# Book XXXVIII

The Washington Post
March 2. 1878

**Isaac Bassett's Glory.**

From the Courier-Journal.

Isaac Bassett, the present Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate, was taken to Washington in 1832 by Daniel Webster, and started as a page. He likes to look down from his altitude and to muse upon the good Daniel.

XXXVIII
P.17

The Chicago Tribune
March 25 1878

DOORKEEPER BASSETT,

who came to the Senate as a page in 1832. Then there were thirty-six Senators and two pages—now there are seventy-six Senators and sixteen pages. To witness a living automaton, one has only to watch Bassett when the President's Private Secretary presents himself at the door. Hastening to his side, Bassett stands there, like a militia corporal at "attention," until the Vice-President arrests business, when he—Bassett—says, "A message from the President of the United States." Then, with his body square to the front, and his head swung mechanically half around and down, like the heads of the moving little figures on a hand-organ, he keeps one eye on the message until the Private Secretary officially delivers it, when, with a triumphant air, he takes it to the Vice-President, then meekly subsides into his seat again. This performance he has gone through with about once a day for the last twenty years, and has not varied an inch in his deportment all that time. Bassett keeps the run of absent Senators, and can send pages for them when there is a vote, to find them in committee-rooms, the restaurant, the library, or at "Sanderson's." But he is very ignorant about what business is before the Senate, and wild horses could not tear from him any of the secrets of an executive session.

Williams County Record
Texas
April 27, 1878

**A VETERAN OF THE U. S SENATE.**

Capt. Bassett, Assistant Doorkeeper of the Senate, is one of the oldest employes in that body. He was first a page when he was eleven years old, and has been there continuously ever since, being now about sixty. He is a fine-looking, tall, grey-haired man, and a most pleasant and agreeable gentleman. He has been with all the historic characters that have figured in our country's history for the last half century—such as Clay, Webster, Calhoun, Johnson and a host of others. He has listened to the voice and wisdom of all those distinguished statesmen who have "crossed the river," and whose voices are stilled in death, never again to resound throughout our legislative halls. He was there at his post during the early years of our country's glory; and when the fires of the civil war raged with unabated fury, desolating homes and scattering sorrow and death to many hearts, this old veteran was still there; and now, when the angel of peace hovers over our land, teaching brotherly love and kindness, he still performs his every duty, loved by all, Democrats and Republicans. Our earnest wish is that our gallant friend may continue there as long as life shall last, and when legislative bodies are no more, when the "earth shall have been rolled together as a scroll," may he rest "Over There."

The Presbyterian, Philadelphia
April 4. 1874

It is not generally known that the chairs and desks used by Clay, Calhoun, Webster, Benton, and other distinguished men, are retained in the present Senate chamber. It is not stated whether their mantles also rest upon the present Senatorial occupants. A private mark is on these valued relics of departed greatness, known only to the assistant doorkeeper. This is done to protect them from the desecrating hands of relic-hunters. Mr. Sumner, until his death, occupied the same chair in which he was assaulted by Mr. Brooks, and in which he sat for over twenty-two years.

Daily Eastern Argus of Main
Tuesday August 13. 1878

WASHINGTON PERSONALS.

The numerous friends throughout the country of Captain Isaac Bassett, the well-known and popular Doorkeeper of the United States Senate, will be glad to learn that he has recovered from his late illness. Captain Bassett, who has been officially connected with the senate for a period of forty-seven years, is writing his personal recollections and personal reminiscences of members during that time which embraces several of the most eventful periods known in its history, and promises to be a work of unusual interest.

Major J. W. D.

# EMINENT PUBLIC MEN.

## PENCIL PORTRAITS OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES.

### Senators Anthony, J. D. Cameron and Ingalls—Representative Sayler.

BY L. D. INGERSOLL.

Let me hereby wish all the readers of THE REPUBLIC a happy new year, and begin my sketches of 1879 with a notice of

HON. HENRY B. ANTHONY, OF RHODE ISLAND.

This distinguished man is the "father of the Senate;" for although Senator Hamlin was a member of that body some years before Mr. Anthony, his term of service has not been consecutive, he having been in the meantime Governor of Maine, Vice-President of the United States, and Collector of Boston. Senator Anthony has constantly been a member of the Senate for twenty years. He entered that body some time before the beginning of the war of the rebellion, when the graceful and accomplished John C. Breckenridge was its president, when Douglas, Seward, Sumner, Henry Wilson, Trumbull, "rare old Ben Wade," Fessenden, John P. Hale, Harlan, Preston, King, Collamer, Chandler, were eminent Senators from the North, while James A. Bayard, James H. Hammond, John J. Crittenden, James A. Pearce, Jefferson Davis and John Slidell were among the eminent representative men of the South. Most of these are now dead, not one in public employment. No less than five States have been admitted into the Union since Mr. Anthony became a member of the Senate. It has been a period of great events in politics and in war. On account of his prominent position for observation Mr. Anthony can say of the most eventful period of American history: "Part of which I was and all of which I saw."

Senator Anthony is one of the most amiable and accomplished of gentlemen. His long eminence in the affairs of the nation, his associations with the most illustrious men of the republic give to his conversation a force and variety of illustration and anecdote and incident which make him, though not the most original, the most interesting and instructive talker among all our public men. Nature gave him admirable powers of conversation, so that with these advantages added, he may be described, for an evening's quiet talk, as absolutely superb and incomparable.

Senator Anthony is a journalist by profession. He was for many years the principal editor of the Providence Journal and still, I believe, contributes to the columns of that paper. Every intelligent journalist knows that it is and long has been one of the ablest and fairest public journals in the country. Before coming to the Senate Mr. Anthony had twice been governor of Rhode Island, which, though a small State, is not in the habit of electing small men governors. After coming to the Senate he soon became recognized as an able man, and for many years he has been universally regarded as a leading man in that body. He was for several years President *pro tempore*, twice elected to that position, which his thorough knowledge of parliamentary law and of the usages of the Senate, his dignity, and his unimpeachable impartiality so well qualify him to adorn. On the floor, he is ready in debate, and in what we commonly call a "set speech," is generally considered as one of the most elegant and effective orators of the Senate.

Senator Anthony may be set down as an unusually good-looking man. His head and face are of classical mould, his hair and long beard now silvering over with the snows of passing years. In private and in public life he is perfectly pure. I suppose there is not a man in the Senate more highly respected and more kindly liked by men of all parties in that body than Henry B. Anthony.

HON. J. D. CAMERON, OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Senator Cameron has been in public life so short a time that except with those who happen to know him pretty well he is not appreciated at his true worth. I first met him at the Chicago convention of 1860 which nominated Abraham Lincoln for the presidency, Mr. Cameron's distinguished father being a candidate for nomination, and coming out third in strength in the convention, receiving more votes than Salmon P. Chase. The present Senator Cameron was at that time a young man, full of enthusiasm, and made about as many acquaintances and friends at Chicago as any one in attendance on the convention. Governor Curtin, Judge Lowrie and Judge Casey, I recollect, were also of "the Pennsylvania crowd"—which was a big one—with whom I enjoyed many a pleasant hour at their hotel, enjoying most of all "Don Cameron," as the Pennsylvanians all called him.

For some years before he entered upon official life, Mr. Cameron was prominently known as a banker and railway manager. In these classes of business and in speculations he amassed an independent competency. There are few more energetic or sagacious business men in the country than Senator Cameron. He has also been an influential man in Pennsylvania politics for many years. In May, 1876, he was appointed Secretary of War, and filled that office till the close of President Grant's administration with uncommon intelligence and ability.

He was chairman of the Pennsylvania delegation to the Cincinnati convention of 1876, and there won a very high reputation among the best politicians of the country as an able and skilful politician. He has occupied a seat in the Senate since the first session of the present Congress, October, 1877, and is esteemed in that body as a man of large capacity and unsurpassed industry. His prominent position on several influential committees demonstrates the high regard in which he is held by the Republicans of the Senate, of whom he is among the most "stalwart."

In person, Senator Cameron is tall and lithe, though he is not actually slender, like Senator Saulsbury for example, who scarcely has more flesh on him than a scare-crow pole. Senator Cameron's movements are quick, but easy and graceful. He is a man of wide information not only with respect to practical affairs, but in literature and the lines of general culture. As a conversationalist, he is genial and agreeable, having a fine capacity of making people about him enjoy themselves.

HON. JOHN J. INGALLS, OF KANSAS.

Senator Ingalls, though a lawyer by profession and a good one, was better known to the country as a writer when he entered the Senate than as a lawyer. He is, in truth, a piquant journalist, with uncommon powers of sarcasm and fine humor. A native of Massachusetts, where he received a thorough collegiate and legal training, he removed to "bleeding Kansas" in 1858, when it was still a Territory and the scene of the liveliest political contests that have occurred on this planet. He there practiced law, and for several years conducted a public journal at Atchison. He held several offices, at one time being State senator, and was as thoroughly well known and generally discussed in Kansas years before he came to the Senate as any man in the State. In the famous senatorial contest in the winter of 1872-3, in which Senator Yorke made his remarkable exposure of what was called "Pomeroy's greenbacks," Mr. Ingalls was elected, and took his seat March 4, 1873. For a couple of years he properly and modestly remained pretty quiet, but since, he has taken a prominent part in the debates, and is now regarded as one of the best debaters in the Senate and about the worst man in that body for one to tackle unless one wants to retreat from the combat very thoroughly and beautifully scalped. He is as quick as lightning and as sharp as tacks. In general legislative labors he is very industrious and conscientious, and by reason of this and of his recognized abilities and large intelligence, commands much influence in the Senate.

He is of the medium size, well enough as to looks, wearing glasses but having very keen eyes. I have never met Senator Ingalls at his own apartments, but when I have seen him on social occasions have observed that he keeps persons about in good nature and seems to be in good spirits himself. Hence I suppose that as a conversationalist he is a success. I have been informed by Kansas men that he really is "one of the finest talkists in America" and I can easily believe it.

Having thus sketched three men of the same party—contrary to my custom—I must look out for a first-class Democrat for my next. Accordingly I pitch upon

HON. MILTON SAYLER, OF OHIO.

Since the death of the lamented General Williams, I doubt if there is a Democrat in the House more kindly esteemed by all his fellow-members of all parties than the distinguished member of the first Ohio district. It has always been a marvel to many outsiders why Mr. Sayler was not elected Speaker instead of Mr. Randall. He is equally well-versed in parliamentary law, is a sounder Democrat on the tariff question, and, generally, is a more popular man, with more genial habits commonly recognized as essentially democratic. The explanation lies in the fact that Mr. Randall is one of the most astute political managers in the country. In that way he has undoubted genius. Hence if it be true, as I have heard it whispered in the little church around the corner, that Mr. Randall purposes trying his hand for the presidency, Messrs. Tilden, Bayard, Thurman and Hendricks must look to themselves; for the present Speaker, in a political game of draw, can hold more straight flushes, ace high, than any man in the business. The other Samuel J. is a good player, but too "conservative." The Pennsylvanian is a better player and, besides, has more audacity.

But this is a digression. Mr. Sayler is not Speaker, because his competitor was one of the finest political managers alive, and Mr. Sayler's *forte* lies not in that direction. He is a strong orator, an able debater, a thoroughly sound and conscientious Democrat, but not a first-class wire-puller. He is a man of a thorough classical education, and an excellent lawyer. As a man, he has troops of friends, every one who knows him respecting his honorable character and loving his kindly dispositions. He is good looking, but his baldness and iron-gray hair and beard give him an appearance of age beyond his years. Closely observing his fine Roman face, however, one perceives that he is still in the prime of life. In fact he is considerably on the sunny side of fifty, so that, though he was defeated last year, he yet has plenty of time, in all probability, to regain the lost ground and have a brilliant and influential political future. If we are to have Democrats in Congress at all I should like as many of the Sayler kind as practicable.

Book XXXVI. Page 18

MATERIAL TOO LARGE TO BE FILMED AS A WHOLE FILMED IN SECTIONS ONLY

# BRIGHT'S TARNISHED NAME.

## *A DISHONORED DEMOCRAT IN A SENATE OFFICE.*

THE FRAUDS PERPETRATED BY THE NEW SERGEANT-AT-ARMS ON THE STATE OF INDIANA—A COMPROMISE EFFECTED BY RESTITUTION—CRIMINAL INDICTMENTS FOUND—THE DENUNCIATIONS OF THE DEMOCRATIC PRESS.

*"When you get a good thing, save it, save it;*
*When you catch a black cat, skin it to the tail."*
—Richard J. Bright in the Indianapolis Sentinel.

INDIANAPOLIS, March 26.—In 1871 Richard J. Bright, who is now Sergeant-at-Arms of the United States Senate, was proprietor of the Indianapolis *Herald*, now the *Sentinel*. The Legislature of that year elected him State Printer, and he assumed that office on Feb. 26. On the next day, the 27th, he presented to the State Auditor a bill for 200 reams of 50-pound book paper, amounting to $2,020. He swore to this account, and it was approved by Secretary of State Eddy. On March 6, Bright presented another bill for 644 reams of paper and other items, amounting to $6,807 72. On the 20th of March, another bill was presented for 452 reams of paper and printing work, amounting to $12,621 85. On the 1st of May another bill was presented for 519 reams of paper and other items, amounting to $13,477 90. These vouchers were published in the Indianapolis *Journal* of July 11, and Bright asked for an explanation. On the 12th of July he published an article in reply, which was headed with the couplet:

"When you get a good thing, save it, save it;
When you catch a black cat, skin it to the tail."

Bright said in response to these bills that he proposed to make every dollar out of the office he could legally, and "we hope it will produce a sufficient amount to satisfy our modest desires and leave on hand some balance to spend, if necessary, to aid in continuing Indiana Democratic." As a result of this article, the term "cat-skinner" was generally applied to Bright, and "cat-skinning" became a name for fraud in office.

On July 26 Mr. Bright was arrested for perjury, based upon a bill rendered to the State on March 6. Going before a Justice of the Peace, he gave bail for appearance in the Criminal Court on the 12th of August next following. The Grand Jury returned an indictment in three counts, charging Mr. Bright with the crime of perjury in swearing to the correctness of his bill against the State of March 6. The first count charged Bright with false and corrupt swearing for the purpose of inducing the Secretary of State to approve the bill, Bright well knowing that the State was not indebted to him at that date for any such amount of paper or sum of money. The second count charged Bright with false and corrupt swearing to induce the Auditor of State to draw his warrant upon the Treasurer of the State for the amount of the bill, and the third count charged him with false and corrupt swearing, in violation of the fortieth section of the Felony act. On the 14th of August Bright was arrested and gave bail in the sum of $2,500. On Sept. 4 his trial was begun in the Criminal Court, the defense being represented by Senator McDonald, A. W. Hendricks, Hon. John R. Coffroth, of Lafayette; the late Hon. James Hughes, of Washington; Hon. Jonathan W. Gordon and W. W. Leathers, of this city. The trial lasted 16 days. No evidence was introduced to show that the paper had been furnished to the State or the work done as charged. The foreman of Bright's office swore it would have been utterly impossible to use the amount of paper for which Bright had charged within the time specified. The defense relied mainly upon proving that it was not the custom of the Auditor of State to require such bills to be sworn to, and that the affidavit being one upon a matter in which no oath was legally required, the charge of perjury could not be maintained.

Secretary of State Eddy testified that he did not approve the bill by reason of Bright's oath, and Auditor Shoemaker testified that he did not require the oath; so the first two counts of the indictment fell. The fight was made on the last count. The jury, consisting of six Republicans and six Democrats, after being out 48 hours, came into court, and being unable to agree, were discharged.

This criminal action created the greatest polit- [illegible] throughout the Sheriff of this county last Fall, and all these facts were published again and again. The contest was very heated, and as Bright is a man of personal popularity, and was warmly supported by the party, he made a strong run, but was defeated by about 600 votes.

## *BAYARD TAYLOR'S SUCCESSOR.*

PRESIDENT WHITE, OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY, NOMINATED FOR THE OFFICE OF MINISTER TO GERMANY.

SYRACUSE, March 26.—The announcement of the nomination of Hon. Andrew D. White, of this city, as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Germany was received in this city with especial satisfaction. President White arrived in Syracuse this evening and cordially granted an interview to the TIMES correspondent. "You can say," said Mr. White, "that I shall accept the appointment, if I am confirmed by the Senate. I have spent three years of my life in Germany, two of which were passed in Berlin. After being graduated from Yale College, I entered the University at Berlin, and took a degree. I made many acquaintances and warm friendships in that city, which I shall be glad to renew. I have never seen President Hayes since he was elected President, although I know him personally very well."

"Did Senator Conkling have anything to do with securing the appointment?"

President White—Not to my knowledge. I do not think he ever suggested to the President my name for nomination. I have always been a warm personal and political friend of Senator Conkling, and advocated his first election as United States Senator. At the same time I have felt at perfect liberty to criticise his policy when I thought he had made mistakes, and have freely told him so. Senator Conkling is a man who, in minor matters, sometimes makes mistakes, but is generally right on grave questions.

"Will it not be said that your appointment will be considered as a peace offering on the part of the President to Mr. Conkling?"

President White—Senator Conkling has had nothing to do with my appointment so far as I am aware, and no such interpretation should be put upon the President's action in the matter. The appointment, I presume, is conferred without reference to political reasons, such as suggested by you. I think, however, that there are significant indications that the opposition to the President in the Republican Party is becoming more conciliatory, and that the breach in the party bids fair to be healed. I know that the President is anxious for harmony, and will do his full share toward bringing it about.

"What do you think of the President's civil service policy?"

President White—I think that this civil service is destined to become one of, if not the gravest question in politics, but I think that at present there are other questions of greater importance that should be alluded to. First of all is the financial question; then the policy of dealing with the South. Upon the wise solution of these questions depends, in the largest degree, the welfare of our country. But, sooner or later, the civil service question will prove to be the dividing line between parties and factions. Civil service leagues will be formed all over the country, and I have no doubt that the civil service party will eventually triumph. The President's Southern policy meets my approval. Ex-President Grant told me in Europe that, in his opinion, President Hayes was right on the Southern question.

"Will you resign the Presidency of Cornell University?"

President White—No, I shall not. When I went to Europe for my health in 1876, I handed in my resignation to the Board of Trustees. The board, by a unanimous vote, refused to accept the resignation. Prof. Russell, the Vice-President, will act as President during my absence in Europe. Cornell University has reached that stage where its success does not depend upon the efforts of any one man.

"Who do you think will be the next Republican candidate for President?"

President White—I think all indications point to Gen. Grant as the coming man. Grant is profiting greatly by his European tour, and is an observing student of the people and governments of the countries he is visiting.

"When will you sail for Berlin?"

President White—Why, my nomination has not been confirmed by the Senate yet, and I cannot tell when I shall leave for Berlin. That will depend upon circumstances somewhat.

President White will address the Union League Club of New-York on Thursday evening next.

Hon. Andrew D. White, who has been appointed Minister to Germany, to succeed the late Bayard Taylor, is a native of Syracuse, N. Y., his father being a wealthy and prominent resident of that city. His collegiate studies were begun at Hamilton College, where he spent a year, and finished at Yale, in 1853, where he was graduated at the head of his class and took first prizes for scholarship and oratory. Mr. White then went to Europe, where he was for a time an attaché to the American Legation at St. Petersburg, and where he laid the foundation of his present magnificent library. On his return he was elected to the chair of "History" in the Michigan University at Ann Arbor, which he accepted after declining a similar position offered him at Yale. Owing to ill health, Mr. White resigned in 1863, and spent six months in Europe. On returning to Syracuse he was chosen a State Senator, serving two terms at Albany. He met Mr. Ezra Cornell, founder of Cornell University, at Ithaca. When the University was organized in 1866 Mr. White became its President, an office he has held ever since. In 1871 he was one of the Commissioners to visit San Domingo. During the same year he presided over the Republican State Convention at Syracuse, and in 1876 he was a delegate at large from this State to the convention which nominated President Hayes.

# THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS.

## *A REVOLUTIONARY PROGRAMME AGREED UPON.*

THE REPEAL OF THE POLITICAL LAWS TO BE INSISTED UPON WITH SLIGHT MODIFICATIONS—A PLAIN THREAT TO THE PRESIDENT—WHAT THE BOURBONS HAD TO SAY ABOUT THEIR PLANS.

WASHINGTON, March 26.—Both houses of Congress adjourned at an early hour to-day to enable the Democratic Senators and members to attend a joint caucus called for 1 o'clock. The object of the caucus was to hear the report of the two committees appointed by a former caucus of the Democratic members of the two houses, to decide upon the order of business and the course of legislation during the present session. Every Senator and member in the city was present with one or two exceptions.

As soon as the caucus had been called to order, Mr. Chalmers, Chairman of the House committee, took the floor and presented the report of the conference committee. He said the efforts of the conference had been constantly directed by a desire and intention to reach an agreement in relation to the repeal of the Federal Election laws, the jurors' test oath, and the law authorizing the presence of Federal troops at the polls. The committee had labored to reach conclusions which would be entirely acceptable to their colleagues in both houses, and from which they would in no event be willing to recede in any particular. To do this was no easy matter, for there were, from the start, differences of opinion in the committee as to the general policy to be pursued, some of which had not been reconciled, while others had only been settled by important concessions. There had been, he said, especial difficulty in reaching a conclusion upon the repeal of the Federal Election laws, for there was a strong sentiment manifested in favor of retaining intact a great part of the machinery, strong arguments being made to show that it was necessary to Democratic success in those doubtful States where all the election machinery was in the hands of the Republicans. Other interests, he said, resisted the attempt to deal with all of this legislation at once, making the argument that the repeal of the jurors' test oath should be first dealt with. There was also, he said, a wide difference of opinion as to the best method of proposing this legislation, whether as special laws or as amendments to appropriation bills. The question as to whether or not some affirmative legislation should be proposed to take the place of that repealed was also discussed at some length, and minor points were contested, so that the report had only been agreed upon after long and serious deliberation and mutual concessions. Mr. Chalmers also said that every point had been so carefully and persistently considered, and so earnest and able had been the debate in the conference thereon, that the service had been the most instructive and interesting, as well as the most arduous, of his whole public life. He hoped the joint caucus would take the report and consider it, together with all the circumstances connected with its preparation, and in whatever shape it should be adopted, to have it understood that there was to be no deviation from it.

He then sent the report to the Secretary to be read. It describes what is proposed to be done in the direction of repealing the Federal Election laws, and is substantially as follows: The provisions of the Army bill are to be identical with those contained in the measure as it was passed by the last House, including the clause which prohibits the presence of troops at the polls. The repeal of the test oath for jurors, the manner of drawing jurors, and the law governing the pay, as incorporated in the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation bill of the last session, will be substantially the same, the exceptions being several alterations in the phraseology. Sections 2,016, 2,018, and 2,020 of the Federal Election laws of the Revised Statutes, and all succeeding sections, including 2,027, are to be severally repealed, and section 2,017 is to be amended by striking out of the first line the words "and required." Section 2,019 will be amended by striking out the clause relative to the canvassing of ballots. Section 2,028 will be amended so as to require Supervisors of Election to be residents of the precincts in which they perform such duties. Section 2,031, except so much thereof passage of separate bills. He expressed confidence that the President would approve bills prepared in this manner.

Mr. Carlisle spoke in favor of the report of the committee. It was better to put this legislation on the appropriation bills, because time would be saved. Appropriation bills were always in order, and could be controlled by a majority, whereas separate bills would be liable to all the delays and obstructions which could be created under the rules.

Senator Bayard advocated the introduction of separate bills, and spoke emphatically against the policy of placing legislation of this kind upon appropriation bills.

Mr. Speer, of Georgia, also advocated the passage of separate bills, and offered a resolution to that effect. This resolution, however, was rejected by such a decided vote that the minority had not the courage to call for a division. A resolution to include the Supervisors in the repealing sections was also rejected.

Speeches in favor of the plan reported by the committee were made by Senators Kernan and Morgan, and Representatives Springer, Turner, and others. Many members desired to have the Supervisors included in the repealing sections, but as the amendments to be proposed to the Election laws strip the Supervisors of all authority over the registration which precedes the election, as well as over the canvass and counting of the ballots, and makes them mere witnesses of the transactions of the election officers in receiving and computing the ballots cast, they were persuaded to accept the report of the committee, which was finally adopted with something like unanimity.

The committee reported that no agreement could be reached touching the subject of attempting general legislation at this session. The House committee favored legislation, while the Senate committee opposed it. The caucus decided to leave this matter to the judgment of the respective houses.

Pending a motion to adjourn, it was suggested that, as the political legislation to be added to the two unfinished appropriation bills had now been agreed upon, those two bills should be at once reported to the House and referred to the Committee of the Whole. Those members of the House who want the standing committees announced opposed this, for the reason that they believe that if those bills are held back in order that they may be reported regularly from the Committee on Appropriations, the Speaker will be forced to announce the committees at an early day. It is known that Speaker Randall is opposed to attempting general legislation at the extra session, and it is believed that should the appropriation bills be passed before he announces the committees he will hold them back until a day for final adjournment is fixed. Those members, therefore, who want the House to proceed with general legislation insisted upon the regular order, which was the motion to adjourn, and it was carried.

The Democrats seem determined to adhere to the programme laid down in the caucus of to-day, and say that should the President veto the bills final adjournment will be fixed for an early day, and Congress will disperse without providing the means to conduct the Government after June 30.

Both the appropriation bills are ready to be reported to the House, but it is doubtful whether they will be reported until the standing committees are announced. A single objection would prevent their introduction at this time.

## *A SCHEME FOR GETTING VOTES.*

THE DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS CONTEMPLATING THE ADMISSION OF UTAH AS A STATE.

WASHINGTON, March 26.—There is what seems to be a serious project on foot in Washington to admit the Territory of Utah into the Union as a State. The proposition is made by a number of leading Democrats whose counsel is known to have much weight with the Democratic Party, and there is some reason to believe that should general legislation be considered during the present session it will receive early attention. Those who favor the admission of Utah do so ostensibly on the ground that it contains upward of 125,000 people, that [illegible] votes at the last election, and that the great majority of its citizens are clamorous for their right to take part in the government of the nation. In reality, however, the partisans who favor the admission do so because they believe that the great mass of the people of the Territory—in other words, the Mormons—knowing that polygamy has always been opposed by the Republican Party as such, would secure the two Senators and the member from the new State to the Democracy. In this way it is hoped that the return of a Republican majority to the Senate will be still further retarded than it would otherwise be. Of course, the Democrats, being now in complete possession of both branches of Congress, would be able to carry their nice little scheme through the National Legislature; but how they expect to overcome the Executive veto, should it be interposed, does not appear. Some of them claim that President Hayes would not refuse to sign a bill providing for the admission of the proposed new State, particularly if it can be made to appear that the Territory now contains the population which entitles it to admission.

*FINANCIAL AFFAIRS.*

correctness of his bill against the State of March 6. The first count charged Bright with false and corrupt swearing for the purpose of inducing the Secretary of State to approve the bill, Bright well knowing that the State was not indebted to him at that date for any such amount of paper or sum of money. The second count charged Bright with false and corrupt swearing to induce the Auditor of State to draw his warrant upon the Treasurer of the State for the amount of the bill, and the third count charged him with false and corrupt swearing, in violation of the fortieth section of the Felony act. On the 14th of August Bright was arrested and gave bail in the sum of $2,500. On Sept. 4 his trial was begun in the Criminal Court, the defense being represented by Senator McDonald, A. W. Hendricks, Hon. John R. Coffroth, of Lafayette; the late Hon. James Hughes, of Washington; Hon. Jonathan W. Gordon and W. W. Leathers, of this city. The trial lasted 16 days. No evidence was introduced to show that the paper had been furnished to the State or the work done as charged. The foreman of Bright's office swore it would have been utterly impossible to use the amount of paper for which Bright had charged within the time specified. The defense relied mainly upon proving that it was not the custom of the Auditor of State to require such bills to be sworn to, and that the affidavit being one upon a matter in which no oath was legally required, the charge of perjury could not be maintained.

Secretary of State Eddy testified that he did not approve the bill by reason of Bright's oath, and Auditor Shoemaker testified that he did not require the oath; so the first two counts of the indictment fell. The fight was made on the last count. The jury, consisting of six Republicans and six Democrats, after being out 48 hours, came into court, and being unable to agree, were discharged.

This criminal action created the greatest political and personal excitement throughout the State. The feeling was so decided that Attorney-General Hanna, a Democrat, began a civil proceeding against Bright for $20,000, the sum the State had been defrauded out of through these false bills. Associated with him in the prosecution was Hon. Napoleon B. Taylor, a leading Democratic attorney of this city. In the month of November, Bright began the work of furnishing paper for which he had charged the State in the preceding March. He built an iron warehouse in the rear of the *Sentinel* printing establishment, filled it with paper, had it insured against loss by fire, and then began negotiating with the counsel representing the State. As a result the officers of the State agreed to dismiss the civil suit for the sum of $20,000, the consideration being that the State had been secured against loss by receiving 859 reams of paper, then stored in the warehouse. This agreement is entered on the records of the court, under date of Feb. 9, 1872.

The second trial for perjury began Feb. 6, 1872, and ended in Bright's acquittal. The civil suit having been compromised three days after this second trial had begun on this hearing, no effort was made to establish the truth of the bills presented in March of the previous year. During this exposure Mr. Bright was denounced by the leading newspapers of his own party. The New-Albany *Ledger-Standard* said on June 22, 1871:

"Mr. Bright owes it to his party to make an explanation of this book-paper transaction. If he does make a satisfactory explanation, none will be more ready than we to publish a refutation of the charges made by the *Journal*. If he does not do it, then the sooner he makes good his threat to resign his office the better for the party."

The Vincennes *Sun*, quoting the remark of Bright that he expected to be re-elected State Printer, said:

"We expect nothing of the kind, and we will hazard a limited amount of currency that in the next Legislature you receive a less number of votes for State Printer than you got for the Penitentiary last week from a jury of 12 good and lawful men of the County of Marion."

The same paper, under date of July 18, said:

"The recent discovery of tremendous frauds on the Treasury by Richard J. Bright, is sufficient to overwhelm with shame and mortification the Democracy of Indiana, and calls for the prompt, earnest, and unanimous condemnation of our party friends throughout the State. Every Democratic editor in the State should fearlessly and unhesitatingly condemn this great wrong. We must either destroy Bright and render him powerless for further evil, or Bright will destroy the party."

From their advent in public affairs in Indiana, the Bright family have been the bane and curse of the Democratic Party. Imperious, tyrannical, selfish, and corrupt, they scruple at nothing, however dishonorable, in order to advance their own individual interests. "Rule or ruin" is the motto which has always guided them, and for personal aggrandizement there is not one of them that would hesitate to corrupt and defeat the party.

Richard J. Bright sought to swindle the State Central Committee last year out of more than $1,000 on trumped-up charges for printing that was never done. A statement is made by one of the best Democrats in Indiana that Richard J. Bright undertook, during the session of the Legislature last Winter, to black-mail a prominent Democrat of Vigo County out of $1,000 by offering for that amount to use his influence to have Gov. Baker veto a certain bill, when he knew at the time that Baker had determined to veto it, and that his influence was not worth a farthing.

Bright was the nominee of his party for [illegible] formed all over the country, and I have no doubt that the civil service party will eventually triumph. The President's Southern policy meets my approval. Ex-President Grant told me in Europe that, in his opinion, President Hayes was right on the Southern question.

"Will you resign the Presidency of Cornell University?"

President White—No, I shall not. When I went to Europe for my health in 1876, I handed in my resignation to the Board of Trustees. The board, by a unanimous vote, refused to accept the resignation. Prof. Russell, the Vice-President, will act as President during my absence in Europe. Cornell University has reached that stage where its success does not depend upon the efforts of any one man.

"Who do you think will be the next Republican candidate for President?"

President White—I think all indications point to Gen. Grant as the coming man. Grant is profiting greatly by his European tour, and is an observing student of the people and governments of the countries he is visiting.

"When will you sail for Berlin?"

President White—Why, my nomination has not been confirmed by the Senate yet, and I cannot tell when I shall leave for Berlin. That will depend upon circumstances somewhat.

President White will address the Union League Club of New-York on Thursday evening next.

Hon. Andrew D. White, who has been appointed Minister to Germany, to succeed the late Bayard Taylor, is a native of Syracuse, N. Y., his father being a wealthy and prominent resident of that city. His collegiate studies were begun at Hamilton College, where he spent a year, and finished at Yale, in 1853, where he was graduated at the head of his class and took first prizes for scholarship and oratory. Mr. White then went to Europe, where he was for a time an attaché to the American Legation at St. Petersburg, and where he laid the foundation of his present magnificent library. On his return he was elected to the chair of "History" in the Michigan University at Ann Arbor, which he accepted after declining a similar position offered him at Yale. Owing to ill health, Mr. White resigned in 1863, and spent six months in Europe. On returning to Syracuse he was chosen a State Senator, serving two terms at Albany. He met Mr. Ezra Cornell, founder of Cornell University, at Ithaca. When the University was organized in 1866 Mr. White became its President, an office he has held ever since. In 1871 he was one of the Commissioners to visit San Domingo. During the same year he presided over the Republican State Convention at Syracuse, and in 1876 he was a delegate at large from this State to the convention which nominated President Hayes.

## *MISS HUBBARD'S HUSBAND.*

DISCOVERY THAT THE GROOM AND BRIDE ARE STILL IN HARTFORD.

HARTFORD, Conn., March 26.—Some of the reports about the marriage of Gov. Hubbard's daughter have been so wide of the truth as to prove very offensive. In the first place, it was generally believed that the coachman and young lady met in New-Haven on Saturday, the former going there the day before, the family supposed, because the girl left home at noon on Saturday, and it was inferred that she left Hartford on the noon train. Up to this afternoon all conversation on the subject has been based upon the idea that the couple were on a wedding tour. But no one has ventured to guess where they are. It now appears that the family and the public have been entirely mistaken. When the young lady left home she did not go to the depot, but proceeded at once to the house of a friend of her husband, who joined her there that night. Neither he nor she has been out of Hartford since. They are not, however, at the house where they first met, but are together in new quarters, the situation of which is known to only two or three people, and caution is exercised to keep the place a secret for the present.

Meanwhile, an effort has been made to obtain assurances from Gov. Hubbard that no forcible measures will be taken if the husband appears in public, but as none have been intended, though the coachman seems, for some reason, to have taken alarm, the request has been looked upon as absurd. It is understood that Gov. Hubbard maintains a severe attitude on the subject, and says that under no circumstances whatever will he receive any communication from either his daughter or her husband. They are privileged to go their own way. The course of Shepard, the husband, in this new development of the case, looks cowardly, and when the fact is known, the impression of his good intentions, which has been gaining ground, will change to a feeling that he is not half the man he has been reputed to be. There is no doubt whatever of his being here, and of the fact that his wife has not been out of Hartford at all.

## *TENNESSEE AND HER DEBT.*

GOV. MARKS SUGGESTS A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IF THE LEGISLATURE CANNOT AGREE UPON A SETTLEMENT.

NASHVILLE, Tenn., March 26.—The following Message was sent to the Legislature to-day by Gov. Marks:

"Your present session ought not to close without some decisive step toward the settlement of the public debt. The public welfare imperatively demands that this question shall be eliminated from the politics of the State as speedily as possible, and if it shall result that your views are irreconcilable, I suggest in that event that you provide for a constitutional convention. This disturbing question must be settled at some time, and the sooner the better. If your views prove irreconcilable now, it is not probable you will agree in the future, and, consequently, the only step you can take in the event of final disagreement is to resort to a constitutional convention. A constitutional convention, composed as it will be of but one body, cannot fail of a settlement. Clothed with sovereign power, its action will be final and irrevocable. Consisting of fewer members, it will cost no more than an extra session of the Legislature. If you provide for such a convention, it still remains for the people to determine whether it shall have any existence or not. I make this recommendation now, so that if you fail to reach an agreement, a proper bill may be perfected before your adjournment, if you concur with me as to the propriety of the step."

[illegible] whether as special laws or as amendments to appropriation bills. The question as to whether or not some affirmative legislation should be proposed to take the place of that repealed was also discussed at some length, and minor points were contested, so that the report had only been agreed upon after long and serious deliberation and mutual concessions. Mr. Chalmers also said that every point had been so carefully and persistently considered, and so earnest and able had been the debate in the conference thereon, that the service had been the most instructive and interesting, as well as the most arduous, of his whole public life. He hoped the joint caucus would take the report and consider it, together with all the circumstances connected with its preparation, and in whatever shape it should be adopted, to have it understood that there was to be no deviation from it.

He then sent the report to the Secretary to be read. It describes what is proposed to be done in the direction of repealing the Federal Election laws, and is substantially as follows: The provisions of the Army bill are to be identical with those contained in the measure as it was passed by the last House, including the clause which prohibits the presence of troops at the polls. The repeal of the test oath for jurors, the manner of drawing jurors, and the law governing the pay, as incorporated in the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation bill of the last session, will be substantially the same, the exceptions being several alterations in the phraseology. Sections 2,016, 2,018, and 2,020 of the Federal Election laws of the Revised Statutes, and all succeeding sections, including 2,027, are to be severally repealed, and section 2,017 is to be amended by striking out of the first line the words "and required." Section 2,029 will be amended by striking out the clause relative to the canvassing of ballots. Section 2,028 will be amended so as to require Supervisors of Election to be residents of the precincts in which they perform such duties. Section 2,031, except so much thereof as relates to the pay of Supervisors of Elections, and all sections or parts of sections which authorize the appointment of a Chief Supervisor of Elections or Deputy Marshals, and all those descriptive of the power of such officers will also be repealed. The effect of the repeal, if enacted, will be to provide for the appointment by the courts of two Supervisors of Elections—representing the two political parties—in every voting precinct throughout the United States, if request is made for the same by petition or otherwise of not less than 10 citizens, voters of the precinct in which the Supervisors are to act in compliance with their request. By the repeal Supervisors of Elections are given the power to act in their capacity not only in cities of more than 20,000 inhabitants, but in small towns irrespective of population. The power of arrest now vested in the Chief Supervisor is to be abolished with that officer, and the functions and power of the two Supervisors provided for are to be restricted to that of witnesses and challengers only. The penal sections of the Revised Statutes—5,505 to 5,528—which provide for the punishment of illegal voting as may be reported, either by the Supervisors or citizens, are not to be interfered with, but will remain intact. At the last session the repealing clauses embraced section 2,011 and all succeeding sections, including 2,028. The programme agreed to leaves standing sections 2,011 to 2,015 inclusive, and all of 2,017 and 2,019, excepting as indicated above, and is simply amendatory of section 2,028, requiring Supervisors to be residents of the precinct in which they act. Section 5,522, which prescribes penalties for the interference of Marshals, was not among the repealing clauses of the bill of last session.

There was considerable discussion over the adoption of the report of the committee. Mr. Voorhees made a strong speech, in which he denounced the Election laws, and charged that they were passed by the Republicans, when that party controlled both branches of Congress by a two-thirds vote, for the deliberate purpose of perpetuating themselves in power. He was in favor of sweeping the Election laws entirely from the statute-books, but had been induced to consent to the retention of the Supervisors, in the form recommended by the committee, as a compromise.

Mr. Lamar also made a speech of considerable length, in which he argued that the Election laws were in violation of the Constitution. He denied that the National Government had the power to confer the right to vote. Not having the power to confer this right, it had no power to enforce it. Congress could regulate the time and manner of voting, and could prescribe that the elective franchise should not be abridged, and that no class of citizens should be discriminated against, but it could not assume to direct and control elections by appointing officers to take charge of the ballot-boxes and to canvass the votes. This was reserved to the States. He had no doubt whatever about the unconstitutionality of that portion of the Election laws which provides for the appointment of Deputy Marshals, and he did not believe that the Republicans could successfully defend that portion of those laws. About the Supervisors there was room for reasonable doubt, and therefore he favored retaining those sections with the modifications proposed. He wanted the repealing legislation to be so framed that the Democrats could stand upon it and justify their conduct to the people of the country.

Mr. Stephens spoke briefly, and urged the [illegible] providing the means to conduct the Government after June 30.

Both the appropriation bills are ready to be reported to the House, but it is doubtful whether they will be reported until the standing committees are announced. A single objection would prevent their introduction at this time.

## *A SCHEME FOR GETTING VOTES.*

THE DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS CONTEMPLATING THE ADMISSION OF UTAH AS A STATE.

WASHINGTON, March 26.—There is what seems to be a serious project on foot in Washington to admit the Territory of Utah into the Union as a State. The proposition is made by a number of leading Democrats whose counsel is known to have much weight with the Democratic Party, and there is some reason to believe that should general legislation be considered during the present session it will receive early attention. Those who favor the admission of Utah do so ostensibly on the ground that it contains upward of 125,000 people, [illegible] votes at the last election, and that the great majority of its citizens are clamorous for their right to take part in the government of the nation. In reality, however, the partisans who favor the admission do so because they believe that the great mass of the people of the Territory—in other words, the Mormons—knowing that polygamy has always been opposed by the Republican Party as such, would secure the two Senators and the member from the new State to the Democracy. In this way it is hoped that the return of a Republican majority to the Senate will be still further retarded than it would otherwise be. Of course, the Democrats, being now in complete possession of both branches of Congress, would be able to carry their nice little scheme through the National Legislature; but how they expect to overcome the Executive veto, should it be interposed, does not appear. Some of them claim that President Hayes would not refuse to sign a bill providing for the admission of the proposed new State, particularly if it can be made to appear that the Territory now contains the population which entitles it to admission.

*FINANCIAL AFFAIRS.*

XXXVIII
19

MATERIAL TOO LARGE TO BE FILMED AS A WHOLE FILMED IN SECTIONS ONLY

March 24, 1879.

79.

# A WARRIOR'S WELCOME

## Magnificent Reception to General Shields at Jefferson.

## His Plea for Harmony and Conciliation.

## Full Report of the Gallant Hero's Speech --The Police Commissionerships.

## Maguire the Tramp---Lincoln Institute.

Special Correspondence of the Post-Dispatch.

JEFFERSON CITY, March 23.—This has been a pleasant and quiet day at the Capital. The anticipation of the morrow keeps newspaper men from doing anything desperate.

The Senate, when in executive session last Friday, adjourned to meet in executive session at half-past ten to-morrow morning. At that time

THE CASE OF MR. LADD

will be attempted to be reconsidered. Senator Mackey had a mass of testimony, consisting chiefly of the recommendations of merchants of the Cotton Exchange and tobacco men of St. Louis, recommending Mr. Ladd. These documents have been turned over to Senator Majors, and the attempt to get the Senate to reconsider will be hotly contested. Senator Mackey feels confident if there is a full Senate and the evidence is produced that Mr. Ladd will be confirmed. It seems that Senators Majors, Mackey and Cottey are the gentlemen who are standing by Mr. Ladd and championing his lost cause. The cause therefor is left to the knowing ones to determine. If the Senate still refuses to-morrow to reconsider, then certainly Gov. Phelps will give them two new names this week.

Next Friday, the 28th, is the date fixed for the execution of

MAGUIRE, THE TRAMP

who brutally murdered Charles Brown in this city last summer. His case has been pending in the Supreme Court for the past month, and unless said court reverses the cause when it convenes to-morrow, Maguire will hang on that day. He has given various orders to the Sheriff in relation to the execution, and among the most prominent is that the drop should not be more than three feet. For the past week he has eaten very little, and is in close daily communion with his Christian adviser.

THE RECEPTION TO GEN. SHIELDS,

to-morrow, promises to be a great success. The programme is for the members of the General Assembly, the Mexican veterans and citizens to proceed in a body to the depot at 2 p. m., accompanied by a band of music, and receive the old General in a becoming manner. All citizens having carriages are to have the same on hand for the accommodation of visitors, etc. After his reception at the depot, the assemblage, headed by the band, will proceed up Water street to Madison, thence to Main and then west on Main to the Capitol, where the reception and speeches proper will be made in the Hall of the House.

The directors of the

LINCOLN INSTITUTE

in this city have been congratulating themselves and feeling highly elated over an appropriation of $5,000, made by the General Assembly, to pay the indebtedness of that institution, and hardly a dissenting vote was heard upon its passage, but now comes the rumor that Gov. Phelps, in whose hands the appropriation bill is, intends to veto that portion relating to this $5,000, on the grounds that the Constitution prohibits the paying of any such indebtedness. This, if true, will be a severe blow on this institution, and one that is bound to cripple it, as they have grown despondent over the payment of said debt, and have just been feeling happy and thankful to the Thirtieth General Assembly for its noble efforts in thus releiving them of this heavy burden.

The house interest bill is the special order in that body for Tuesday next. This is the 6 per cent bill, and the House, without doubt, will lay it on the table and

gether. North and South, East and West, will all sink down together to the dead level of the other unfortunate Republics of this continent. But there are political leaders who tell us that one of the causes of this sectional struggle is a "solid South." It ought not to be forgotten, however, that the South has been compelled by circumstances to become solid, in self-defense; that the Southern people considered it their duty to unite to save themselves and their families from what they regarded as moral, social and political degradation. Then there are statesmen, and able statesmen, too, who look upon the solid South as something honorable at this time to American character. They think it demonstrates to the world that the grand old American spirit still lives amongst the American people. They say that the spirit of 1776, which united the thirteen colonies into a *solid America* against the threatened injustice of England, is the spirit of 1879 which unites the Southern States into a *solid South* against threatened injustice from any quarter. So long as this spirit lives amongst our people, so long will we be able to present a *solid America* against all enemies, and a *solid America*, if true to itself, will be always able to bid defiance to the combined powers of a hostile world. But to my notion Southern human nature is the same in all respects as Northern human nature. Insult and injury produce alienation and discontent, while kindness and confidence insure conciliation and good will. Would it not be well, therefore, to hazard the experiment of treating the Southern people, for some time at least, with kindness and confidence, and with that which is due even to the South—common justice. The result, in my opinion, would fully justify the experiment.

NAPOLEON AND LA VENDEE.

A historical incident occurs to me at this time, which will illustrate what I mean in recommending this policy. In 1799 Napoleon Bonaparte was chosen First Consul of the French Republic. Soon after his appointment he called his counselors together and informed them, in his frank and fearless way, that France had to prepare to make head against a coalition of all the great powers of Europe. "To fight all Europe successfully," said he, "the complete pacification of the province of La Vendee is absolutely necessary. Gentlemen, what course ought this Government pursue to effect the pacification of that province?" "Pacify La Vendee!" answered his counselors; "that is a task which is simply impossible."

"La Vendee cannot be conciliated. The people are incorrigible rebels, and they will seize upon the first opportunity to aid in overthrowing the Republican Government. We have no alternative left but to crush them. This Government will be compelled to destroy La Vendee in order to save the French Republic."

"I hope not," said Napoleon. "France needs all her sons, and I will not be the man to destroy the children of France. I shall try an experiment upon these Vendeans, and I will have to change my estimate of human nature if it does not prove successful. I shall send for the Vendean leaders and meet them alone in the Bois de Boulogne, and conciliate them by doing them and their people complete justice."

"Meet these rebels alone in that forest?" said his counselors. "The traitors will assassinate you."

"No," said Napoleon, "there is no fear of that. Men who fight for a conviction, however erroneous it may be, are not assassins."

He sent a safe conduct to the Vendean chiefs. He met them alone in the Boulogne forest. He told them frankly what he had told his counselors before, that France had to prepare to battle against combined Europe, and that the reconciliement of the people of La Vendee was absolutely necessary to enable her to encounter the coming storm. "I might be able," said he, "to destroy that province, but I cannot reconcile its people to a republic. You can, however. You are the natural leaders of the people. You can aid France and save your native province. There is a pledge under the seal of State that you shall be left hereafter in full enjoyment of your own institutions and laws, usages and traditions, rights and privileges. The people of La Vendee shall have full power to manage their own affairs in their own way, without any interference on the part of the General Government. The only return I ask for this is that as Frenchmen you will assist your country in the coming struggle." The Vendean chiefs burst forth into acclamations of joyful surprise: "Why, this is all we ever asked for and more than we ever hoped for. The Republican rulers always treated us as rebels and almost succeeded in making us forget that we are Frenchmen; but you are magnanimous, you place confidence in us and treat us as fellow countrymen, and from this hour fellow countrymen we will be, and as such assist France under any government to fight the combined powers of Europe." And handsomely and gloriously they kept that pledge; they were amongst the best soldiers of those armies that entered in triumph afterwards into nearly all the capitals of Europe; and from that day to this they have continued to be amongst the most faithful citizens of their beloved country. This was the policy of the great Napoleon in a case very similar to ours, and my opinion is that if both political

upon its passage, but now comes the rumor that Gov. Phelps, in whose hands the appropriation bill is, intends to veto that portion relating to this $5,000, on the grounds that the Constitution prohibits the paying of any such indebtedness. This, if true, will be a severe blow on this institution, and one that is bound to cripple it, as they have grown despondent over the payment of said debt, and have just been feeling happy and thankful to the Thirtieth General Assembly for its noble efforts in thus releiving them of this heavy burden.

The house interest bill is the special order in that body for Tuesday next. This is the 6 per cent bill, and the House, without doubt, will lay it on the table and agree to the Senate bill placing the legal rate at 5 per cent, contract rate 8 per cent.

The grain and warehouse bill will also be acted on by the committee on Tuesday, and although the majority will report against it, a few will favor it.

## The Programme Carried Out.

Special to the Post-Dispatch.

JEFFERSON CITY, March 24.—The programme of the reception to General Shields has been carried out in a most successful manner. The hero of two wars and the Senator for three States was received most enthusiastically. Cheer after cheer greeted him on his arrival at the depot, and the veteran warrior never looked better or happier.

From the depot to the Capitol the gallant General met with one hearty, tumultuous ovation. In the hall of the House he was received by the Senators and Representatives, and in response spoke as follows:

GEN. SHIELD'S SPEECH.

Gentlemen of the Legislature, Fellow-Citizens and Old Comrades:

I return my heartfelt thanks for your kind, generous and enthusiastic reception. It does my heart good to find myself once more amongst warm-hearted friends, who have always stood by me, both in war and in peace. I made a strenuous effort while in the Senate to have tardy justice done to my old comrades, the Mexican veterans. Unfortunately, the effort proved unavailing for the time being; but it had the effect of calling the attention of the country to the subject and of recalling to the public mind the magnitude of the services rendered by that little army. In my opinion, the present Congress will be sure to complete what the last Congress had only an opportunity to commence.

My term of service in the Senate was very brief, but still it was long enough to give me time and opportunity to scan the present political horizon. I observed with some anxiety that there is one dark cloud visible in that region. The cloud I refer to is not only dark, but is charged with some elements of future danger to this Republic.

SECTIONAL PREJUDICE.

The danger is found in sectional prejudice, sectional antipathy and sectional animosity, and my great fear is that time will harden these feelings into deep-seated sectional hostility. My reasons for this apprehension are these: Twenty years ago, in the year 1859, I sat in the Senate of the United States, representing in part, at that time, the young and prospering State of Minnesota. The all-absorbing question of that day was a sectional question, the question of slavery. This question was then called the "irrepressible conflict." That question inflamed political passions, obstructed general legislation, and contributed to paralyze the energies of the Government. All the evils of that conflict were charged upon slavery at that time, and philanthropists declared that if slavery were once abolished, all conflict between the North and South would terminate forever. Well, after a lapse of twenty years I entered the Senate once more. I sat in that body again, representing in part, at this time, the great and growing State of Missouri. A wonderful change had passed over the whole land in the meantime. I found the Senate changed, the Capital changed, in fact the whole country changed, and that slavery, as an evil, had ceased to exist. But there was one thing that change had left untouched, the irrepressible conflict confronted me still; the "sectional contest" between the North and South was as fierce as ever. I asked myself then, in the Senate in Washington, and I ask myself now in this Capitol in Jefferson City: Is this unnatural, unnational and un-American conflict to go on forever? Will it never come to an end? Will the American people never be permitted to live together in peace and harmony? The American people as a whole are deeply injured by this conflict. To them it is productive of nothing but unmitigated evil. No people on earth are better fitted by nature to live together in amity. They are children of the same soil, citizens of the same republic, and heirs of the same destiny, and, in spite of their divisions and dissensions, and even in spite of themselves, they will have to submit to the same destiny so long as a republican government lasts in America. There are not two destinies marked out by fortune for this people, one for the North and another for the South.

A PLEA FOR HARMONY.

The North and South must go up together or down together. Providence has bound them together by chains forged by nature, which are as hard as adamant and as strong as iron. If, in an access of madness, this people ever break these chains, they will all go down together as surely as we are Americans. Let us, then, forget that we are Frenchmen, but you are magnanimous, you place confidence in us and treat us as fellow countrymen, and from this hour fellow countrymen we will be, and as such assist France under any government to fight the combined powers of Europe." And handsomely and gloriously they kept that pledge; they were amongst the best soldiers of those armies that entered in triumph afterwards into nearly all the capitals of Europe; and from that day to this they have continued to be amongst the most faithful citizens of their beloved country. This was the policy of the great Napoleon in a case very similar to ours, and my opinion is that if both political parties, Democrats and Republicans, would follow this example in their treatment of the South, the "irrepressible conflict," as it is called, would soon come to an end, and that dark cloud which now obscures the brightness of our political horizon would be sure to disappear forever.

I thank you for your courteous attention, and now take my leave of you.

XXXVIII

20

MATERIAL TOO LARGE TO BE FILMED AS A WHOLE FILMED IN SECTIONS ONLY

The Democratic debate as to the "uncer-"tainty" of the President's action upon the Army bill must exhaust itself to-day, for the announcement comes from Washington that his message vetoing the bill will reach the House of Representatives to-morrow—would be sent in to-day if the House were in session. For a man who has been either favorably disposed toward the bill, as some Democratic wiseacres have represented him, or turned hither and thither by doubts and fears, as others have had it, the President, when once compelled to decide, certainly makes up his mind with extraordinary promptitude, and becomes very suddenly courageous. From the statements made in our Washington dispatches, it is clear that the majority in Congress will be as little pleased with the matter of the veto message as with its manner. It is likely to show that the President has been misunderstood by Republicans as well as Democrats. If it fulfils the expectations formed of it in Washington, it will not only state the plain and inevitable grounds of objection to the bill itself, but will go further and boldly declare that it is part of a scheme to coerce the President under threats to withhold appropriations. There is reason enough in the bill for a veto message of the usual sort. Some of its non-political provisions even are questionable—those relating to promotions, for instance, which the majority in the Senate refused to have amended. But there is reason enough in the bill and behind it for a veto message of an unusual sort, and this, it seems, we are to have. The President will, it is believed, assert the rights of the Executive Department within its proper sphere, and defy Congress to encroach upon them. Let him take this stand, and he will find the people behind him.

*WHAT WAS THE USE?*

After forty days of angry and useless debate the Democracy in Congress have passed the Army bill and pushed the Legislative Appropriation bill through the House, and at the end of this prolonged expenditure of force they find themselves just where they stood at the beginning. They are no nearer the object of their desires now than they were when they deliberately defeated the supply bills in the last session. The repeal of the Federal statutes for the protection of a free and fair ballot cannot be effected by this Congress; and the longer the dispute continues the stronger becomes the popular conviction that they ought not to be repealed. Any political leader of average shrewdness ought to have seen, three months ago, that this would be the outcome of the proposed revolution, and to have warned the over-eager Democrats that their strength was unequal to the task they wished to undertake. They have acted all along upon the idea that a bare majority of

brought up with a round turn. What do they propose to do next?

*BISMARCK'S NEW POLICY.*

A revolution has been planned in Germany this Spring, but it is a movement without anarchical tendencies. It is a commercial revolution, and the leader is the iron-handed Chancellor, who has made the Fatherland the first of military nations, and yet has failed to crown her years of united action with economic prosperity. With consummate tact he has succeeded in diverting public attention from the Socialist craze, the obnoxious Force bill and the futile attempt to gag a Parliament elected by universal suffrage; and by bringing the Customs controversy into the foreground of politics has given all classes something new to think and talk about. If disappointment, distrust and restlessness have prevailed since 1874, it is because the burdens of the world's economic laws have fallen upon this victorious nation and weighed it down to the earth. A radical change of policy from Free Trade to Protection offers the people a promise of relief, and checks, temporarily at least, the spread of disaffection.

The Parliament which resumes its sessions to-day will be put in possession of the new Tariff Act. It has been prepared by a special commission as a revenue tariff, but is in reality a protective tariff, albeit so hastily drawn as to be crude and ill-proportioned. The Bundesrath, which exercises the functions of a privy council rather than those of a Senate, approved the measure without undertaking the work of revision. The draft has been published and all the commercial boards and branches of trade have discussed it. The Chancellor himself is advocating the new policy with characteristic energy and shrewdness. He has recently suffered a Parliamentary defeat in the rejection of the Gagging bill; and although such reverses cause him no embarrassment, inasmuch as he holds his office by the will of his sovereign and not at the pleasure of the Reichstag, it is more comfortable for the Chancellor to have a majority behind than in front of him. He is bent upon securing the passage of this Tariff Act. During the last two months economic questions have been discussed at every social gathering in his palace, and although the party which has uniformly controlled the Reichstag since 1871 is fully committed to free trade, so many converts have been made that the adoption of the new policy is now considered certain. The Chancellor has even gone so far as to have a long conference with Herr Windthorst, the leader of the Centre, who has bitterly opposed him, not only in ecclesiastical matters, but even in the repressive measures against the Socialists to which the Liberal factions gave their assent. The Centre is recruited mainly from the rural districts, and is naturally in sympathy with the High Tariff movement, inasmuch as agricultural products are named in the schedules. The prospect is that the Conservatives will be reinforced by many National Liberals and Catholics, and that the Chancellor will be suffered to have his own way.

Americans cannot complain if the success of their National policy induces other countries to follow their example. There has not been a year when the Chancellor has not been at his wits' end to make both ends meet, and owing to the burdens of the military establishment the deficits have steadily increased. He now has recourse to a high tariff, and expects not only to swell the revenue receipts, but to stimulate home industries. What the Fatherland has needed more than anything else is a comprehensive commercial policy that will enable the physical and intellectual forces which triumphed in war to work out their ends in an era of peace. Certainly nothing could be more opportune than the advocacy of this economic policy at a time when the country is suffering from a sense of compression caused by the rigid and vexatious

## WHAT WAS THE USE?

After forty days of angry and useless debate the Democracy in Congress have passed the Army bill and pushed the Legislative Appropriation bill through the House, and at the end of this prolonged expenditure of force they find themselves just where they stood at the beginning. They are no nearer the object of their desires now than they were when they deliberately defeated the supply bills in the last session. The repeal of the Federal statutes for the protection of a free and fair ballot cannot be effected by this Congress; and the longer the dispute continues the stronger becomes the popular conviction that they ought not to be repealed. Any political leader of average shrewdness ought to have seen, three months ago, that this would be the outcome of the proposed revolution, and to have warned the over-eager Democrats that their strength was unequal to the task they wished to undertake. They have acted all along upon the idea that a bare majority of the two houses has the ability, and the right, to carry any measure of legislation it may see fit. But the Constitution carefully withheld any such right from a bare majority of Congress, and when the Democrats undertook to compel the opposition, by threats of stopping or subverting the Government, to yield to them a power which the Constitution distinctly denied them, it was inevitable that the entire conservative and rational part of the country should rise in resolute resistance. A few of the wiser men in the Democratic party did foresee this result, and recognized the policy of an extra session as a great mistake. We presume that most of the fiery patriots are sorry by this time that they did not sit down and count the cost before they began to build.

We have said that the debate has been useless. It has certainly been useless to the faction that provoked it. But to the people of the United States the extra session has been full of instruction, and save for its cost to the public treasury and the obstruction it has caused to the incipient revival of business, the Republicans might well rejoice at such an exhibition of the folly of their adversaries. A year ago the prospects of the Democracy were bright. The Nation had suffered from a long and severe commercial and industrial depression. Hard times are always unfavorable to the party in power; and there were internal dissensions and other circumstances which gave the Republicans no slight anxiety. If the Democracy had been blessed with wit enough at this critical time to attempt nothing more than they could lawfully accomplish, and to keep within the bounds of decency and moderation, it is possible that even the disclosure of their enormous operations in the line of bribery after the election of 1876 might not have destroyed their chances of the next Presidency. There can be no question, however, that they have damaged themselves irreparably by this extra session. Every observer of political signs is conscious of a strong drift of public feeling against this party of disturbance. In a thousand incidents, in the tone of the press, in the talk of the clubs and public resorts, in conversation, the prevailing sentiment displays itself. Except, perhaps, in Washington, where members of Congress often mistake the echoes of their own words for the voices of their constituents, even the Democrats are convinced that they have steadily lost ground all the Spring, and that they are still losing.

And they have not advanced one step toward their object. The abolition of the election laws is, to all appearances, more improbable to-day than it has been at any time in several years. The President will interpose his veto; the veto will be sustained. This result the Democrats might have foreseen two or three months ago. They had not votes enough in the last Congress to repeal these laws. They knew well enough in advance that they had not votes enough in this Congress either. Yet they called Congress together, and went to work, swearing that the laws should be repealed. Well, they have gone to the end of their rope, and

New-York Daily Tribune.

FOUNDED BY HORACE GREELEY.

MONDAY, APRIL 28, 1879.

schedules. The prospect is that the conservatives will be reinforced by many National Liberals and Catholics, and that the Chancellor will be suffered to have his own way.

Americans cannot complain if the success of their National policy induces other countries to follow their example. There has not been a year when the Chancellor has not been at his wits' end to make both ends meet, and owing to the burdens of the military establishment the deficits have steadily increased. He now has recourse to a high tariff, and expects not only to swell the revenue receipts, but to stimulate home industries. What the Fatherland has needed more than anything else is a comprehensive commercial policy that will enable the physical and intellectual forces which triumphed in war to work out their ends in an era of peace. Certainly nothing could be more opportune than the advocacy of this economic policy at a time when the country is suffering from a sense of compression caused by the rigid and vexatious enforcement of the Socialist law, and when the Northern Empire is honeycombed with revolutionary societies.

XXXVIII
21

Alabama seceded Jan. 11, 1861
re-admitted by act of June 25, 1868
Arkansas seceded " May 6, 1861
re-admitted " June 22, 1868
Florida seceded " Jan. 11, 1861
re-admitted by act of June 25, 1868
Texas seceded Feb. 1, 1861
re-admitted by act of Mar. 30, 1870
Tennessee seceded May 6, 1861
re-admitted by act of July 24, 1866
Louisiana seceded Jan. 26, 1861
re-admitted June 25, 1868
Mississippi seceded Jan. 9, 1861
re-admitted Feb. 23, 1870
South Car. seceded Dec. 20, 1860
re-admitted June. 25, 1868
North Car. seceded May 21, 1861
re-admitted June 25, 1868
Virginia seceded April 27, 1861
re-admitted Jan. 26, 1870.
Georgia seceded Jan. 19, 1861
re-admitted July, 15, 1870