

SENSIBLE TALK.

Extract from a Speech of Hon. David Turpie, at Indianapolis, Ind.

The country has considered itself under great obligations to corporate interests. They have spanned the oceans and crossed and recrossed the continent, and they have received a vaster return than many imagine. I don't refer now to the subsidies of land or money, but the franchises they have been granted without stint, for if there is any power which has not been granted to corporations it has been simply because it has not been asked for. There has been no restriction—such has been the course of public feeling, and such has been Republican policy for the past twenty-five years. Now, fellow-citizens, I think it is time to retrace our steps and go in another direction; and when we have given the same kind of study and care and attention to the rights and interests of labor, and of those interests which affect flesh and blood as they are related to these corporations, and always must be—when we have done that—those parties will be placed more upon an equality. In Indiana we have had some Democratic administration; we have a mechanic's lien, and made weekly or monthly payments of employees compulsory, and made claims for labor preferred debts. We must dig down deep into the lives of wage-workers and see to it that both by State and national legislation the right to live, at least, in this country of freedom shall be guaranteed beyond all risk of injury. I hope for the peaceable adjustment of the troubles between organized capital and labor, because I hope well of my country and of my countrymen. The Christianity and public conscience of the age will demand that capital shall concede something. I believe, fellow-citizens, that both sides are capable of self-government, and self-government means self-sacrifice. Public opinion formulated in the law must be the measure of that self-renunciation, and the parties must yield in the interest of peace and order. We have a savor in Democratic doctrine, usage, and tradition—a savor in this example of a Democratic President—a savor of health, security, and repose, which time and patience will at last establish and secure.

Not only were the rights of labor particularly brought to the front by the President in his message to Congress. Look at the action of the Executive upon the question of the public domain. Trespassers have been driven from it, and 50,000,000 acres of lands forfeited by grants heretofore made to corporations which have failed to comply with the condition of the grants have been recovered to the Government. The last land grant has been made to corporations. The last land grab has been accomplished, and the public lands are hereafter to be reserved for actual settlers. This is one of the great measures in the history of the progress of that reformation which I think is to be carried through all departments of the Government.

I think much of the criticism made upon the President with respect to removals and appointments is not justly founded. You must remember we have an act upon the statute-book, passing during the Republican administration, called the civil-service reform act, whose leading feature would entitle it to the name of "perpetual tenure of office act." By its provisions persons who apply for positions under the Government must pass an examination as to scholastic competency. There is no objection to that. But the great feature in the act is that after having so passed and secured a position they are not to be removed except for cause. The whole civil service is to be put upon the plan of officers in the army and navy. To that part of the enactment we have an undivided opposition. It is casting the country too much into the mold of a monarchy to appoint 14,000 for life; we might as well appoint the rest for life, and so finish. It is a practical disfranchisement of the remainder of the people. I believe the right to vote includes and embraces in it the right to be voted for, and every citizen has the same right, other things being equal, to aspire to any position in the political civil service. While these are mine, and I feel confident they are your sentiments, we can not blame the Chief Magistrate for enforcing existing laws, for he has sworn to execute the law. The remedy is to repeal the law which is obnoxious to public sentiment. And besides this obstacle in the way of a thorough change of Federal appointments, the Executive is not only tied by a statute, but also tied by Senatorial consent and discretion. One large class of officers are not removable under an existing law, and all others are not effectively removable without the consent of a political body hostile to the President of the United States. Instead of being a matter of criticism it might be a matter of surprise that so much has been done as has already been accomplished. It is a common saying that we are now living under a Democratic administration. I regret, deeply regret, to say that statement is not true. It is a misconception, it is an error, and the sooner the public mind is disabused of that error the better. Under existing circumstances we can not have Democratic administration. It is true in November, 1884, we elected a distinguished citizen, a gentleman fully imbued with Democratic principles and truly loyal to Democratic tenets and tradition, who was then Governor of the State of New York, to the Presidency of the United States; and it is true at the same time we elected to the second office Thomas A. Hendricks, of Indiana, one whose whole life had been given to the advocacy of Democratic rights and interests; and it is true at the same time we elected to the House in the second branch of the Government a large majority of gentlemen of the same political faith and sentiment. But a President and Vice President and a House of Representatives do not make an administration. They could not alone administer the Government a single day. They could pass no law, inaugurate no policy, nor appropriate a dollar from the Treasury by their action alone. There is still a large and important branch of the National Government which was against us in 1884, and is against us yet—the Senate of the United States. How far this adverse element has prevented or may prevent this administration from being Democratic no man can say. Under the Constitution of the United States its office is to advise and assist the President in the discharge of certain executive duties. But there is nothing necessarily of an obstructive character in its sessions, whether public or private. The trouble is not in the Senate as such, but in

the political character of the men who compose it. What, then, remains as part of our duty in Indiana? I am not one of those who think the great political reaction that commenced in this country in 1884 by our success is to take one step backward. I believe it will move forward. I believe Democratic success will come. It may be hindered, it may be retarded, but it will arrive at last. We must put such construction upon public judgment as shall touch and reach the Senate of the United States before we can have a Democratic administration and before we can carry the principles of Democratic reform into the different departments of the Government, where they have been so long denied and needed. In Indiana we have a part to do in that work. And we must send from Indiana to the Senate of the United States a man who will help to do that. And let us send to the National House of Representatives gentlemen who will aid and help President Cleveland. This is our duty, and this will be our pleasure. You will all be with me in that. Let us form the column, dress the line, draw the sword, throw away the scabbard and battle once again for Democratic truth and justice.

FRANK HURD INTERVIEWED.

The Tariff Issue Upon Which Parties Must Henceforth Be Formed.

Ex-Congressman Frank Hurd, of Toledo, Ohio, was recently interviewed by a New York reporter. Said he:

"I consider the action of the Democrats in the House who refused to vote with Morrison on the question of bringing up the tariff bill as inexcusable. It means a serious rupture in the Democratic party. What will be the result? Why, everything is tending toward a tariff issue, and the lines will be tightly drawn. Randall and those Democrats who believe in protection will have to leave their party and join the Republicans. They will find no other alternative in the end. At present, and possibly for a short time in the future, they may call themselves Democrats and have platforms doctored to suit their tariff ideas, but that will not last long. When the issue boldly faces them—free trade or protection—they will have to go with the Republicans and protection. Then the triumph of the Democratic doctrines will be assured. On the single issue of tariff or free trade every Western State, with the exception of Ohio and Minnesota (the latter is Republican, but free trade), will declare unmistakably for Democracy and free trade. It is narrowing down to that, and nothing can change the result. Five years ago I could not get an audience to listen to me when I spoke on the question of free trade; they did not care anything about it. To-day it is just the reverse. Everybody desires to hear that issue discussed. Michigan went Democratic two years ago solely on that ground. Whenever it becomes the only political issue the Democrats will win every time. Of course President Cleveland favors tariff reform—he is with the Democrats. If he desires re-nomination he can get it."

Those Confederate Bonds.

"The proposition brought forward for the holders of Confederate bonds by Judge Fullerton, that this Government is bound or ought to pay those bonds," said Representative Daniel, of Virginia, to a Washington Post reporter, "is as palpable and eccentric an absurdity as the frivolous wit of man can invent. In the first place the amendment to the Federal Constitution forbids it, and that alone disposes of the question. In the second place, the United States Supreme Court has decided that Confederate securities never had a legal constitutional existence; and that settles them. In the third place, the theory of the war was that the Confederate States had no legal existence. The victors in the war would as soon think of reviving the Confederacy as of paying its debts, and the men who were Confederates are as little disposed as their former foes to pay them. In the fourth place, there is no law, no equity, no principle of honor, and no reason of expediency to suggest that the United States or that anybody should pay the Confederate debt."

"Was it generally understood that the validity of the debt depended on the validity of the Government that assumed to contract it?"

"Certainly, everybody knew that. The Confederate bonds—at least, such as I have seen—expressed this on their face, being payable at a specified time 'after a treaty of peace between the Confederate States and the United States of America.' That treaty never took place. The bonds, by their terms, are not yet due, and will never be due. But, apart from all this, the United States has already made England pay the Alabama claims, based on pretensions that negative the idea that the Government will ever pay a debt contracted to fight it. It is an idle waste of time to discuss this question, and minds to which the proposition made is not an arrant absurdity would never understand the arguments presented. Evidently speculators are trying to make a turn in Confederate bonds; and evidently, also, only the ignorant and unwaried will be caught by such chaff as is thrown before them. Judge Fullerton is an able lawyer, and I have no idea that he can entertain the slightest notion of success. He speaks for clients, as he has a right to do, and his clients have a right to be heard if they want to be; but they are on the wildest kind of a wild-goose chase, and if they expect the United States to pay them anything they are themselves the wildest kind of wild geese."

The Duty of Party Leaders.

It is not a very good Democrat who will allow disappointment in the matter of distribution of offices or his personal feelings with another Democrat to overshadow his loyalty to the success of the party that represents his political principles to a degree that would make the disappointment or preference contributory to their defeat. The majority of people are Democrats or Republicans through convictions on certain measures or principles involving their ideas of how government should be administered. As a whole, these masses care neither for individuals, their quarrels, nor the offices, that at best can affect but the slightest few. They do, however, care for their principles, and they confide them to the management of leaders in the full strength of their honest conviction, and ask nothing more from them than that these convictions be stamped upon the Government as its political policy. They do not care how they dispose of the offices, but they ask that their principles be not sacrificed. They do not know of nor care about the personal differences of those to whom they confide their leadership, except that they be not dragged into them or be sacrificed on account of them. —*Indianapolis Sentinel.*

DEATH OF JUDGE DAVIS.

He Passes Away Peacefully, Surrounded by His Relatives and Friends.

Sketch of His Career as a Jurist, a Statesman, and a Citizen.

Judge David Davis passed peacefully away at his home in Bloomington, Ill., on the morning of Saturday, June 26. An hour or so before his death he talked incoherently for some time. His family and friends in the house were around his bedside and he passed into death as if going to sleep. Judge Davis' physician says the immediate cause of his death was a spipela which first appeared April 30, but that diabetes,



which must have been insidiously working for two years, was the primary cause, and to it is attributed his rapid decline in flesh a week before the end came. He had been under the care of Dr. George P. Davis, his only son, George P. Davis, and wife; his only daughter, Mrs. Sarah D. Swayne, and husband; his granddaughter, Alice S. Davis; his niece, Mrs. Fannie Pierpont; his cousin, John M. Walker; and his old friend, Frank D. Orme, of Washington, were present at his death.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

A Short Sketch of Judge Davis' Busy Life.

Judge David Davis was born in Cecil County, Maryland, March 9, 1815. He received a careful education in the best American schools of the early part of the century. He studied law with Judge Bishop in Lennox, Mass., and afterward in the law school in New Haven, Conn., graduating as the first of his class. Judge Davis removed to Bloomington, Ill., in 1836, being then 21 years of age. His home was in that city from that date until his death. He soon gained prominence as a lawyer and local politician. In 1845 he was elected to the Illinois Legislature.

He was a member of no party, and he soon attracted attention by his conscientious work and his freedom of action on all questions.

He was chosen to the Constitutional Convention of 1847, and the next year elected Judge of the Eighth Judicial Circuit of Illinois. He was re-elected to this office in 1855, and again in 1861. His capacity for work and his clear-cut decisions soon became proverbial all over the State and beyond its borders. He and Abraham Lincoln became warm friends long before the latter rose to more than local prominence. He became one of Lincoln's most ardent supporters for the Presidency and took an important place in national affairs as adviser of Lincoln after Lincoln's election to the Vice Presidency. Lincoln appointed Judge Davis Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States Dec. 8, 1862. After Lincoln's death Judge Davis became administrator of his estate. At the National Convention of the labor reform party held in Columbus, Ohio, Feb. 21, 1872, Judge Davis was nominated for President of the United States, the candidate for Vice President on the same ticket being Joel Parker, of New Jersey. When the Liberal Republicans nominated Horace Greeley for President at the Cincinnati Convention of the same year, Judge Davis, who had been a candidate before the same convention, receiving 92½ votes on the first ballot, withdrew from the field. Judge Davis remained on the Supreme Court bench until 1877, when he resigned to take a seat in the United States Senate. He had been elected to that body by the Illinois and Democrats of the Third General Assembly of Illinois. After the death of President Garfield, Judge Davis was chosen President of the Senate, in which position he was virtually Vice President of the United States. Soon after retiring from the Senate in 1883, he was married to a niece of Judge Green, member of Congress from North Carolina. From that time to his demise he resided quietly at his home in Bloomington.

REMINISCENT.

Judge Davis' Early Career—Characteristics of the Citizen and the Judge.

"I have known David Davis since 1848," remarked Hon. Leonard Swett, of Chicago, at which time he came into public prominence. His first appearance was as a member of the constitutional convention. In the same year he was chosen Circuit Judge of the Eighth Illinois District.

Judge Davis, Abraham Lincoln, John T. Stewart, John J. Hardin, Stephen T. Logan, Edward D. Baker, Edward Hannigan, Daniel W. Voorhees, Kirby Benedict, Edward Jones, David B. Campbell and myself were the company that the attorney would only go through a lottery or two and then drop out. Lincoln and I accompanied Judge Davis throughout the entire circuit. We would travel on horseback, generally, and would invariably put up at one hotel.

"Continually thrown in intimate companion ship with Lincoln and Davis, I came to know both well. They were antipodal natures, but the closest of friends. Davis was the most positive, decisive character, taking his positions firmly, and holding to them tenaciously and doggedly. Lincoln was suave and more yielding. Both were princes of geniality and capital story-tellers. Each had a fund of stories that seemed inexhaustible, and never lacked appropriateness, nor loss of relativity in the telling. The intimacy found in the Eighth Circuit, may be found the foundation of both Lincoln's and Davis' after greatness."

"The strong points in Davis' character, as exhibited in his whole career, public and private, were many. He had the keenest foresight. Away back in 1840 he saw this State as we now see it. To-day he is a very rich man, worth probably \$8,000,000. I don't know; no one does. He never made a dollar in trade; never made a trade in which he was not worsted. He did not know how to make a bargain, and seldom if ever tried. He knew good land when he saw it. He made all his money entering land. His present magnificent farm of 1,000 acres in McLean County cost him about \$3,000 acre."

"I remember once a case that illustrates him very well. In 1855, Felt of Indianapolis was a member of the down-grade. Mr. Davis received a note from some Eastern party against Felt, which he was instructed to collect. Felt and Davis were friends. On investigation, Davis found there were no resources, save an eighty-acre piece of ground near Chicago. Felt offered to give up the land for the note. Without a moment's hesitation Davis accepted. When the Eastern party came out he was incensed at losing the note for a worthless piece of swamp. Davis agreed to take the land himself and pay the amount of the note in cash. This offer was accepted. That eighty acre tract lies between the city and the stock-yards, and is of incalculable value."

"Davis excelled as a Judge. It was his natural sphere. He was more like John Marshall than any of the common law produced. Of Marshall it is related that he would listen attentively to an argument, catch at once the point,

and say: 'That's it. That's the law exactly.'

"Now look up an authority or two." It was just so with Davis. He took the law as a greyhound takes the scent. He never relied on a knowledge

of authorities, and never allowed his legal

lore to smother his common-sense perception of equity and justice."

HOT WORDS IN THE HOUSE.

Morrison, Randall, and Bragg Indulge in a Lively Tilt on the Tariff Question.

The Illinois Free-Trader Calls the Pennsylvania Protectionist a Traitor—The Latter Retorts in Kind.

In the National House of Representatives, on Tuesday, June 22, Mr. Morrison called up the proposed change of rule providing that every general pension bill may be amended by the addition of a provision for the imposition of a tax to meet the expenditure required by the bill.

In advocating the proposition, Mr. Morrison argued that its adoption was absolutely necessary unless Congress was prepared to grant pensions and leave the Government without the means to pay them. He referred to the immense sums paid out for pensions since the war and the large amounts necessary for present and future requirements, and said that the gentleman from New York (Mr. Hiscock) and other gentlemen on both sides of the House had predicted that for the next fiscal year there would be a deficit of \$14,000,000.

Mr. Reed (Me.) expressed surprise that this rule was not adopted in reference to pensions alone. There was not a practical man in the House who did not know that the proposed rule would be fastened upon every pension bill some method of taxation which would prove obnoxious to men who might want to vote for the measure. He for one was not willing to enter on such an invidious course.

Mr. Hiscock said that the Democratic party had not redeemed a single pledge it had made, but had stood cowering before the country admitting that it was powerless to lift any burden from the people; that it had spent all the money, and that empty vaults were the fruit of Democratic victory. [Applause on the Republican side.] He wished to emphasize that a Democratic Congress had been in session for six months, and that the Republicans had not confessed that it had known nothing about the receipts of the Government, and was incompetent to carry out any of its promises and pledges. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Messrs. Laird (Neb.), Cutcher and Burrows (Mich.), and Henderson (Iowa), opposed the change.

Mr. Bragg (Wis.) expressed delight at a reference made by Mr. Reed to the failure of the House to consent to consider revenue bills, saying:

"I am delighted because it shows what sort of contempt the Republicans of this House feel for those who have been recreant to their faith and their pledges. While they are received with open arms, with a hearty welcome, and a hearty endorsement for the act they have done they are thoroughly despised for their political defection. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Continuing, he said that he had seen the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. Henderson) take out the old hobby-horse to be ridden around again and danced about for the benefit of claim agents' newspapers to be circulated among that class of men whose vote the Republicans thought could be bought by a pretense that the Republicans were the soldiers' friends. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Bragg (imitating the Republicans)—"Oh! oh! oh!" Why was it that when you had a wo-words majority in this House, when the war was on, when men were suffering from wounds everywhere, when you placed a limitation on pensions, and provided that every pension not presented within five years should only commence to draw pension from the date of application? Who did that? Will you answer me? "Oh! oh! oh!" It was the Republican party. "Oh! oh! oh!" Who was it that repealed the arrears limitation and paid the soldiers whose claims were pending from the date of disability? It was the Democratic party? "Oh! oh!"

Continuing, he maintained that there was nothing in the pending proposition looking to a refusal of pensions to soldiers. It did not refuse to grant pensions, but it provided for their payment. When gentlemen sprang from the field and cried out that it was an attack upon the soldiers, they were attempting, under the guise of friendship for the soldier element, to protect the bondholders to protect those men who, during the war, fattened on the blood of men in the field, and as contractors filled their purses. [Laughter and applause on Democratic side.]

Mr. Randall—I did not intend to indulge in any further discussion of this subject, and I would not except for the language used by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I stand here his peer in every respect, with connection as pure as he can possibly have [applause on Republican side], participated in by the Democrats who followed Mr. Randall's lead previously, and I have courage to maintain them. How is this question? Some years ago we had the same controversy, and I cast my vote then as I cast it on Thursday—from conviction. I resisted anything that tended to free trade, and the United States and the world of labor to American laborers. [Applause on the Republican side.] We were condemned in some quarters for that vote. I went with the rest of you [addressing the Democratic side] to a national convention, where I was told that I would have no Republicans to help me. What was the result of that convention? Does any man here attempt to say that the measure reported to this House by the Committee on Ways and Means is in harmony with the spirit of that convention, or the enunciations of those who took the stump in its behalf? No. I am just to-day where I stood then. I am in favor of a revision of the tariff and the lowering of rates of duty, and a repeal in part of internal taxes, upon which we have been in accordance with the Chicago platform.

Mr. Morrison—The gentleman from Pennsylvania claims that no bill is fair and in the spirit of the Chicago platform that does not present him an opportunity of voting on internal revenue taxes, and again and again he makes his promise as to what he would do; and we are reproached by the other side because at Chicago we pledged ourselves against the repeal of the tariff. The gentleman from Pennsylvania had gone out of his way to say that the proposition presented by the Ways and Means Committee was not within the spirit of the Chicago platform.

Mr. Hewitt declared that the measure reported by the Ways and Means Committee was in accordance with the Chicago platform.

Mr. Morrison—The gentleman from Pennsylvania claims that no bill is fair and in the spirit of the Chicago platform that does not present him an opportunity of voting on internal revenue taxes, and again and again he makes his promise as to what he would do; and we are reproached by the other side because at Chicago we pledged ourselves against the repeal of the tariff.

The court-house at Salem was sold at public auction for \$285. Alfred Shrum was the purchaser. It was built in 1828, and was in its day one of the finest buildings of the kind in the State. It has shown signs, of late, of giving way. Mr. Shrum has commenced to remove it.

A can containing a quantity of dynamite was discovered under the New Harmony Church, near Leota, Scott County, and was taken by some boys to a safe distance and exploded. Several attempts have been made before to destroy the building.

A thief entered the boot and shoe store of J. L. Wolf, at Elkhart, and stole about \$150 in cash from the safe, which he succeeded in opening. It is supposed that the thief had, by some means, secured the combination and duplicate keys.

<p