have been named who could more surely carry a large majority, and we may add that, so far as that State is concerned, almost any other candidate would have been infinitely more acceptable to the Republican leaders. There is a proverb that "no man is a prophet in his own country," but we venture the prediction that when the time comes Mr. English, if not a prophet, will prove a tower of strength to the Democracy. To be sure there is work to be done in securing the State, for even now the wire workers of Garfield are busily engaged in colonizing illegal negro voters; but under the watchful eye of so sagacious an opponent as the Vice President, we have no fear but that their nefarious schemes will be frustrated. If only in this regard the choice of the Cincinnati Convention was most fortunate.

In response to a letter of inquiry as to the situation in Indiana, Hon. W. H. English wrote as follows to a Pennsylvania Democrat:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., August 7, 1880.

MY DEAR SIR:—Never mind the claims and boasts of the Republicans about Indiana. It is all bosh. The Democrats are thoroughly united here, are gaining by conversions, and are only in danger by reason of the importation of negro voters, frauds and the use of great sums of money, which the Republicans are raising with a view to overwhelming the State. But with God's help, we intend to hold the fort.

Yours respectfully,

W. H. ENGLISH.