LOCAL.

Half fares will pass those attending the University Commencement.

Henry Corriher of Atwell's Township, reports cotton at his house with 8 leaves.

Several valuable contributions from distant correspondents unavoidably crowded out of this paper. Such of them as will not spoil by keeping shall appear hereafter.

"VILLA FRANCA"—P. O. only 15 or 16 miles distant, ought to receive a package from this office every week with perfect regularity, but we learn it does not. Where does it lodge?

Round trip tickets to Thomasville will be sold on the North Carolina railroad to persons wishing to attend the commencement exercises of the Female College on the 2nd, 3d and 4th of June, good for six days.

A STRAY.—There is a stray sow at Mrs. Jessy Trodden's which the owner is advised to call and take away. She is black, with a crop and a hole in the left ear, and has three pigs following her.

TOBIAS KESTLER.—We are glad to learn that this citizen of Providence Township, who has been for weeks a terrible sufferer from carbuncle on the back of his neck, is now out of danger and convalescent.

"THE COMET."—The book bearing this title by the late H. W. GRIDIN, of Lincolnton, N. C., has again come into notice by the press, and is pronounced by a distinguished western gentleman, "the most remarkable book I ever read."

Mr. HARVEY DEAL, and Miss REBECCA CORRELL, were married in Raleigh Wednesday evening. They are both well and favorably known here, and we feel authorized to tender them the congratulations of their Salisbury friends. They will make Charlotte their home.

To-morrow is the day appointed to strew flowers on the graves of the Federal dead in the Cemetery at this place. There will be Excursion trains from Charlotte and from Swananoa to accommodate those who desire to take part in the ceremonies of the occasion.

Dr. I. W. Jones, of this vicinity, is collecting Indian relics which he proposes to send to Col. C. C. Jones, of Augusta, Ga., who is writing a book on the Indians of the Southern portion of the country. The relics picked up here and there in every neighborhood almost, brought together and compared, it is believed will shed much light on the antiquities of the country.

STATE CONVENTION Y. M. C. A.—We received this morning a circular from the Secretary of the State Ex. Com. of the Young Men's Christian Association, from which we learn that the third annual convention of this body of christian workers will be held in Salisbury, commencing Thursday June 26th, and continuing until Sabbath following. It will be an occasion of unusual interest to the religious public.

FOUND DEAD.—Jesse L. Trexler, aged about 40 years, left the house of Geo. Miller, a brother-in-law, Wednesday, May 14th, taking with him a bundle of clothes and an axe, and was not heard of again until his dead body was found in a piece of woods, two miles from his starting point. His body was found in a path leading to John Long's place. He had been dead for a week, it is supposed, and was only recognized by his clothing, his bundle and his axe. A coroner's jury examined the case and returned death from natural causes.

Enochville Items.

Rev. J. B. Davis, D. D., of Mt. Pleasant, preached a very able and instructive sermon here last Sunday. On the same day, W. E. Litaker, the superintendent of the Sunday school resigned his position and A. Yost, Esq., was elected to fill his place.

The closing exercises of the Academy at this place will come off the 6th day of June. The public is invited to attend and a good time is expected. W.

South River Ripples.

Franklin Township is investing in $30. plows.

Crops are looking well. The recent rains have given new life, not only to the vegetable kingdom but to the animal and "mineral."

The closing exercises of "Hall's Academy" will take place on Friday night the 6th of June. There will be two prizes awarded: One for scholarship and one for the best conduct. In connection with the exhibition there will be a Tableaux. F. S. S.

For the Watchman.

Local Option—"Truth Conquers."

MR. EDITOR: The article in the *Watchman* of the 18th inst., giving a "Statement of the Question" and a "summing up" of the discussion has not been answered. The challenge, contained in it, to show that a defence of the liquor traffic has been made, or, in lieu of that, to defend it, has not been accepted. No attempt has been made to *prove* that anything contained in the article in question is either true or false. It still stands untouched. True, it drew forth a response in the way of a "summing up" of its author, in which the said author is "terribly used up" after the manner in which all true reformers of every age and nation have been "terribly used up" by the "blind leaders of the blind." In the order of things a barren tree is never pelted with stones. A fruit-bearing tree is pelted with stones and that pelting is what makes its fruit available. So it is all right. An attack on the workman does not undo his work. Persecution is always behind time; it seeks to destroy the sower after he has sown his seed. If the seed is vital with truth it is immortal and the harvest is all the greater if watered with the sower's blood.

Nimrod, Jr., wrote in the belief that he was only the amanuensis of that invulnerable and immortal genius whose name is Truth, of whom 'tis said:

"Truth crushed to earth will *rise* again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
While error wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshipers."

therefore, the demonstration that his "faith is well founded" is contained in the philosophy of that honest confession,

"The harder you do throw him down,
The higher he do bounce!"

When "the Greeks" thus strike their colors and "bring gifts" the question of victory is settled. "Let not Ulio that putteth on the harness boast as he that taketh it off." I now lay mine aside. *Vivere est vincere.*

NIMROD, JR.

MR. EDITOR,—Through the medium of your columns, the officers and congregation of the 1st Baptist Church, colored, in Salisbury, desire to express their heartfelt regrets, at the departure of their minister, the Rev. A. M. Conway, from the scene of Pastoral labors for nearly 4 years, to the 1st Baptist Church, colored, of Wilmington. The Rev. Mr. Conway has labored among us with great zeal and success, bringing many souls within his church, and thus largely contributed to the extension and influence of the Baptist Church here. May he be rewarded, with even greater success, in his new field of operation.

JOHN W. BARTON
OSCAR SUMNER
WASHINGTON HENDERSON
CALVIN HARRIS.

SPEECH OF

HON. ZEBULON B. VANCE,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

In The Senate Of The United States,

MONDAY, MAY 19, 1879.

The Senate having under consideration the bill (H. B. No. 2) making appropriations for the legislative, executive and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, and for other purposes—

Mr. Vance said:

MR. PRESIDENT: Before entering upon the remarks which I propose to make, I am requested to say, and that request accords with my own inclination in the matter, that the school literature refered to by the Senator from Maine [Mr. Blaine] is non-existent in the Southern States. During the war there was some literature of that kind prevalent, but even then it met with little favor, and I am assured that since the war no child, white or black, in the Southern States has ever seen any such literature.

And now, Mr. President, it seems to be the peculiar misfortune of the section from which I come, and I believe it to be also the misfortune of the whole country, that no question in any way pertaining to the South or originating with any representative from the South has been able to obtain a fair hearing in these halls upon its merits. Indeed it would seem as if the day for that kind of discussion had passed away forever. I had been taught to believe that the object of all discussion was mischievous if that was not the object to be attained. If this indeed be so, I might appeal with confidence to every fair-minded man in the United States who hears or reads our debates here and ask if the discussion of the question now before the Senate has been fairly or logically handled with the view to ascertain the truth. It is proposed—

First. By the legislation which is now in part before us and which has been, to repeal the laws under which authority is assumed to interfere with the elections of the country by the use of the military.

Second. To repeal the laws by which the United State marshals and supervisors were authorized to control the elections of the country.

Third. To repeal the law requiring jurors in the federal courts to take the test oath.

Now, these are the questions, plain and simple, which have engaged the attention of the American Congress and the people for the last three months. Common sense and a decent regard for the public interest require that they should receive at our hand the calmest and most dispassionate consideration which it is in our power to to bestow upon them; that they should be abstracted and dissociated from every passion or prejudice and viewed solely with regard to their effect upon the public welfare. Has this been done? The record of our proceedings is evidence that it has not. The staple of the arguments in opposition has been as wide of this object as it is possible for human imagination to conceive. One Senator, in his argument, cries out *rebellion*; another cries out *secession*; another exclaims, with alarm, that *rebel soldiers* are here in these halls; another claims that the North pays the larger part of the direct taxes, and nearly all of the taxes collected on imports; another sees a goblin in the shape of a Democratic caucus; another holds up his hands in holy horror in contemplating the fact that there is absolutely a Democratic majority in both branches of Congress; and yet another sees ruin in a solid South; and last, but not least, one Senator exclaims in the famine of argument, "Jefferson Davis;" and that is the contribution that he furnishes to the literature of the country.

These various and logical appeals have not even the merit that the old negro groom attributed to John Minor Botts's race-horses; for when taunted with the fact that his horses could not beat anything, he congratulated himself that at all events they could beat each other! These apologies for arguments cannot even beat each other in absurdity. An honest judge will be compelled to decide that the race is a drawn one and all bets are off.

If our proceedings, Mr. President, were in the nature of a complaint and answer there is not a court in the land but would be compelled to order that the answer put in here by the Republican defendants to these bills be stricken out as frivolous, and that a judgment be rendered in favor of the plaintiffs. I will not recapitulate the arguments in favor of these bills. They are before the country, and will be properly judged in due season. I desire only to make a few observations in reply to these sectional appeals.

Mr. President, who made the South solid? The answer is as plain and unmistakeable as it is possible to make anything to the human intellect: the Republican party is responsible for this thing. At the beginning of the late war almost the entire Whig party of the South, with a large and influential portion of the Democratic, were in favor of the Union, and deprecated with their whole souls the attempt at its destruction, but through love of their native States and sympathy with their kindred and neighbors, they were drawn into the support of the war. What became of them after the war? Their wisdom in opposing it was justified by the ruinous results; their patriotism and courage were highly appreciated, and when peace came this class were in high favor at the South, while the secessionists as the original advocates of a disastrous policy were down in public estimation.

If you gentlemen of the North had then come forward with liberal terms and taken these men by the hand, you would have established a party in the South that would have perpetuated your power in this government for a generation, provided you had listened to the views of those men and respected their policy on questions touching their sections. But you pursued the very opposite course; a course which compelled almost every decent, intelligent man of Anglo-Saxon prejudices and traditions to take a firm and determined stand against you; a course which consolidated all shades of political opinion into one resolute mass to defend what they conceive to be their ancient forms of government, laws, liberties, and civilization itself. By confiscation and the destruction of war, you had already stripped us of property to the extent of at least $3,000,000,000, and left our land desolate, rent, and torn, our homes consumed with fire and our pleasant places a wasted wilderness.

Peace then came—no, not peace, but the end of war came—no, not the end of war, but the end of legitimate, civilized war; and for three years you dallied with us. One day we were treated as though we were in the Union and as though we had legitimate State governments in operation; another day we were treated as though we were out of the Union and our State governments were rebellious usurpations. It was the regular game of "Now you see it, and now you don't." We were in the Union for all purposes of oppression; we were out of it for all purposes of protection. Finally, seeing that we still remained Democratic, the Union was desolved by act of Congress and we were formally legislated outside in order that you might bring us into the Union again in such a way as to guarantee us a republican form of government, that is, that we should vote the Republican ticket; and you cited article 4, section 4, of the constitution, as your authority to do this. You deposed our State governments and ejected from office every official from Governor to township constable, and remitted us to a state of chaos in which the only light of human authority for the regulation of human affairs and the control of human passions was that which gleamed from the polished point of the soldier's bayonet. Under this simple and easily comprehened system of jurisprudence so consonant to the great assertion of the great declaration, that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," you began and completed the task of guaranteeing to us a "republican" form of government. You disfranchised at least ten per cent. of our citizens, embracing the wisest, best, and most experienced. You enfranchised our slaves, the lowest and most ignorant; and you placed over them as leaders a class of men who have attained to the highest positions of infamy known to modern ages.

In order to preserve the semblance of consent, conventions were called to form new constitutions, the delegates to which were chosen by this new and unheard-of constituency. The military counted the votes, often at the headquarters in distant States, the general in command determining the election and qualifications of the delegates. Many of these delegates were negroes, on whom the right to vote and hold office had not yet been bestowed. They framed constitutions in which they gave themselves this right, and it was submitted for ratification to the same constituency who chose the delegates, and none other—that is to say, they propounded the question whether they should vote and hold office to themselves, and decided this question by their own votes, while white men were not permitted to vote. Perhaps the annals of the race from which we spring, with all its various branches spread throughout the world, cannot furnish such a parody upon the principles of free government based upon the consent of the governed.

These constitutions were declared adopted by the general in command. Perhaps they were adopted. And at the same election, so called, were also chosen State officers for a long term of years, and chosen by the same constituency. The new governments went to work, and in the short space of four years they plundered those eleven Southern States to the extent of $262,000,000; that is to say, they took all that we had that was amenable to larceny, and they would have taken more doubtless, but for the same reason that the weather could not get any colder in Minnesota, as described by a returned emigrant from that State, "because the thermometer was too short." [Laughter.] And now recalling these facts and a hundred more which I cannot now name, can any candid man wonder that old Whigs and Democrats, Union men and secessionist, should unite in a desperate effort to throw off the dominion of a party which had inflicted these things upon them? And your military interference, your abuse, and your denunciation continue unto this day.

Can you wonder that your following in that country has dwindled into insignificance? The negro alone is your friend there, and a very few whites, and his eyes, blinded as they have been, are steadily opening to the great truth which you ought to have taught him, that his prosperity and welfare are inseparably connected with that of his white neighbors. One by one the Northern adventurers who led them have packed their carpet-bags and silently stolen back to the slums of Northern society, whence they originated, and the lonely native Republican makes his solitary lair in some custom house or postoffice or revenue headquarters. The broad, free, bright world outside of these retreats in all the South is Democratic, thanks to you, the Republican party of the North. It would be well enough for Republican leaders to remember that the inflexible law of compensation exists in politics as well as in all things else. If we violate the laws of health, we suffer bodily pains or early dissolution; if we violate the laws of society, we suffer in public esteem; if we violate the laws of man, we are subject to its pains and penalties; if we violate the laws of God, we will suffer the penalties of sin; if we violate the laws of nature, we can reap none of the benefits which our knowledge of them now enable us to derive therefrom. So it is in politics. You outraged all of our sensibilities in your treatment of us, and we naturally became your political enemies. There is no impunity for transgression.

You now affect to treat the presence of representative Southern men in these halls as both an intrusion and a calamity, and the tone of your speeches will induce an intelligent stranger sitting in these galleries for the last three months to believe that you were sorry you spent so much blood and treasure to force us back into the Union. Is this realy true? Do you regret that the proper sentiment of society in the South is represented here? And rather than this should be, would you prefer that the South had staid where she tried to go? I hope not. For the sake of your patriotism, I hope not. Had you rather that the Union had been lost than that you should lose power? Was it the Union you fought for, or was it political supremacy? Notwithstanding the wild blasts of alarm which you are sounding throughout the length an breadth of this vast country, you well know the only danger which our presence here indicates is the danger of your being ousted from political power. In what way can the Democracy injure this country? What motive have we to injure it? Having surrendered the doctrine of secession and abandoned any intention whatsoever to divide this Union, how could we expect that the Democracy to which we belong could obtain and hold the control of the government except by showing the people by our acts that we are patriotically desirous of promoting its welfare and its glory. But you say you distrust these expressions. My friends, in your hearts you do not. On the contrary, a man who has offered his blood once for his plighted faith you believe when he plights his faith again. There is not a Southern rebel, no matter how bitter and rampant he may have been, that you have not received with arms wide spread, and rewarded with offices of honor and trust, who came to you with craven repentance on his tongue, ready to vote the Republican ticket and eating dirt with the same gluttonous appetite with which he once ate fire. You profess to believe him, but you despise him in your hearts. You are not alarmed to receive him, and you cast no suspicions upon his professions of sincerity, though, as has more than once happened, he asks you to believe he tells the truth to-day because he told a lie yesterday.

Mr. President, it seemed to me not a little hard and inhospitable that Southern Senators whose States were forced back into the Union should be so often twitted with their presence on this floor. We are here in obedience to the constitution and the Union, and if I recollect aright some of the Senators on this floor came to the South to invite us back into these halls. And I have a distinct recollection that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Logan] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Burnside] came all the way down to North Carolina to invite that State to send Senators here, and they came attended with such a numerous retinue and were so urgent in their solicitation that I, for one, found it impossible to resist so weighty an invitation. [Laughter.]

Mr. Logan. When I got here I did not find you. [Laughter.]

Mr. Vance. But I came as soon as I could. [Laughter.] The honorable Senator found me, and he would not open the door for me after he had invited me. [Laughter.]

Now that we are here the Senator from Illinois complains of our presence, and the Senator from New York accuses us of wishing to "dominate" at the feast to which we have been invited, and says that we are like McGregor, who claimed that the head of the table was wherever he sat. For one I disclaim all desire to dominate at the feast, unless, indeed, voting for Democratic measures be domination. I do desire, however, to be equally honored with the other guests. And I desire, in vindication also of the good name and rude hospitality of McGregor, to say that in my opinion he would have been the last man in all Scotland,riever and cattle-lifter as he was, to invite a man into his house and up to his board and then denounce him for being there.

Mr. President, would there be any real danger to the best interests of this country if it were again under the complete control of the Democratic party? Surely not. It is history that this country owes its chief glory and development in the past to that grand historic party. But for its sagacity and patriotism it is safe to say that we would still be a feeble and inconsiderable people. The democratic party have extended the boundaries of this Republic from the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean. Its policy acquired the territory of Louisiana, which extended from the Gulf of Mexico up the Father of Waters to the British Dominion, embracing Iowa, Minnesota, Dakota, Kansas, and all that vast region west to the Rocky Mountains. It acquired Florida, Texas, New Mexico, California, including their grand extent of country, plains, rivers, and mountains, with all their wealth of gold and silver and precious metals, embracing more than a million of square miles. As I now remember, not a single foot of land has been added to the empire by the Republican party except Alaska—a broad stretch of icy waste, a land where frozen earth contends with frozen water, inhabited by seals and savages, in a climate which I have heard described as nine months of winter and three months of damnation cold weather. [Laughter.]

In addition to this territorial wealth and power which Democracy has given to the Republic, its great lawyers and magnificent statesmen have in all generations of our existence been the special champions and expounders of the constitution—the bond of our Union and the very ark of the covenant of our liberties. They have striven to have its principles understood, its provisions maintained in their purity, and its blessings extended to all; and great as their services have been in enlarging our boundaries, spreading our commerce, and elevating our diplomacy abroad, their services to our people and to mankind in the exaltation of constitutional principles more entitle them to the confidence of American citizens than all things else put together. In addition to their services in maintaining the constitution they have in the main been the chief promoters of public economy and enemies of corruption. Under Democratic rule there has been in this country no Credit Mobilier, there has been no Black Friday, no Sanborn contracts, no robbery of freedmen's savings banks, no Belknap, no returning boards and no electoral commission; no military interference at the polls, no test oath for jurors in the United States courts, no Federal spies and overseers when the people were choosing their rulers. And now that we are seeking to restore this state of things and to bring back the government to the paths in which our fathers trod, the attempt is denounced as revolutionary and the trumpet is blown to warn the country that the end of all things is about to come when, we trust, nothing is about to come to an end except the domination of the Republican party.

Coming briefly to the real questions, I ask why should the law authorizing the military to be used at the polls not be repealed and why should the law authorizing Federal supervision also be not repealed? I take it to be indisputably established without further argument, that the whole subject relating to the elective franchise is placed by the constitution under the control of the States, and all that the Federal government can do is to see that the States, as such, do not discriminate against any on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. This is the whole duty and power of Congress as declared by the Supreme Court. When any Republican Senator has ventured for one moment to abandon the line of inflammatory appeal to the sectional feeling of the country, the excuses given for the retention of this law upon the statute-book are illogical almost to puerility.

One Senator gravely urges that it should not be repealed because the great bulk of the army is in the distant West, only some few hundreds being east of the Rocky Mountains. He tells us in the course of his enumeration that there are only about thirty in the State of North Carolina, and asks the Senators from that State if they are afraid of that number of soldiers. Passing over the obvious fact that within thirty days ten thousand could be sent there if desired. I answer that we *do* fear them, because they represent the power of the United States government and the enmity of the Republican party which wields that power; we fear them as the Hollander fears the first small leak in the dikes which bear back the waves of the ocean from deluging the meadows of his homestead; we fear them as the physician fears the first speck of gangrene in the system of his patient; we fear them as the sailor fears the piling up of the storm clouds upon the horizon, knowing that their deceptive beauty covers the fierce desolation of the tempest; we fear them as the shepherd of the mountain fears for his lambs at even the flitting of a shadow athwart his path, for he knows it to be the shadow of the eagle, the remorseless tyrant of the air; we fear them as Charlemagne feared the rude wooden ships of the Norse Vikings on their first appearance in the seas of his empire; we fear them as all patriotic Romans feared the crossing of the Rubicon by Cæsar, the passage of which, with arms in his hand, marked him as the enemy of Roman liberty.

Even so we fear and believe that when an American Executive crosses the Rubicon of his constitutional powers and appears at the place of choosing our rulers, armed either with the sword or with illegal powers of arrest, he thereby proclaims himself the enemy of the liberties of our people. A flagrant illustration of the justice of this fear is to be found in the various orders of the War Department directing the concentration of troops in the States of South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana on the occasion of the election of 1876. The excuse that these soldiers were not intended to interfere with elections or to be placed at the polls, but only to be sufficiently near to keep the peace, is not sustained by the facts of that reign of military violence, nor will it be if tried again. I quote from an order dated headquarters Department of the South, Columbia, South Carolina, October 8, 1876, issued by General Ruger:

> Should the barracks or camp in any case be so far from the place of voting that prompt assistance could not on occasion arising be rendered the civil officers, the commanding officer will so place his command or a sufficient part thereof that such assistance if required may be promptly given. No troops, however, will be placed *actually at any poll* of election except upon *requirement to that effect by the marshal or his deputy.*

So it seems that the discretion as to whether the law should be violated or not was vested in a deputy marshal! In fact they were so illegally disposed and used, in a hundred instances. The President, as appears by the order of General Townsend to General Emory, dated October 27, 1874, seemed anxious to have the troops placed at the polls without the appearance of doing so. In that order he propounds a physical problem or conundrum to General Emory which that officer had to give up. He says:

> Cannot points be selected near polls where attempts to overawe voters, likely to result in riots, may be made, and troops stationed there a day or two beforehand? It would not be desireable to have soldiers *at* or *too near* the polls, *as all appearance of military interference, except to secure voters their right to vote, should be avoided.*

Not to "keep the peace," mind you, but to secure voters their right to vote! Now, this was a hard problem: to place troops so far from the polls as to avoid all appearance of interference with the elections, and yet so near as to actually interfere by securing all men in their right to vote. *Quod est demonstrandum.* It was too much for General Emory—in fact, it was too much for common sense and common honesty.—All these orders show palpable and shameless determination on the part of the Executive to control both the elections and the counting of the votes of presidential electors, as well as the organization of State governments. The manner in which the troops were shifted about from one to the other of these three States, on which the presidential election depended, exhibits the animus of this infamous transaction in a manner so plain that the wayfaring man, though a Republican, need not err therein.

But the President tells us in his veto message that there has been no interference during his administration, and promises that there shall be none. So we are to take his royal promise to respect the people's liberties and not to have them secured by law? Here is the promise of one President of the United States, and one who stands exceedingly high in Republican estimation, dated November 10, 1876, to General W. T. Sherman, Washington, District of Columbia:

> Instruct General Auger, in Louisiana, and General Ruger, in Florida, to be vigilent with the force at their command to preserve peace and good order, and to see that the proper and legal boards of canvassers are unmolested in the performance of their duties. Should there be any grounds of suspicions of fraudulent counting on either side it should be reported and denounced at once. No man worthy of the office of President would be willing to hold the office if counted in, placed there by fraud. Either party can afford to be disappointed in the result, but the country cannot afford to have the result tainted by the suspicion of illegal or false returns. U. S. GRANT.

On the same day the following telegram is also forwarded to General Sherman:

> The President thinks, and I agree with him, that it will be well for you to give to the Associated Press his telegram and mine to you, referring to affairs now in the South. J. D. CAMERON, *Secretary of War.*

Of the vast, open-jawed, and cavernous-bellied nature of this promise I have not the heart or the time to discourse. I shall content myself with imitating the discretion of Mr. Rodman, who, returning home one night full of tax-paid, and fearing that his speech would betray him, to the many questions of his wife, for a long while maintained an obstinate silence, until at length to end the matter, he solemnly remarked, "Mrs. Rodman, you know I am a man of few words, and now I am plumb done talking." That subject immediately became *res adjudicata.* I am done talking on this subject so well calculated to make an American citizen blush.

The argument made by the opponents of these bills, especially those of the veto messages, strike me with a good deal of amazement. To illustrate their absurdity let us frame them into the semblance of mathematical propositions, thus:

Proposition first: Theorem.—The troops of the United States are two thousand miles away on the frontier and could not be used to control elections if they were wanted.—Senator from Maine.

The troops could not be so used if they were here, as the law forbids it. I promise not to use them.—The President.

Hence it is revolutionary and dangerous to liberty and the purity of elections to pass this bill forbidding such use of troops.—Q. E. D.

Corollary first.—The necessity for troops at the polls to secure fair elections is in proportion to the squares of the distance of their present location, *i. e.*, the greater the distance, the greater the necessity.

Corollary second.—The necessity for the presence of troops at the polls is also in proportion to the legal inability to use them if they were present, and if the President is determined not to use them at all to control elections, then the necessity becomes absolute.

Corollary third.—The revolutionary and dangerous character of a law consists in the fact that it is useless, there being already in existence laws sufficient to effect the purpose.

Scholium.—In the above it is assumed axiomatically that the terms "liberty" and "purity of elections" are synonymous with the term "Republican party." [Prolonged laughter.]

Proposition second: Theorem.—The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.—The fifteenth amendment quoted by the President.

The Supreme Court in the United States against Cruikshank, and in Myers vs. Happersett, have declared that the only right guaranteed by this amendment is the right that citizens shall not be discriminated against on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. Hence "national legislation to provide safeguards for free and honest elections is necessary, as experience has shown, not only to secure the right to vote to the enfranchised race at the South, but also to prevent fraudulent voting in the large cities of the North."—The President.

Corollary first.—It follows that if John Smith gets drunk at an election in North Carolina and punches a negro's head he immediately, by presidential logic, becomes the State of North Carolina embodied in the flesh, and he, or it, *discriminates* against the said negro within the meaning of the constitution and the guarantee is called for at once.

Corollary second.—If it be a white man whose head is punched by the embodied State-of-John-Smith-North-Carolina it is a discrimination all the same, provided the said white man was about to vote or had voted the Republican ticket, that being the true meaning and interpretation of the words "race, color and previous condition of servitude."

Corollary third.—It follows necessarily, that if a New York repeater vote the Democratic ticket five times in one day, he becomes likewise the great State of New York (including the Senator) or *e converso*, the great State of New York becomes the repeater, and by so voting he discriminates (the Lord knows how) against the right of somebody (the Lord knows who) to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; and the only avenue opened up by which this guarantee can be enforced is to send in the army and Johnny Davenport. [Laughter.]

Scholium.—The "previous condition" referred to in the foregoing is that of Republicanism, and implies also present condition; that is, being a Republican.

Scholium second.—Enforcing the right to vote by soldiers is not an "interference with elections."

Scholium third.—This doctrine of "discrimination" does not apply to the State of Rhode Island, where man's right to vote may be freely abridged on account of his present condition of impecuniosity.

Proposition third: Theorem. "The practice of tacking to appropriation bills measures not pertinent to such bills did not prevail until more than forty years after the adoption of the constitution. It has become a common practice. All parties when in power have adopted it. The public welfare will be promoted in many ways by a return to the early practice of the government and the true principles of legislation."—The President

Hence the practice of tacking legislation to appropriation bills having been practiced by all parties for more than fifty years, it should be immediately abandoned when disagreeable to the President or inconvenient to the party, its antiquity not being sufficient to justify it, though greater than the period of its non-use.

Corollory first—It follows, therefore, that the practice of using troops at the pols, which did not prevail for more than seventy-five years after the adoption of the constitution, should now become of general and indispensable use; fourteen years being amply sufficient time to legalize it, and it being now absolutely necessary for the preservation of the Republican party.

Scholium.—For the purposes of the next presidential election fourteen years of military interference are equal to seventy-five years of free and unrestrained elections, on the well established principle "that circumstances alter cases." (The Lawyer's Bull vs. the Farmer's Ox, I Webster's El Spell.)

N. B.—It is said on high authority that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of State once held this problem unsound but were coerced into assenting to it by party necessity. But *quien sabe!* [Laughter.]

So much for the absurb deductions which may be logically drawn from the premises contained in the veto messages and the arguments of Senators.

Now, Mr. President, why should not the peace at the polls and the purity of elections be entrusted to the authority, the virtue, and the patriotism of the States, where alone our fathers placed it? Is it because the States are unable with their civil machinery to preserve the peace? They have invariably proven able in the past except in cases of such unusual violence as is contemplated in the constitution, article 4, section 4. Are they unwilling? Surely they are willing to preserve their autonomy and perpetuate their own existence. Are they corrupt? Surely if their inhabitants as citizens of the States are too corrupt for self-goverment, it is not possible that their virtue should be improved and their corruptions cease the moment they are invested with authority by the United States. On the contrary there is always found less of reponsibility and more of corruption in aggregated than in separate communities. How can a corrupt State officer become an incorruptible Federal officer?

To suppose that the States are either unable, unwilling, or too corrupt to hold peaceful and honest elections is to declare unmistakably that the people thereof are incapable of self-government. "Let each Senator have written on his brow what he thinks of the Republic," said the Senator from New York, quoting the old Roman. So say I. Let each Senator say for himself what he thinks of his State; are its people incapable of self-government, of choosing their rulers peaceable and honestly? For one I can say with unspeakable pride and with absolute truth that the people of the State of North Carolina who sent me here are able, willing, and virtuous enough to fulfill these and all the other high functions of free government; that they have ever done so since the keels of Raleigh's ships first grated upon the white sands of her shores; and God helping them, they and their children will continue to do so, if not destroyed by centralization, until chaos shall come again. It is with extreme sadness that I hear any other Senator intimate that it is not so with his people.

Mr. President, did you ever consider for a moment the manifold and extraordinary uses to which we are subjecting the soldiers? And did you ever think that all this means in fact the failure of the civil authority, that our liberties are declining more and more as we employ force? Sir, in the uses to which we put the soldiers I am reminded of what I read about the bamboo in Asiatic countries. It is said the natives do almost everything with that wonderful arborescent grass. When young and tender it is eaten and preserved; it is made into houses and boats, astronomical instruments, ornamental work, yards of vessels, aqueducts, rain-cloaks, water-wheels, fence-ropes, chairs, tables, hats and umbrellas, fans, pipes, cups, shields, tool-handles, lamp-wicks, paper, knives, and a hundred other things. In this way it seems to me that we are forsaking the civil functions of our institutions and utilizing the soldier.

In addition to their legitimate business as defenders of the country, we have made of them governors of States, legislators, organizers of legislatures and judges of the election and qualifications of the members thereof, judges of law and equity and of the criminals courts, policemen, sheriffs, marshals and deputy marshals, revenue officers and still-house hunters, managers of railroads, controllers of churches and of schools, justices of the peace, supervisors of election, mathematicians to see a fair count, protectors of witnesses, foster-fathers of returning boards, and, above all, as Republican propagandists. In the language of a sewing-machine companies, "no family should be without one," [laughter;] this Republican political bamboo. Is there not great danger? Does it not indicate the decay and the disuse of the civil arm of the law, which is the natural and only safe protector of our liberties? Let us, sir, discard this miserable bamboo product and cease to make the soldier our political maid of all work.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the position of the Republican party in reference to the use of soldiers and supervisors at the polls, on the pretense of preserving the peace and securing fair elections, is the most remarkable that reasonable men ever assumed. It may be formulated thus: The election shall be free if we have to surround the polls with bayonets; the elections shall be according to the laws of the States if we have to overawe the civil magistrates and State officials by an exhibition of power; the elections shall be pure if it takes Davenport and all the convicted criminals and occupants of all the dens of infamy in our great cities to manage them; the election shall be unforced and without the appearance of violence if a battery of artillery has to be trained on every ballot-box in the land; and lastly the election shall be fair if we have to arrest without warrant and imprison without bail, until the elections are over, every man who offers to vote the Democratic ticket.

The speeches of Republican Senators mean this, the vetoes of the President mean this, and they mean more than this, Mr. President—in effect they say that unless we can use the army at the polls we will let that army dissolve, we will leave our forts and arsenals ungarrisoned, we will strip the frontiers of its protection and let the men, women, and children of that border country be slaughtered and scalped, and the unchecked savage extend his barbarious sway over all that land of promise, once more restored to its ancient wildness. We will not only do this but we will denounce the Democratic members of Congress who offered us the money to support this army, as the authors of this disaster. All these things will we do rather than lose our chances to count in the next President, and we will cover the facts and obscure the logic of the case by reinflaming the bitter prejudices of the war in the hearts of our constituents! Can it be possible we do this? Is there to be no end to passion, no restoration of reason? We shall see.

I confess that I do not believe these absurd methods of dealing with the American mind can much longer prevail. I regard them as the desperate efforts of a sinking party, and I believe the people will so regard them. I have been much touched by the affectionate warning given us by the other side that we were ruining ourselves in trying to repeal these laws. The kind-hearted Senator from Michigan notified us frankly that if we persisted we would go down into the waters of oblivion to rise no more forever. He did not even give us a chance at the general resurrection. [Laughter.] It seemed to distress him, and if I thought it was true prophecy I would freely mingle my tears with his at the contemplation of so dire a calamity. Candor compels me, however, to acknowledge that I cannot reciprocate his charity. I thought the Republican party was standing upon the brink of a precipice beneath which seethed those cold waters of oblivion, instead of warning them, I pledge you my word I would try to induce them to step over the edge—in fact I might lend them a push. [Laughter.] At least I should feel as indifferent about it as the lodger at an inn did, who was awakened in the night when the meteors were falling, and told that the day of judgment had come. "Well, wake me," said he, testily, "tell the landlord about it: I am only a boarder." [Laughter.]

And now, Mr. President, if the brink was about to leave by body and I was permitted to say but one word as to what my country most needed, that word should be, *Rest!* Rest from strife, rest from sectional conflict, rest from sectional bitterness, rest from inflammatory appeals, rest from this constant, most unwise, and unprofitable agitation. Rest in all lands and in all literature is used as the symbol of the most perfect state of felicity which mankind can attain in this world and the next. "And the land had rest," said the old Hebrew chroniclers in describing the reign of their good king; "and his *rest* shall be glorious," says the prophet Isaiah in foretelling the coming of our Lord when Ephraim should have ceased to envy Judah and Judah should have ceased to vex Ephraim.

Heaven itself is described as *rest*—a place "where the weary are at rest." "There remaineth therefore a *rest* for the people of God," saith the apostle. Can we not give this rest to our people? I know, Mr. President, that those from whom I come desire it above their chief joy. The excitement through which they have passed for the last twenty years, the suffering and sorrow, the calamities, public and private, which they have undergone have filled their hearts with indescribable yearnings for national peace, for a complete moral as well as physical restoration of the Union. There is one policy, and but one, to effect this object, and that is the policy of conciliation, of restoration, so steadily pursued by the Democratic statesmen and people of the North. It is the only true statesmanship for our condition, the only genuine remedy for the hard times with which we are afflicted. Nature everywhere teaches it, and her thousand agencies, silent and mysterious, constantly inculcate it even as day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night showeth knowledge. Cross this noble river which flows by the capital and search for the battle-field-blood-watered Virginia. You scarce can find them. Dense forests of young saplings cover all the hills and plains that were so lately swept bare by marching and encamping armies. "For there is hope of a tree if it be cut down that it will sprout again, and the tender branch thereof will not cease." Waving seas of wheat cover the open fields so lately plowed by the bursting shells while charging battalions met in deadly shock, and green grass has so covered the lines of intrenchment as to give them all the seeming of the cunning farmers' ditches. Restoration is nature's law. Let us imitate her. God of all mercy and grace may not these gaping wounds of civil war be permitted to heal, if they will?

The Okolona *States* buccaneer is well paid for his slush by the Republican leaders.—*Courier-Journal.*

The Winston *Sentinel* concludes an article on the Atlanta tragedy with the following:

"An ungovered temper, a few glasses of liquor, and a pistol, are all that is necessary, as in the case alluded to, to effect a murdered despair, blighted lives, disgrace and [illegible] distribution."