DAILY

The Cairo Bulletin.

JOHN H. OBERLY & CO., PROPRIETORS. CAIRO, ILLINOIS--SUNDAY, MARCH 10, 1872. BULLETIN BUILDING, WASHINGTON-AV

INSURANCE.

W. H. MORRIS, Notary Public, H. H. CANDEE No. Pub. and U. S. Com.

INSURE!

FIRE, HULL, CARGO, LIVE STOCK ACCIDENT, LIFE,

INSURANCE!

ÆTNA, HARTFORD, Assets $5,549,501 97
NORTH AMERICA, PA., Assets 2,763,000 00
HARTFORD, CONN., Assets 2,544,210 72
PHŒNIX, HARTFORD, Assets 1,781,148 80
INTERNATIONAL, N. Y., Assets 1,353,398 15
PUTNAM, HARTFORD, Assets 706,937 00
CLEVELAND, CLEVELAND, Assets 515,673 88
HOME, COLUMBUS, Assets 515,274 40
AMERICAN CENTRAL, MO., Assets 500,000 00
CONNECTICUT MUTUAL LIFE, Assets 20,000,000 00
TRAVELER'S, HARTFORD, LIFE AND ACCIDENT, Assets 1,500,000 00
RAILWAY PASSENGERS ASSURANCE CO., HARTFORD, Assets 500,000
INDEPENDENT, BOSTON, Assets 630,824

SAFFORD, MORRIS & CANDEE,
71 Ohio Levee.
City National Bank, CAIRO, ILL.

FIRE AND MARINE

INSURANCE

COMPANIES

NIAGARA, N. Y., Assets $1,436,216 79
GERMANIA, N. Y., Assets 1,068,721 70
HANOVER, N. Y. Assets 726,862 00
REPUBLIC, N. Y., Assets 714,925 00
Comprising the Underwriters' Agency.
YONKERS, N. Y., Assets 878,464 71
ALBANY CITY, Assets 453,193 23
FIREMEN'S FUND, S. F., Assets 678,800 00
SECURITY, N. Y.—MARINE. Assets 1,432,849 00

STORES, Dwellings, Furniture, Hulls and Cargoes, insured at rates as favorable as sound permanent security will warrant.
I respectfully ask of the citizens of Cairo, a share of their patronage.
C. N. HUGHES.

F. BROSS,

FIRE AND MARINE

Insurance Agency.

TRIUMPH, CINCINNATI, Assets $500,000
NEW ENGLAND MUTUAL, LIFE, Assets, over 6,000,000
ALSO THE
ANCHORD FIRE AND MARINE
Of St. Louis.

Solicits all kinds of risks.
F. BROSS,
oct27tf Agent, Cairo, Illinois.

FAMILY GROCERIES.

LOUIS JORGENSEN,

Dealer in all kinds of

STAPLE AND FANCY

GROCERIES.

Farmer's Yard and stabling
WITHOUT CHARGE.

Cor. Washington-av. and Twentieth-st.
CAIRO ILLS.
d&w1y.

THE BULLETIN.

LYMAN TRUMBULL.

HIS GREAT SPEECH IN THE SENATE.

SHARP AND INCISIVE UTTERANCES.

In the Senate of the United States, Feb. 23, 1872.

The senate having under consideration the resolution in relation to the sales of to French agents—

Mr. Trumbull said:

MR. PRESIDENT: Every effort at reform and to expose and correct abuses is met in this body by assaults upon those who make the effort, by aspersions upon their motives and by allegations of bad party faith. Questions affecting the purity of the government, the interests of the people, and the welfare of the public, in the opinion of some members of this body who assume to be the peculiar exponents of the Republican party, should no longer be decided upon their merits, but with a view to their political effect.

Chief among those who would subordinate the public welfare to party, stands the senator from Indiana, (Mr. Morton,) who in the discussion of the resolution under consideration has devoted several hours in speeches made upon different days, to party politics, and not content with assailing those who have thought it their duty to move the present investigation and have taken part in the present debate, the senator wanders away from them and takes occasions to speak of a senatorial cabal, and to refer to movements made at other times and other stages of the session in favor of investigation.

I do not know by what authority any member of this body assumes to be the peculiar exponent of the Republican party, or even of the administration. Before I conclude I intend to say something, not upon the subject of investigation in regard to the sale of arms by the government, but in reply to these repeated assaults of a political character made by those who assume to be better Republicans than their fellow-senators, and unless I misunderstand what the principles of the Republican party are, I think I shall be able to show that he who stands foremost here on all occasions to denounce others as making assaults upon the Republican party has himself forgotten the fundamental principles upon which the Republican party was founded and has always stood.

In the first place, I propose to show how an attempt is made on every occasion to defeat every effort at reform, no matter from whom it comes nor in relation to what subject, lest it should injure the party, and in this chamber, where partisan considerations ought never to interfere with the discharge of public duty; where the legislation should be for the country, and not for any particular party in the country, we have time and again heard appeals made to party for the purpose of carrying measures.

In the discussion which occurred in this chamber as long ago as March last, on the question of displacing the senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) from the position which he had long held with great service to the country as chairman of the committee on foreign relations, it was boldly announced by the senator from Indiana that—

"The question with us now is not as to the propriety of the change that has been made in the chairmanship of the committee on foreign relations, but whether we intend to stand by the organization and the usages of the Republican party."

It was not a question of propriety here by senators oath in the discharge of public duty, but a question of fidelity to party organization.

In the further discussion of party allegiance, and of the duty to vote as it is supposed will best promote party ends, the senator said that when the party had made a decision "it may be even against my convictions of right, but as far as all personal considerations are concerned I give my solemn pledge that I will abide by its action." Yes, sir, contrary to his solemn convictions of right in the exercise of his duty as a senator, he gives his pledge in advance that he will abide by the decision of a party caucus.

This doctrine was announced nearly a year ago. Again, at the commencement of the present session, when it was proposed to raise a committee to inquire into the abuses of government, the proposition was met by certain senators with all sorts of obstacles. You will remember in the first instance it was proposed to raise a joint select committee of the two houses of congress, such a committee as we had had for several congresses without objection, to inquire into existing abuses in all the departments of government, to know whether there were supernumerary officers employed, whether men were in the public service who performed no duties and who ought to be discharged, and generally to ascertain the condition of the public service with a view to purifying and improving it. The objection was made that a joint select committee was improper, particularly a committee vested with power to send for persons and papers and to make investigations. No such objection had been made to the committee which had existed for years; but now it is insisted that all subjects of inquiry ought to be referred to the standing committees of the senate. We had standing committees, it was said, upon almost every subject to whom any matter could be referred, although it was known that no standing committee of the senate was charged with the duty of inquiring into the abuses of government.

It was thus that the first proposition for investigation was met, with what motives I will not undertake to say, but it was understood by the country as a mere evasion to avoid investigation; and when the voice of the people began to be heard in favor of investigation, in favor of exposing and correcting abuses, we finally found the very senators who had started out with hostility to the original proposition proposing to raise a committee, but it must be a standing committee of the senate to inquire into abuses; still it must be a committee without power. The proposition was to raise a commitee of investigation and retrenchment, to do what? To inquire into such subjects as should be referred to it! And when a proposition was made to invest that committee with power to make the inquiries which had been made under the direction of the joint committee of the two houses at former sessions of congress, that was opposed, fought inch by inch, and finally voted down by a vote of 35 to 24 in this body. And then it was that the senator from Indiana again sounded the party cry and with amazement exclaimed, that the object of this investigation was to show that corruption existed under this administration! Of course it was, if any existed, and why not? He then averred that "the drift of the debate" was "a reflection upon the Republican party; and the party was appealed to, to so organize the committee that the opponents of the proposed investigation should control it.

As I said, twenty-four senators had voted to clothe this committee with ample authority to inquire into existing abuses and expose them; thirty-five had voted against it; and when the public sentiment of the country had forced senators to agree to an investigation, then the party cry was raised to so organize the committee that of the twenty-four senators who voted in favor of clothing the committee with authority to inquire into abuses, one single one, and he a Democrat, alone was put upon it. Of the other six not one had voted in favor of giving authority to the committee to send for persons and papers, and make the investigation thorough as originally proposed. It is true that when the subject was brought to the notice of the senate, one of the six declined and another senator was substituted in his place, the senator from California (Mr. Casserly) making two Democrats on the committee. Why was the committee so organized? It was done in obedience to party dictation. The cry of party allegiance was invoked to accomplish it. These were the words of the senator from Indiana:

"We were asked to create a smelling committee to be set upon the president from that time until the election, just as we would put a detective upon a suspected criminal. No sensible party would do that. We did not do it; we created a committee that was denounced as being a whitewashing committee; but it has already vindicated itself."

Now, the senator from Indiana tells you why the committee was created as it was. We were not going "to create a smelling committee," as he says, "to be set upon the president." No sir; but was the senator from Indiana opposed to organizing a committee in favor of exposing abuses, if they existed? And is that setting a smelling committee upon the president of the United States? I repudiate such an idea. Nothing could have given greater strength to the president of the United States than to have had an earnest, faithful committee in favor of investigation, who should have hunted out in all of the departments of the government the abuses, if any, that existed, should have brought them to his notice, and allowed him to correct and reform them. Why, sir, that would have given strength to the administration, strength to the Republican party. But what was the impression that went all over this country in consequence of the partisan organization of the committee? It was that a "whitewashing committee" was formed, as the senator from Indiana tells us. Is it any wonder?

But he says the committee has "vindicated itself." Mr. President, I shall make no comment upon the conduct of the committee. It has not yet made its report, but its action and conduct in the management of the investigation were public, and are before the world.

The committee was instructed to inquire into official abuses in the city of New York, and in the custom-house particularly. It was charged with the duty of inquiring whether officials had improperly interfered with the free vote of citizens; of inquiring whether officers in the custom house had been assessed for the purpose of raising money to control elections, whether they had improperly interfered in party conventions and in politics; and when it was sent to make that inquiry, it was not sent nor instructed to inquire into the conduct of the people themselves in political matters. The people have a right to do as they please at elections; but the printed reports show that witnesses, who came before that committee to prove that custom-house officers by the score had thronged the halls of legislation, interfering with the organization of the legislature of the state of New York, were inquired of whether they were not there interfering also, as if this committee was authorized to inquire into the conduct of the people instead of the misconduct of the officers!

The report further shows that witnesses who came before the committee to testify to abuses existing in the custom-house, to the fact that custom-house officials were in the habit of exacting money from merchants for the performance of duty, were inquired of to know if it was not as bad for them to give money as for the officials to take it. Was this committee of ours sent to inquire into the conduct of the merchants of New York, or into the misconduct of the officials in the custom-house?

And, sir, I have seen it stated in the papers—I know not with how much truth—that notice has been given that the witnesses brought before this committee, who expose the bribery, corruption and malfeasance of officials, are to be prosecuted themselves as participants in the frauds they expose. Sir, I will make no comment upon this. I state but what I have seen published, and shall be gratified if it is not true; for it will strike the country as a strange way of ferreting out the abuses of officials, to publish in advance that the witnesses who expose them will themselves be indicted as participants. You will not be likely to find out many abuses in that way.

And, sir, here in this body, on the present occasion, a resolution is offered threatening senators, even, who move investigations with fine and imprisonment in connection with the investigation about which they propose to make the inquiry! Sir, the country will understand this. Senators may tell us they are for investigation, in favor of exposing abuses, but their acts and their votes in this body will all be well understood by an intelligent people.

How is the proposed inquiry now under consideration met? By the same allegation as was made against the other, that this debate is to make capital against the Republican party—the same charge; we heard it in March; we heard it in December; we heard it in February. Not an investigation has been moved, no one has proposed an inquiry into the existing abuses, but he has been assailed as unfaithful to party; and it has been said that the object is an attack upon the Republican party! I deny it. I say that the Republican party can only maintain its ascendency and ought only to maintain its ascendency by being a party of purity of honesty, of fidelity to the constitution; and when it becomes a mere spoils party, it will soon receive the condemnation of an indignant people.

The public mind has been greatly stirred of late by the exposures of official misconduct. I do not allude simply to officials of the federal government, nor the officials of the state government, nor the officials of our large cities; but growing out of the war there has been that demoralization both in public and private life which all history teaches follows great wars. At one time during the war we expended $3,000,000 a day; and of course when such vast sums had to be disbursed frequently on occasions of great emergency, and at remote places, there was no opportunity for securing that accountability essential to the secure and faithful disbursement of such vast sums. There was necessarily a great waste of money during the war, as there will be in all wars, and the country has not yet recovered from the demoralization which followed the getting rich in a day as was often the case while the war lasted. This demoralization has extended not only to government officials, but it exists to some extent in private life. Many of our merchants have become gamblers in stocks; and some of our great railroad corporations have lost thousands and tens of thousands of dollars through dishonest officers.

Official corruption seems to have culminated in the city of New York last autumn. A powerful party existed in that city which had for years sustained itself in power by the corrupt use of patronage and the plunder of the people. The monstrous Tammany frauds never could have existed in such proportions before the war, and never could have been perpetrated except in the name of party. When first charged they were denied, and an attempt was made by the party in power to cover them up, to keep them out of sight; but the people of the city of New York, without regard to party, appointed reform committees of investigation, and after great labor and many difficulties, they succeeded in unearthing and exposing those terrible robberies and frauds which shocked the whole nation. At that time the Tammanyites raised the party cry in order to prevent investigation just as you will always hear it raised by dishonest officials whose acts it is proposed to investigate.

But the investigaion went on, and the cry of reform first started in New York has been heard throughout the country. They have heard it in Chicago, and to-day two or three of the aldermen of that city are under conviction and in prison for corruption in office. The same cry has reached Florda, and within a few days we have heard that its governor has been unanimously impeached for theft and other crimes, while the debt of that state has been fraudulently swelled by millions and million of dollars. The governor of another state who but a few years ago was on this floor influencing senators in behalf of his corrupt schemes, is a fugitive from his state, and I know not but an exile in foreign lands, to escape the punishment his robbery of the people and other crimes deserve; and his associate in guilt, who came here claiming a seat in this body with no more right than if he had been elected by fifty men upon Pennsylvania avenue, was once sustained in his claim by the senator from Indiana. That associate to-day, as I am informed, holds as a protection from the penitentiary a pardon obtained from the governor.

I shall not go over the history of the enormous frauds which have been perpetrated in nearly all of the reconstructed states. I have not had time to examine the voluminous report which has laid upon the table; but I understand that the debt of North Carolina has been corruptly swelled by many millions since 1868; the debt of South Carolina nearly or quite as bad: Louisiana worse.

Now, Mr. President, when such things as these are existing all over the country, when in one single service department after defalcation is occurring, is it expected that the people will not demand investigation, require reform and a higher standard of official integrity? There is something wrong. The people demand a remedy; and when we propose to make inquiry so as to know how to apply the remedy we are met with the cry of danger to the party. Your investigation is designed to throw "mud upon the party," exclaims the senator from Indiana. Sir, no dirt will be thrown upon a party that is pure, by investigating its acts, but if it be impure, the sooner its garments are cleansed by thorough investigation and reform the better for it.

This cry of "party," upon all occasions to prevent investigation and the exposure of abuses, reminds me of what was said by Patrick Henry of one John Hook, who brought suit to recover pay for a couple of steers taken by the commissary of the revolutionary army for famishing soldiers who were exposed to the weather and hard pressed, and whom any man with a patriotic heart in his bosom would have rejoiced at an opportunity to have fed and cared for; but Hook followed up the army, demanding pay for his steers, and is described by Henry as he appeared at Yorktown when Cornwallis with the last British army marched out of his retrenchments and surrendered to the American forces. On that occasion, says Henry:

"Triumph lighted on every patriot face, and the shouts of victory and the cry of Washington and liberty were heard as they rung and echoed through the American ranks, and were reverberated from the hills and shores of the neighboring river. But hark, what notes of discord are these which disturb the general joy, and silence the acclamations of victory? They are the notes of John Hook, hoarsely bawling through the American camp. Beef! beef! beef!"

[Laughter.]

And so, sir, when the country is reeking with corruption, and an investigation is proposed to ascertain whether it exists among government officials, we are met with the cry of "party!" "party!" and that is the speech heard from the senator from Indiana in opposition to every inquiry.

The senator has a wonderful knowledge of parties. He tells us not only what the Republican party will do—when it will nominate and what is to happen to it, but he tells us also what the Liberal Republicans will do, and then tells us what the Democrats will do. He says the Liberal Republicans have called a convention at Cincinnati in May, and that they will make nominations for president and vice-president. How does the senator know it? I have no such information. The resolutions under which the convention is called do not state it; but the senator from Indiana knows, and he says when they have made their nominations the Democrats will play—I think he calls it—"the possum game;" they will lie low, in his elegant language, until late in the season, and then they will bring out a candidate of their own; that they are encouraging these Liberal Republicans, and if they should adhere to the possum game, and should conclude to support the Liberal Republican candidate, then one-third of the Democrats will vote with the Republicans to sustain Gen. Grant. The senator knows just how many of the the Democrats will vote with him. He seems to have polled the Democratic party, and knows he will get one-third of it, and the other two-thirds voting with the Liberal Republicans would not carry a single state. I do not know how the senator from Indiana acquired authority to speak for the Republican party even, to say nothing about Liberal Republicans, if there be any such party, and I know of none as a distinct organization from the Republican party; and how he knows what the Democracy will do, is more than I can tell.

But, sir, the senator tells us that the platform adopted by Liberal Republicans in Missouri is "essentially a Democratic platform," that it is "anti-Republican," and he proves that by saying that the Democracy of Connecticut have adopted it! I propose to make some remarks upon that platform, and see what that anti-Republican and Democratic platform, as the senator calls it, is. I ask the secretary to read the resolutions which I send to the table.

The chief clerk read as follows:

"*Resolved*, that we the Liberal Republican of Missouri, faithful now as we were in the dark days of war, to the vital principles of Republicanism, by no act or word will endanger the rightful sovereignty of the Union, emancipation, equality of civil rights, or enfranchisement. To those established facts now embedded in the constitution we claim the loyalty of all good citizens.

"*Resolved*, that true and lasting peace can come only from such profound reconciliation as enfranchisement has wrought in this state, nor can those governments be pure or great in which tax-payers have no actual part. We therefore demand, with equal suffrage for all, complete amnesty for all, that the intellect and experience of every state may be welcomed to active service for common welfare.

"*Resolved*, that no form of taxation is just and wise which puts needless burdens upon the people. We demand genuine reform of tariff, so that those duties shall be removed which, in addition to the revenue yielded to the treasury, involve an increase in the price of domestic products and consequent tax for the benefit of favored interests.

"*Resolved*, that the shameless abuse of the government patronage for the control of conventions and elections, whether in the interest of individuals or of a party, with its consequent corruption and demoralization of political life demands the thorough and genuine reform of the public service. Those who would suppress investigation forget they owe a higher duty to the country than to any party. We honor those senators whose courageous course has compelled the disclosure of gross misdeeds, and they deserve the thanks and support of good citizens.

"*Resolved*, that local self-government, with impartial suffrage, will guard the rights of all citizens more securely than any centralized authority. It is time to stop the growing encroachments of the executive power; the use of coercion or bribery to ratify treaty; the packing of the supreme court to relieve rich corporations; the seating of members of congress not elected by the people; the resort to unconstitutional laws to cure the Ku klux disorders, irreligion, or intemperance, and the surrender of individual freedom to those who ask that the practice or creed of some shall be the law of all. We demand for the individual the largest liberty consistent with public order, for the state self-government, and for the nation the return of the methods of peace and the limitations of power.

"*Resolved* that true republicanism makes it not the less our duty to expose corruption denounce usurpation of power, and [illegible] reforms [illegible] public welfare. The times demand the uprising of honest citizens to sweep from the power the men who prostitute the name of any honest party to selfish interest. We therefore invite all Republicans who desire the reforms herein set forth to meet in the national mass convention at Cincinnati on the first Monday of May next, at noon, there to take such action as our convictions of duty and the public exigencies may require."

Mr. Trumbull: Now, Mr. President, I propose to show that the senator from Indiana, who has stigmatized these resolutions as "essentially anti-Republican and essentially Democratic," does not know what Republicanism is. I propose to show that these resolutions contain the very principles on which the Republican party was founded, and on which it has won all its triumphs. The only reason given for denouncing the resolutions as anti-Republican, as essentially Democratic, is that the Democracy of Connecticut have adopted them, and I wish that the Democracy of the whole land would adopt them. Neither envy, nor, hatred nor malice, shall make me oppose that which is right because my political adversaries adopt it.

What is this first resoultion?

That we, the Liberal Republicans of Missouri, faithful now as we were in the dark days of war, to the vital principles of true Republicanism, by no act or word will endanger the rightful sovereignty of the Union."

That is anti-Republican is it? By no act or word to endanger the rightful sovereignty of the Union, for which Republicans fought through a bloody war, and for which hundred of thousands laid down their lives, is denounced by the senator from Indiana as essentially anti-Republican. Sir, no man who is a Republican in heart and in principle can refuse to indorse the resolution, because the "rightful sovereignty of the Union" was the very thing that Republicans and the loyal men everywhere fought through a long war to maintain.

The next vital principle announced in these resolutions is "emancipation." Was emancipation anti-Republican? Where did the senator from Indiana learn his Republicanism? Was the great Thirteenth amendment, which declared henceforth and forever no human being should tread the soil of the United States as a slave, anti-Republican? Who carried the great amendment through congress and adopted it as a part of the constitution of the country but the Republican party? Was it not indorsed in our national conventions? Was not "freedom and liberty" the shibboleth by which we conquered?

What is the next principle embodied in this resolution, which the senator says is anti-Republican? "Equality of civil rights." Why, sir, did we not struggle as a Republican party to establish equality of civil rights? Has the senator forgotten the struggle in this body to pass the civil-rights bill, securing citizenship with equality of civil rights to every person born in the land, no matter what his race, color or previous condition? Is it anti-Republican to refuse to do anything to endanger equality of rights? The senator says it is. He says equality of civil rights is essentially a Democratic principle, because the Democracy of Connecticut have adopted it. Then he is for slavery, I suppose, because the Democracy of Connecticut are for freedom? What logic!

What next? "Enfranchisement." That is another of the principles adopted by the Democratic party of Connecticut, which has thereby, in the senator's opinion, become "essentially anti-Republican."

What is in the second resolution? It has been read at the desk and embodies the principles of amnesty. "We therefore demand, with equal suffrage to all, complete amnesty for all," is the language. Is that anti-Republican? Why, sir, the last national Republican convention adopted as one of its resolutions the principles of amnesty, and the president of the United States has urged it upon us in his annual message with very peculiar force. This is his language:

"More than six years having elapsed since the last hostile gun was fired between the armies then arrayed against each other—one for the perpetuation, the other for the destruction of the Union—it may well be considered whether it is not now time that the disabilities imposed by the Fourteenth amendment should be removed. That amendment does not exclude the ballot, but only imposes the disability to hold offices upon certain classes. When the purity of the ballot is secure majorities are sure to elect officers reflecting the views of the majority. I do not see see the advantage or propriety of excluding men from office merely because they were before the rebellion of standing and character sufficient to be elected to positions requiring them to take oaths to support the constitution, and admitting to eligibility those entertaining precisely the same views, but of less standing in their communities. It may be said that the former violated an oath, while the latter did not. The latter did not have it in their power to do so. If they had taken this oath, it cannot be doubted they would have broken it, as did the former class."

Now, sir, we have not only the authoritative declaration of the Republican party in its national convention in favor of the removal of political disabilities, but we have also the earnest recommendation of the president of the United States, and the repeated expression of the people's representatives in favor of the same measure. Thrice the house of representatives has passed bills for the general removal of disabilities. Two of those bills lie upon your table now, and one was strangled by the enemies of amnesty loading it with amendments.

But, Mr. President, if the Republican party had not recommended amnesty in its national convention, if the president had not recommended it in his annual message, if the house of representatives had not given expression to the opinions of the people by the passage of three general amnesty bills, there would be reason enough, I think, to satisfy any reflecting mind why such a bill should pass.

The committee charged with the investigation of affairs in the South, which has spent much time and labor in inquiring into the condition of things in that section of the Union, come back and recommend the removal of political disabilities. And why? Because their continuance is only a matter of irritation among the people, and is not required by the public safety. These disabilities to hold office were originally imposed not as a punishment of the individuals, but as a measure of public safety. The colored people of the South are now voters; they have become accustomed to the exercises of the elective franchise and are in a position to know how to vote and protect their rights; whereas at the time these disabilities were imposed it was apprehended that in the new organization of state governments, if no such disabilities was imposed, the leading men in those states who had carried them into rebellion and who had managed [illegible] public affairs and have it in their power to oppress the new Union men among them and the colored men before they had become accustomed to exercise their rights and assert their independence. Hence a provision was adopted excluding the leaders in the rebellion from office till the state government should be reorganized and the newly enfranchised population should come to understand their rights. As a consequence of their disfranchisement, it has happened, and I regret it, that inexperienced and sometimes corrupt and dishonest persons in those states have been elevated to the control of public affairs, and the result has been that the people of those states have been plundered by their state governments without example in the history of this country. While we have allow the sons, with less experience than their fathers, equally rebels with them, to take office, we have excluded their fathers, who were acquainted with public affairs, and who, whatever may be said of their guilt as rebels, were neither robbers nor thieves. Had public affairs in the late rebel states been controlled to a larger extect by men of political experience in those communities, it would probably have been better for them. I am sure the time has now come when the people of all the states should be permitted to elect and the federal government to appoint whom they please to office. The removal of political disabilities puts no man into office. It merely authorizes the people to express their own choice in the election of whom they will.

Why can we not pass an amnesty bill in this body? The senator from Indiana will tell you, perhaps, he is for amnesty. When the first bill came here, now nearly one year ago, efforts were repeatedly made to bring it to the consideration of the senate, and where were these senators who claim to be the peculiar representatives of the republican party? Were they not constantly found voting for any and every motion that would lay it aside, and finally adopting a resolution that precluded its consideration during the session of last spring? And how has it been this winter? When it was under consideration was ever a motion made to lay it aside that did not receive the support of the senator from Indiana? Was ever a proposition made to amend it, no matter how absurdly, nor for what purpose, that he did not give it his support? I think you will find his name recorded on the yeas and nays, in favor of as many amendments to the amnesty bill.

Why can we not take up one of the bills now on the table and pass it? Mr. President, the country will understand why. It does not become me to speak of the motives of senators, but the country will know that if two-thirds of the senate were honestly in favor of amnesty, they would soon find a way to pass the bill. The trouble is that some senators are not enough for amnesty to let us have a direct vote upon it. It is shuffled off, and every effort to come to a direct vote on one of the house bills is voted down.

What conclusion will the country draw, and especially what conclusion will it draw when it reads one of the speeches made upon that subject by the senator from Indiana, in which he held up to public gaze all the horrors of the war? He seems to delight in opening afresh all the wounds of this dreadful conflict; and for what purpose? Is it to keep alive the hates and animosities engendered by the war, in order to accomplish some party purpose? Is it supposed that the party can better succeed by keeping up hostility between the different sections of the union? Is it from envy that the senator from Indiana is unwilling that the democracy of Connecticut should be in favor of amnesty? Why is it, if he is for amnesty, as the republican party is, as the president is, as the people's representatives are, that we do not have his powerful support to bring up one of these bills and pass it in a day, as we easily could with his assistance? Oh, Mr. President, he is not for amnesty if the democrats are for it! When indorsed by the democrats of Connecticut, it becomes essentially a democratic measure! Let me commend to my friend from Indiana, who seems to take pleasure in depicting the horrors and sufferings of the war in order to keep alive the animosities and hates it engendered, a sentence or two from a book whose authority, I am sure, he will respect:

"If ye have bitter envying and strife in your heart, glory not and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where envying and strife is, there is confusion and every evil work. But wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy."

I would, Mr. President, in the interest of peace and harmony and good feeling, that we could in the language of this resolution which the senator condemns, "demand, with equal suffrage for all, complete amnesty for all." The time has come when the peace of the country requires it. The time has come when, laying aside all malice and hate, we should cultivate kindly feelings and endeavor to govern the country in the interests of peace. I assume, then, that amnesty is not anti-republican. To refuse it, and strive to keep alive the hatreds of the war by the constant exhibition of its horrors, is to my mind not only unpatriotic, but positively wicked.

The next resolution declares—

"That no form of taxation is just or wise which puts needless burdens upon the people."

That is another "anti-republican and essentially democratic" principle, is it? Then the reverse of it is a republican principle, and that form of taxation is just which puts needless burdens on the people. Is that the opinion of the senator from Indiana? He says that the resolution is essentially anti-republican. Of course he means it. The senator's speech will have great influence in the country. It will be circulated all over the land, and his constituents and mine (for they all read what the senator says) will read the declaration that these resolutions are essentially, not in single instances, but "essentially anti-republican" and "essentially democratic." I am sure the intelligent republicans of this land will ask to be delivered from such sort of republicanism as desires to put needless burdens on the people.

The next resolution relates to the civil service, and declares:

"That the shameless abuse of the government patronage for the control of conventions and elections, whether in the interest of individuals or of a party, with consequent corruption and demoralization of political life, demands the thorough and genuine reform of the public service."

That also I believe to be a republican principle. I know the senator from Indiana has commended our present civil-service reform as the best in the world; but I know it has been disclosed recently that the [illegible] of the government are assessed for party purposes. It has been recently disclosed that they are used to pack conventions and primary meetings. It is known that in this city the officials of the government have been banded together for political purposes, and that assessments have been put upon them for party purposes. This was disclosed by a former secretary of the interior, who strove to protect the subordinates in his department from political assessments.

The present civil-service system is demoralizing to the heads of departments and members of congress. What more humiliating than to see the members of this body and the other house dancing attendance in the ante-rooms of the secretaries, asking to have appointed to office some favorite who had been active in their behalf at some cross-roads, or among the members of the legislature that returned them to this body? No matter whether there is a place for him or not, a place must be created. He has come to Washington perhaps from a distant state. He rendered essential service to the member in the canvass, and the member says, "you must give him a place, Mr. Secretary. But the secretary replies, "we have no vacancy." "Well, make one for him; give him a temporary appointment; it will never do for him to go home to the district he is too important a man, without giving him a posit on here. I promised it during the canvass, if I was elected." The secretary does not want a quarrel with the member, and he assigns his friend some temporary position. And, sir, when your appropriation bill comes in—a deficiency bill or a general appropriation bill—you will very likely find an appropriation of twenty, fifty, or one hundred thousand dollars asked to pay extra clerk hire and temporary clerks. Do you think the member who got his friend appointed clerk will vote against it? Do you think he will scan the measures of the department as he would if he was not dependent upon its head for favors? Do you think the head of the department to free to discharge his official duty as he would be if he were not afraid of the consequences of disobliging members of congress in the favors they ask by way of appointments? This whole thing is demoralizing the public service; and while we have thousands of honest, incorruptible and good men in office, I doubt not we have scores also in offices not for the salaries they are to receive, but expecting to make money out of them in some other way.

The great evil in our civil system, however, grows out of the manner of making appointments and removals, and the use which is made of the patronage, treating it as mere party spoils. Often the patronage is used for purposes not rising to the dignity of even party purposes, but by certain individuals for individual and personal ends. It would be bad enough if the patronage were used as mere spoils for party, but it is infinitely worse than that under our present system.

The senator from Indiana, in his speech the other day, undertook, to create the impression that I was opposed to civil-service reform. Why, sir, I offered the very bill in this body which became a law under which the civil-service commission was organized. I introduced bills here years ago in favor of a reform in the civil-service, and especially to break up the running of members of congress to the departments begging for offices. In my judgment, there is nothing more disreputable or which interferes more with the proper discharge of public duty than this hanging around the skirts of power begging for offices for friends.

But the senator says that I commented

(Continued on second Page.)