

University of Mississippi

eGrove

---

Clippings and Pamphlets

Civil War Collection

---

8-8-1876

## Congressional Record 8 August 8, 1876

Lucius Q. C. Lamar

Follow this and additional works at: [https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ciwar\\_clip](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ciwar_clip)



Part of the [United States History Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Lamar, Lucius Q. C., "Congressional Record 8 August 8, 1876" (1876). *Clippings and Pamphlets*. 6. [https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ciwar\\_clip/6](https://egrove.olemiss.edu/ciwar_clip/6)

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Civil War Collection at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Clippings and Pamphlets by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact [egrove@olemiss.edu](mailto:egrove@olemiss.edu).

# Congressional Record.

FORTY-FOUR CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

Vol. 4.

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, AUGUST 8, 1876.

No. 184.

Policy of the Republican Party and Political Condition of the South.

## SPEECH

OF

HON. LUCIUS Q. C. LAMAR,  
OF MISSISSIPPI,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Wednesday, August 2, 1876.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the bill (H. R. No. 2592) to transfer the conduct of Indian affairs from the Interior Department to the War Department—

Mr. LAMAR said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: I listened early in the session with great pleasure to an interesting and suggestive speech delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts upon the proposition to amend the Constitution so as to make the President of the United States ineligible to a second term of service. I was struck with the views which he presented upon the subject of the relation of this proposed amendment "to the corrupt and debasing practices which have crept into the public service of the country." I do not propose to discuss that subject fully now; it is too large; but I may say as to the whole subject of civil-service reform that no cure can be successfully applied which does not secure that removal from office shall be made only for cause, and that the tribunal which decides that cause shall by its freedom from all interest or feeling as to the result guarantee the good faith and impartiality of its decision; and my object on this occasion is to discuss in this connection certain great agencies which through this service affect the public interests.

Mr. Chairman, it cannot be asserted that the practices and peculiar system of measures adopted by the present Administration for several years past command the approbation of a majority of the people of this country. On the contrary, the assertion may be ventured, with entire confidence in its accuracy, that the sentiment with which the greater portion of the American people regard the conduct of our public affairs is one of decided dissatisfaction and despondency. This sentiment is irrespective of the hostilities of party. Inside of the dominant party itself, among those in entire sympathy with the political principles which brought it into power—that is to say, among republicans of earnest purpose, self-abnegating patriotism, and unbiased intelligence—there is an anxious protest against the methods of administration, the tone and character of the public service, and the principles of legislation which have marked the action of the Government for many years past. It must also be admitted that this sentiment, so pronounced and so pervading, has not produced its legitimate effect upon the action of the Government, has wrought no change in the administration either as to character or policy.

This is a noteworthy fact in American politics.

In every country enjoying the privilege of representative government such a condition of public sentiment would have found its active political expression. In England, whence we have derived our parliamentary instincts and habits, in spite of the checks upon the popular will to be found in a hereditary peerage and monarchy, such a condition of public sentiment would produce a change in the administration in twenty-four hours. How then is it that in our Government, the completest representative of the popular will in theory that has ever existed, with no check or hinderance upon the prompt and free expression and application of public opinion to its machinery, depending for its vitality upon its ready and sensitive sympathy with the public conscience, such a condition of public sentiment fails to impress itself upon the administration? What is this mysterious and invisible influence which, paralyzing the free activities of the American people, prevents them from bringing the action of the Government into conformity with their will. We must believe that the moral character of our people is sound, that they enter upon the second century of their nationality with increased moral earnestness, with higher standards of public virtue and official rectitude, and with a more solemn sense of the needs of restoring their Government to the tone and purity of the earlier days of the Republic.

The question then grows in urgency, what is it that prevents the sentiments of a free people from finding realization in the character and policy of its government? I desire to give a single example, which is typical of the general condition that I am trying to illustrate.

But a short time since a convention of the republican party of Massachusetts was called in Boston. The president of that convention, upon taking the chair, uttered the following significant remarks. After referring with eloquence to the proud achievements with which the party named was identified, he warned the convention "against the mistake of fighting the battles of the future upon the issues of the past."

In the year when a glad and patriotic people swells the chorus of a nation's jubilee, it is not by lighting again the camp-fires of conflicts that are ended, it is not by kindling anew passions that ought to subside, it is not by postponing the final hour of peace and reconciliation that victories deserve to be won.

Speaking as a republican to fellow-republicans, I shall offer no apology for plain and honest words. No one who has watched the current of recent political events has failed to see a deep, wide-spread, and growing dissatisfaction with the management of national affairs.

Have you any longer a doubt as to the causes which have wrought this change in our fortunes? Surely we have not abjured our creed. Our distinctive policy and aims were never more clearly affirmed, our traditions and the names of our great leaders never more reverently held.

No, gentlemen, the protest is not against the record or the creed, but against the methods of administration; against dominant influences and tendencies that have debased the character and tone of the public service; against a leadership that has wielded power and patronage for its own ends and not for the public good; against a partisanship narrow, intense, and violent, that has usurped the place of a broad and enlightened statesmanship and repelled accessions of recognized character and ability as an element too repugnant to be tolerated; against a code of financial morality that has corrupted the standards of official honesty and turned places of public trust into opportunities of private gain or public plunder.

Observe with me for a moment, gentlemen, some of the forces of opinion and sentiment that indicate the drift and demand of the hour. Note first the material looking for relief from the long-continued depression that rests upon the material interests of the country and the feeling that some change, some new dispensation, is essential to such relief.

It will be perceived that this gentleman here arraigns the vices and practices of the national administration, its lawless usurpations, the corruption which revels in its high places, the trifling with the important interests of finance and currency, the prostitution of public office to personal gain, in language which, if uttered upon this floor by a democrat, would be regarded as the exaggerations of partisan animosity. Yet, singular as it may seem, that convention was held in the interest, exclusively, of the great political organization under which these evils, thus characterized and thus held up to the reprobation of the American people, have been fastened on our Government. And these gentlemen, the members of the convention and the president of it, and perhaps large portions of their constituents, with all their talents and moral influence, are in active co-operation with the administration so denounced in the support of a political party which has indorsed that Administration and has in return been indorsed by it.

Now what is the influence which thus sweeps vast masses of a free and virtuous people into a course of conduct in direct contravention of their most solemn convictions and their most earnest purposes.

More than a quarter of a century ago one of the greatest of the great statesmen of America, Daniel Webster, declared that the power of the Executive of our National Government had increased until it had become dangerous to liberty, and he predicted that if ever the President, who was the head of the nation, should become the mere head of a party, such party could and would, by the sheer force of the political power and patronage which it grasped, maintain that power, from term to term, and continue any policy which it devised in direct resistance to the will of a majority of the people, unless that majority became overwhelming in numbers and rose to simultaneous action by some great excitement only short of civil revolution.

Another great statesman, from another extreme of the Union, belonging to a different school of politics, and yet his peer in intellect and patriotism, Mr. Calhoun declared that the patronage of this Government at that time—and it was nearly half a century ago—in the hands of the President was too great a power for the Chief Magistrate of a free people; that it was imperial in its character, giving him absolutely to the extent of that power more control than the autocrat of Russia; and he predicted when the corps of office-holders under this Government should reach one hundred thousand the people might almost as

well surrender their liberty, the contest would be too unequal; for the party thus entrenched in power could show a vast superiority over the two-thirds of a popular majority scattered over the country unorganized and acting upon different grounds of opposition.

In the predictions of these two great statesmen we see developed the powerful agency which now nullifies the sentiment of a free people and prevents the application to the machinery of this Government of that great social force in all free governments, public opinion.

An intermediate and irresponsible body known as *the party* has interposed itself between the people and their Government; a body unknown to the Constitution, having no part in the civil apparatus of society, yet tyrannizing with selfish and relentless energy over both people and Government, converting the agents of the one, ay its highest officers, Cabinet officers, into the willing and active instruments in the advancement of its ambitious designs and employing the passions of the other as the servants of its partisan and mischievous purposes. This centralized party organization, forming as I said no part of the Government, yet fastened upon it, entrenched in its interior departments, extending and ramifying its net-work of selfish power and dishonest influence to the remotest points and the obscurest neighborhoods of the Union, garrisoning with an army of 100,000 office-holders and a reserve of another 100,000 expectants every Department, every post-office, and every custom-house in the land, tempting men from honest industry into the dependence and servility of office-holding and office-seeking, welded by a single will into unity of purpose and concert of action—this monstrous perversion of popular liberty is the great and insuperable obstacle to the reforms which the people demand—and which threatens to make this Government in all its departments the instrument of an irresponsible and despotic power.

But, sir, this, while it is the chief obstacle in the way of the harmonious co-operation of all the elements in favor of reform, is not the only one. There are thousands of voters too honest to flatter power, too independent not to speak their condemnation of its abuses, and brave enough to unite in the effort to overthrow their own party for the good of the country, who yet hesitate, in view of the uncertainty and responsibility attaching to the next step. They are reluctant to accept and co-operate with the democratic party as the instrument for inaugurating the system of measures which good government demands. Their objection to such a course is based on the apprehension that an improvement in the public service and reform in the methods of administration cannot be guaranteed by a mere change of party relations, by bringing the democratic party into the administration from which the other party has been expelled, with the same system at work with the same amount of patronage, subject to the same agencies, with the same control over its vast machinery, and abdicated, as they charge, in the past periods of its power, to the same use of the patronage in its hands.

Sir, whether this apprehension be well-founded or not, there is one consideration touching this subject which should not be overlooked. It practically gives up the demand of the people for a reform in their Government. It is a virtual abandonment of the struggle. For though it may be possible or probable that the change of party may not insure this reform, it is unquestionably certain that no change at all will end all hope of reform. Sir, it is utterly impossible that the reforms desired can be effected by continuing in power the party whose debasement of the civil service of the country and corruption of its administration is the thing to be reformed. And the reason is obvious. This result arises from the fact that such vicious tendency is the predominating influence, the strongest principle of the political organization which controls the Government, while the counteracting element of purity and reform is weak and subordinate.

If this be so, if the controlling spirits of a party organization be those who represent its worst tendency, if they are the men of action and resolution, aggressive and dominant; while those who represent the other element are passive and inactive, acquiescent and submissive, it is utterly impossible that such an organization should reform itself by its own inherent and self-evolving energy; as impossible as it is for an insane mind to restore its own reason by its own will. In addition to this, the success of this party at the polls will of itself give immunity to the corrupt practices which are the subject of such universal condemnation. If the people of this country, at the ballot-box, in view of the great evils complained of, in view of the issue made against the present Administration and the bold acceptance of that issue by the Cincinnati convention, decide or indicate their feeling that they have other objects paramount to that of reform, such action is equivalent to a ratification of the existing system in all its enormity and closes all opportunity for overthrowing it. To say, then, that by a change we have no assurance of a better state of things, is the policy of despair, of abnegation. It is the surrender of liberty to power which Webster and Calhoun contemplated with such pungent apprehension.

On the other hand, if this great republican party with its imposing achievements of the past is hurled from power by the American people on account of the abuses of its civil service, on account of the practice of using the patronage of the Government for the purpose of consolidating party strength and controlling elections, such a defeat for such a cause will of itself inflict an incurable, if not a mortal, wound upon this pernicious system. It will of itself give to the suc-

cessors in power a practical warning of a like fate if they pursue a like policy. These will come in holding their newly acquired power under a tenure of office, which tenure is an abstinence from the courses of their predecessors.

I do not overlook or undervalue the declarations of the republican candidate for the Presidency. I believe they are sincere. I applaud the sentiments and honor the author. But their significance must be measured, not by what he is willing to promise as a candidate, but by what he will be permitted to perform as a President. Sir, rarely in history have we seen the man who has the courage and resolution to put down the exacting tyranny of his own party, to impose upon it the impress of his own will, to infuse into it a higher life and say to the selfish and ambitious politicians who had chosen him as their tool, "Behold your master."

The character and fixed policy of the party of which he has consented to be the representative, the influences which are now combined in his support, are in direct opposition to those declarations. While these promises of the candidate are held out to the ear, the Administration which supports him itself is in every moment of its existence breaking them to the hope. While the republican candidate declares that there shall be no appointment as a reward for party service and no removals for party disservice, the Administration is eliminating from its own organization every element of reform that has by the mutations of appointment found its way there.

But there is an avenue of reform, available and effective, which a change of parties will open. One of the greatest sources of the abuse of patronage and the corruption of administration is to be found in the enormous revenues and expenditures of Government, making necessary this extravagant number of officers and agents to collect this revenue and disburse these expenditures. A system of retrenchment and reform, cutting down the revenues and expenditures to the most economical needs of the Government, would at once deprive the Executive of a large percentage of this patronage. To that policy the democratic party is not only pledged, but it has signalized its past administrations by a faithful adherence thereto, as a comparison of democratic administrations with that of the party now in power will abundantly demonstrate.

Sir, the objections which the people of this country have hitherto had to the re-ascendency of the democratic party have never grown out of its administration of the fiscal concerns of this Government. They are based upon its use of the powers of this Government for what was supposed to be the maintenance of the interests of the slave-holding sections of the country. All the lawless usurpations and misuse of powers of government charged against the democratic party have reference to those subjects and to those alone. Upon all other subjects, and in all other interests, when the democratic party surrendered the Government into the hands of their opponents, it was, in the language of one of its most eminent men, without a stain upon its honor, matchless in its splendor, incalculable in its strength, the wonder and admiration of the world. The power which the nation showed in the great civil conflict, its resources of men and material, its vast appliances, manufacturing, mechanical, and commercial, were but the rich harvesting of a period of sixty years under democratic rule out of seventy of the country's existence.

But, sir, there are other influences still more controlling which obstruct the tendencies of the people to change their administration of government. One of them is the apprehension of a large class of voters that the presidential election involves not merely questions of administrative reform but political principles of vital importance to the country. They believe that the great social and political transformations in the South which have resulted from the war of secession should be guaranteed a successful and peaceful working undisturbed by adverse influences. And they fear in the advent of the democratic party to power an influence unfavorable and dangerous to their stability and permanence. These misgivings, based upon their estimate of the past career and purposes of the democratic party, are strengthened by the fact to which they point, that the people of the South are united against the party which established the new order of things and in support of the party which opposed it, thus threatening the re-establishment of that southern sectional domination so repugnant to the sentiment and the purposes of the northern people. They therefore are not prepared, for the sake of correcting the disorders of administration, to peril the newly established condition of things by placing it in the hands of those who were originally inimical to its institution.

Without questioning the sincere acquiescence of the democratic party in the changes wrought by the constitutional amendments, they do not regard that party as sufficiently identified in its views and purposes with the objects of those amendments to guard them against the dangers of reactionary movements. They consider the supervision and intervention of the Federal authority as necessary to the exercise and protection of the rights which these amendments guarantee to the newly enfranchised race at the South, and that should the democratic party succeed, this necessary supervision will be withdrawn.

I have attempted, Mr. Chairman, to state these views fully in order that the southern people, the people whom I in part represent here, shall be fully apprised of the precise character and force of the public opinion which bears upon their present condition and their future destiny. I shall endeavor as a representative of the South to appreciate the value of these grave apprehensions. In doing so I shall

1  
speak as one who feels that he represents in part a people who even in their desolation are no unimportant element in the national life; who have accepted with manly sincerity the changes which the war has brought; who know that they have the confidence of the country to regain, but who are assured that, with a fuller and truer knowledge of their condition, their motives, and their purposes, to which it is our duty here to contribute they can claim and will receive, that restored trust and affection which can alone bind the great sections of this Republic in the unity of the spirit and in the bonds of peace—that peace which in these days of miserable discord almost passeth the understanding.

I believe the apprehension growing out of the united southern support of the democratic party is wholly unfounded and should not stand in the way of the aspirations of a great people for progress and reform in their Government. The idea that the South under any combination of parties will ever again obtain the control of this giant Republic and wield its destinies against the will of its mighty people is of all ideas the most visionary and baseless.

Sir, if such an idea has any effect whatever with the North, no such hallucination inflames the imagination of the South. The southern people are a prostrate people. They have been defeated in war, and they have been made to know and feel that the sacrifices, the humiliation, and helplessness of defeat are theirs; while the North have reaped the rich results of a victorious war, and have interfused them into the very elements of the national life and constitution. Their institutions, political and social, have been destroyed as completely as if an earthquake had overwhelmed them; their agricultural industries are disorganized; their fertile soil sterilized by an all-devouring taxation; their educational institutions languishing; their population impoverished and so inferior in numbers as to place them in every department of the Government in such a hopeless minority that, so far from ruling the interests of other sections, they are impotent to protect a single interest or right of their own.

Sir, even if such a dream were in their mind, the occasion for it is gone. The conflicts in the past grew out of questions connected with slavery, its area, and the maintenance of its constitutional right, its political privileges, and its property interests. These questions have been eliminated from the problem of American politics, and with them have gone all the passions and antagonisms to which they gave rise. Nor is there any influence or incident connected with their present condition which makes them not fully homogeneous with the whole American people; nor anything, except harsh and ungracious administration, to prevent their sympathy and identity with the interest and destiny of the American nation. She feels that she must be either part of the nation or its province; must be part of the Government or held in duress under it. With her people national patriotism is a philosophy, a moral and political necessity. To obey the laws of their country and to recognize its authority over themselves and their society as a mere matter of force and compulsion and fear, would be, as they well know, degrading to their character. As southern men, they know that to keep up the high moral standard of a high-spirited people obedience must emanate from patriotic love and not from ignoble fear. Their very sectionalism, which has hitherto tended to insulation, now identifies them with the national life and makes them cultivate that wider and broader patriotism which is co-extensive with the Union. They have no aspirations not bounded by the horizon of that Union, no purpose adverse to the national instincts, no scheme that looks to the disturbance of the elective franchise as it exists in the Constitution.

In acting unitedly with the democratic party they are simply obeying the imperative law of self-preservation. It is not that they desire to reverse the policy of this Government as fixed and fortified in the fundamental law by the victorious forces of the Union, but simply because they desire to escape from the practical grievances and sufferings which the hostile and oppressive policy of the republican party brings upon them.

No, sir; the great constituency of a democratic administration, as must be seen by consulting the statistics of population, will be national, and not sectional. The President will be a citizen of the State of New York. The Vice-President will come from the mighty West. The public sentiment which will be brought to bear upon its conduct of public affairs will come from that quarter in which the physical and political power of the country so overwhelmingly preponderates, that which is the seat of population, commerce, the mechanic arts, and all scientific and material development. All the South can hope for is such an influence as moral and intellectual elevation will give her Representatives and a representative share of the benefits and responsibilities of the common Government, according to the measure of her resources and population.

Equally unfounded, I think, sir, is the apprehension that the results of the war as embodied in the Constitution are unsafe in the hands of the democratic party. Whatever may be the future administration of this country, freedom, citizenship, and suffrage are established institutions, embodied in the fundamental law, recognized in all statutes, Federal and State, enforced by courts, accepted and acted on by the people. To say that these conditions will be periled by trusting them to the party which opposed their original establishment, is to contradict the philosophy of history; and if acted upon would in every free government keep the administration of its affairs always in the hands of one single party. There has not

been a single great measure in the constitutional history of England, not a single great reform which after its establishment by one party was not in the course of time, and a very short period, placed in the hands of the party originally opposed to it. Repeated instances might be given; indeed no instance to the contrary can be found. The repeal of the corn laws, the great measures for law reform, the more recent measures of parliamentary reform which brought England to the verge of revolution and came near sweeping from the English constitution the House of Lords, where the tory party had its greatest strength, have by the suffrages of the English people over and over again been placed in the hands of that tory party with perfect confidence of security. Indeed it is considered the very highest policy, after securing reforms adopted and pushed by the party of progress, to mature and consolidate them by placing them in the hands of the party of conservation and opposition. The democratic party, when these measures were proposed, stood by the inviolability of the Constitution and opposed them on that account. But this very principle of devotion to the Constitution, which forced that party into opposition, makes them now the safest custodians of those very innovations which by the vote of the people have become established parts of the Constitution itself.

Now, sir, is there anything in the relation of the democratic party, to this subject, or its creed, or its past conduct which would justify any such apprehension? Its reluctance to adopt the measure referred to has simply been a little later than that of the republican party. Its advocacy of slavery and all its incidents, its pledges to the exercise of the powers of government for its protection where it existed, was simply maintained for a short period after its republican opponents changed their policy.

Events have galloped upon this subject and both parties have been more or less the subjects of prodigious revolutions of sentiment. It was but a short time since, in 1861, that a republican House of Representatives by a large majority adopted resolutions in favor of the enforcement of the fugitive-slave provision of the Constitution and called upon the States to enact laws for remanding all fugitive slaves to their condition of servitude. It was but a few days prior to the publication of the proclamation of emancipation that the illustrious author of that historical document declared in a public letter that he would be in favor of establishing slavery if the doing so would save the Union. It was but a short time previous to the incorporation of these great amendments into our Constitution that State after State in the North by overwhelming popular majorities recorded what seemed to be an inflexible hostility to granting to this newly emancipated race any of the rights of citizenship. As late as 1865 the most distinguished war governors of the North were unequivocally opposed to the policy of incorporating the four millions of emancipated slaves into the political system of the country and investing them with citizenship and the right of voting.

I will next address myself to the objection that the accession to power of the democratic party will suspend the habitual supervision by national authority over the conduct of affairs in the Southern States, and that such a suspension of that supervision and intervention will involve great peril to the enjoyment of the newly acquired rights of the race recently enfranchised in the South; and that the republican party, with all its misconduct and misgovernment, is still an evil necessary to be endured for another presidential term in order to secure these rights and the conditions upon which they are based.

Sir, I ask a patient, charitable consideration of the reply which it is my duty as a southern Representative to make on this subject. I think, sir, if gentlemen will accompany me into an examination of the causes which produced the present condition of things in the South, they will find that it does not grow out of any natural or necessary conflict of race or any desire to abridge the rights, political or personal, of any class of American citizens.

The first to which I would call attention is the sudden incorporation into the political system of the South of an element, not only incongruous with the political habitudes of our people and to the established conditions of their old society, but impossible except through time and education to be raised to that level of ordinary citizenship to which a century's training of freedom has elevated the white citizen of the country. The magnitude alone of this new element, 4,000,000 of people made citizens, 800,000 of them voters, made such in the twinkling of an eye, was of itself sufficient to shock and shatter the political order of any community on earth.

Mr. Chairman, but a short time since when it was proposed to admit the distant and sparsely settled Territory of New Mexico into our Federal community of States, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. HOAR,] who addressed the House to-day so impressively and so earnestly, objected strenuously to the measure upon the ground that that feeble population of 120,000 inhabitants, largely composed of Mexicans and Indians, because they could not read or speak the English language, was disqualified to exercise the privileges of citizenship, and should not therefore be admitted into the community of American States.

Mr. HOAR. My point was that a community made up of such people should not be admitted as a State; not that the individual should not be allowed to exercise the rights of citizenship.

Mr. LAMAR. Did the gentleman understand me as saying that?

Mr. HOAR. The gentleman used the phrase that such persons were

disfranchised or should be disfranchised from exercising the rights of citizenship.

Mr. LAMAR. No, sir; the gentleman puts into my mouth a word which I did not use.

Mr. HOAR. I so understood the gentleman.

Mr. LAMAR. I repeat my proposition. The gentleman's ground, as I understood, was that a body of that sort composed of people speaking the Spanish language (not because they spoke that language, but because they could not read or write the English) was as a body unfit and disqualified, or rather unqualified, to discharge the duties of American citizenship, and therefore as a community should not be admitted into our Federal system.

Sir, but the other day a distinguished Senator from the Pacific coast made a most striking protest against the further immigration of Chinese into the community there, and still more recently both parties seemed to be vying with each other as to which should go furthest in preventing this admixture of the Mongolian race with ours. To illustrate the disturbing force of this measure, let us suppose that in the six New England States and the States of New York and New Jersey, whose population corresponds most nearly to that of our Southern States, in one night 4,000,000 of unaccustomed, incongruous population, such as Mexicans and Chinese, should be incorporated into the political system of those Commonwealths, and by some paramount power outside of those States should be so compacted together as to gain control of all the departments of their government, of all the offices, all the institutions, State and municipal—in a word, invested with the entire sovereignty of their body-politic, I ask you would not the repose of society be disturbed; would not all assurance of law, of healthful industry, of business arrangements and investments—would not all confidence give way to dismay and perplexity, to restless fears, wild passions, and bloody scenes? Why, sir, the more splendid their political civilization, the more complex their system of laws, and the more perfectly adjusted their social and economic forces, and the higher the moral tone of their society, the more hideous would be the ruin and the more refined the agony of the people subjected to such a catastrophe.

But the case as supposed is not as strong as the case which actually occurred in the Southern States. The 4,000,000 of people who by a scratch of the pen were made citizens and crushed into our political system, the 800,000 voters and office-holders and legislators and magistrates, had just emerged from the immemorial condition of slaves.

This fearful experiment was regarded by thinking men all over the world with the profoundest concern and misgiving. It was viewed with disfavor by a large majority even of the republican party. Its most able and its most extreme leaders looked upon it as committing society to the sway of ignorance, servility, corruption, and tyranny; and such was their sentiment until the conflict of the republican party with President Johnson and one other cause, which I shall notice before I close, seemed to sweep away every consideration of reason and justice. In 1865, the year in which there was in the South certain legislation which has been the subject of much denunciation of the South and the occasion and excuse for the oppressive and humiliating methods which have been applied to her people—I say in that year Mr. O. P. MORTON in a message to the Legislature of Indiana used the following language:

It is a fact so manifest that it should not be called in question by any that a people who are just emerging from the barbarism of slavery are not qualified to become a part of our political system and take part not only in the government of themselves and their neighbors, but of the whole United States.

So far from believing that negro suffrage is a remedy for all of our national ills, I doubt whether it is a remedy for any, and rather believe that its enforcement by Congress would be more likely to subject the negro to a merciless persecution than to confer upon him any substantial benefit.

By some it is thought that suffrage is already cheap enough in this country; and the immediate transfer of more than half a million men from the bonds of slavery, with all the ignorance and the degradation upon them which the slavery of generations upon southern fields has produced, would be a declaration to the world that the exercise of American suffrage involves no intellectual or moral qualifications, and that there is no difference between an American freeman and an American slave which may not be removed by a mere act of Congress.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARFIELD. I ask that the gentleman's time may be extended, hoping that the same courtesy may be granted when the other side shall ask to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the gentleman's time will be extended.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMAR. Now, sir, in a speech which this gentleman made in Indiana before these people became invested with any political rights here is his language:

I believe that in the case of four million slaves just freed from bondage there should be a period of probation and preparation before they are brought to the exercise of political power. \* \* \* What is their condition? Perhaps not one in five hundred—I might say one in a thousand—can read, and perhaps not one in five hundred is worth \$5 in property of any kind.

Now, sir, notice the language of Mr. MORTON in the following sentences:

Can you conceive that a body of men, white or black, who have been in this condition, and their ancestors before them, are qualified to be immediately lifted from their present state into the full exercise of power, not only to govern themselves and their neighbors, but to take part in the government of the United States?

Can they be regarded as intelligent and independent voters? The mere state of facts furnishes the answer to the question. \* \* \* To say that such men—and it is no fault of theirs; it is simply a misfortune and a crime of this nation—to say that such men just emerged from slavery are qualified for the exercise of political power is to make the strongest pro-slavery argument I ever heard. It is to pay the highest compliment to the institution of slavery.

Then he goes on with his objections to clothing these people with the rights of citizenship and suffrage. Says he:

The right to vote carries with it the right to hold office. You cannot say that the negro has a natural right to vote, but that he must vote only for white men for office.

Then, after demonstrating that point, he makes this conclusion:

If you enfranchise all the negroes in these States you will have at least twenty negro votes to one white vote, and in the work of reconstructing the States of South Carolina, Alabama, and Florida you will have a larger proportion—perhaps thirty colored votes to one white. Now, I ask you, what is to be the effect of that? The first effect will be, you will have colored State governments.

After going into a long argument to prove this fact he reaches this conclusion:

They will have colored governors and colored members of Congress and Senators and judges of the Supreme Court, &c. Very well; and suppose they do send colored Senators and Representatives to Congress; I have no doubt you will find men in the North who will be willing to sit beside them and will not think themselves degraded by so doing. I have nothing to say to this. I am simply discussing the political effect of it. In every State where there is a colored State government, a negro for governor and a negro for supreme judge, white emigration will cease; there will be no more white emigration to any such State. You cannot find the most ardent anti-slavery man in Wayne County who will go and locate in a State that has a colored State government.

Now, sir, why ascribe to the conduct of the people of the South this exclusion of emigration when here is predicted beforehand the result of the state of things which have occurred? Here is his conclusion:

I submit, then, however clearly and strongly we may admit the natural right of the negro—I submit it to the intelligence of the people that colored State governments are not desirable; that they will bring about results that are not to be hoped for; that finally they would threaten to bring about, and I believe would result in, a war of races.

Those are his predictions in 1865. Now what is his remedy? Here it is:

If I had the power I would arrange it in this way: I would give these men a probation and preparation; I would give them time to acquire a little property and get a little education; time to learn something about the simplest forms of business and prepare themselves for the exercise of political power.

Well, sir, that looks amiable and friendly toward these men. But why put them under this system of probation? For the benefit of the race? In order to elevate them? That is not the motive which upon that occasion he declared. Here is what he says:

At the end of ten, fifteen, or twenty years—

Sir, that time has not elapsed. What would he do at the end of ten, fifteen, or twenty years?

At the end of ten, fifteen, or twenty years let them come into the enjoyment of their political rights.

Why then?

By that time these States will have been so completely filled up by emigration from the North and from Europe that the negroes will be in a permanent minority.

There is his devotion to the colored race! Keep them ten, fifteen, or twenty years out of the enjoyment of their political rights, until under the influence of immigration the negroes shall be in a permanent minority!

Mr. GARFIELD. At what time of the year was that speech delivered?

Mr. LAMAR. September 29, 1865.

Why would they be in a permanent minority?

Because the negroes have no emigration, nothing but the natural increase; while

He actually identifies himself with the whites of the South. A MEMBER. He was a white-liner then.

Mr. LAMAR. He goes here further than the white-liners—

While we have emigration from all the world and natural increase besides.

He would put them under probation and keep them out of their rights, as he calls them, ten or fifteen or twenty years; by which time they will be in a permanent minority, and there will be no danger of a war of races, because they cannot elect their own people.

Thus by postponing the thing—

Said he—

only to such times as the negroes are qualified to enjoy political rights, the dangers I have been considering would have fully passed away. Their influence would no longer be dangerous in the manner I have indicated, and a conflict of races would not be more likely to happen than it now is in Massachusetts. In Massachusetts the negroes have exercised political rights for twenty-five years, and yet there has been no disturbance there, no conflict of races? Why? Because the negroes have been in the minority.

I ask, sir, to append the continuous extract to my remarks and one also from Governor Andrew, of Massachusetts.

Now, sir, if this terrible prospect struck this distinguished statesman in Indiana with such alarming effect, what must have been the shock to the people of the South upon whom the thunderbolt fell? If he foresaw this terrible avalanche and warned the people of Indiana who were beyond its destructive sweep, what must have been the appalled feeling, sir, of the southern society upon whom it was to be let loose? Such was his advice in Indiana. Now suppose him to be in the South; take Mr. MORTON from his gubernatorial chair in Indiana and put him in 1865 among the people of the South, and what

would have been his advice? What in point of fact *was* his advice to the people of the South? What was the thing the people of the South were called upon to do at that time by this distinguished gentleman from the North as well as by a distinguished governor of Massachusetts whose views I ask permission to print with my remarks? His advice was: "You must not admit these people into the political system of this Government; they are not qualified to vote; they must not take part in the government of themselves or the government of their neighbors or any participation in the Federal Government of this country; and to keep it from them you must fix upon them a system of probation which will hold them down and keep them out of your political system until they are in a permanent minority."

That being his advice, is it strange, I repeat, that the people of the South just returned from the war, all their society in ruins, full of wretchedness and disappointment, this race emancipated lying upon their plantations, neither slave nor citizen and without any indication of the national sentiment that they were to become citizens; in disorder, without law—for the slave laws were abolished and they were at that time not within the provisions of the civil code which applied to the white race—is it strange, sir, that in improvising legislation which under this terrible pressure, this appalling calamity, these bewildering changes, which have followed one upon the other with such rapidity—is it strange that that system should have some of the incidents of the old system?

Sir, is it to be arrayed against them until the end of time as an evidence on their part of a purpose to remand that people to the servitude of slavery? Measure these people by what the sentiment was at that time, and not by standards you have erected at this time. It was not a system which was well advised or well executed, for, sir, it was repealed by the Legislatures which passed it the very moment the public sentiment of the South could reach those whodid pass it.

It is worthy of special attention that Governor MORROX predicts the results of this policy which have actually followed its adoption. If, sir, that policy furnishes an adequate and inevitable cause of these disorders which he beforehand said it would do, why now seek to attribute them, when they come, to a different cause? Why send investigating committees to the South to charge them upon the murderous and rebellious purposes of the whites?

This policy, so repugnant to Mr. MORTON's sentiment and view of public interest, so suggestive of the alarming results which have actually ensued, could not possibly have been less unacceptable to the southern people. With no prejudice against the negro, they regarded this clothing of him with the awful powers of government as exposing their society to the wildest disorder. But when the policy was fastened upon them they knew that they had a more tremendous stake in its well-working than any other people; they knew that the attempt to reverse or obstruct it would be ruinous; and they set to work with an earnestness for which I know they do not get credit to adjust their ruptured relations to the new order of things, and give it a free, fair, and successful development. It might have had such a development. There were agencies at the South of which Mr. MORTON took no note and which it is difficult from his stand-point to appreciate. Underneath the ruins of our political and social order we had uninjured the old civil institutions of Anglican and American liberty, the principles of the old common law, the mother of freedom and popular government and that Anglo-Saxon race of which we hear so much, so indestructible and invincible, accustomed to the handling of these institutions and trained in the discharge of the high duties of representative government.

True, we had those 4,000,000 blacks, just emerged, as Mr. MORTON would say, from the barbarism of slavery, now free and invested with citizenship, suffrage, and eligibility to political power. But though a distinct it was not an antagonistic element. Harmony, friendship, and confidence existed between these two races. Indescribable sympathies, old memories, kindly services mutually rendered, ties of childhood, of youth, of manhood, days of labor, days of battle, nights of watching, nights of anguish, had so intertwined the lives of that generation of southern men and women, white and black, that at the close of the war there was scarce a black man, woman, or child who did not have some endearing relation with a white man, woman, or child and was not also the object of a reciprocal attachment.

Under the operation of these benign influences, these friendly relations, and the workings of local self-government, there was a well-founded hope that society at the South might be reconstituted, even though it would have to be done with the *disjecta membra* of the old broken-up system. There was one difficulty in the way. The conflict between the republican party and Mr. Johnson began. I do not wish to say anything against his memory; but his championship, or seeming championship, of the South seemed to me more damaging than his hostility had been.

The result of that conflict was that the Federal Government assumed, as a political necessity, the exclusive prerogative of reconstructing government in the South. The policy of reconstruction excluded the white race (on account of its suspected disloyalty) as the basis of the new order. But as the black race was considered as incompetent to manage the new structures built for them, military power, for the first time in the history of the American Government, was employed as the force to put and keep in operation the machinery of civil government. I do not propose to discuss this policy, but simply to call special attention to one feature of it. All the measures in the furtherance of that policy, the Freedman's Bureau, which cut

all connection of the two races sheer asunder, whose agents and officers were made judges to try and punish offenses by the whites against the rights of freedmen, without jury or the right of judicial appeal; the act dividing the South without reference to State lines into military districts, and vesting the power of appointing all civil officers in a commanding general; the acts for restoring civil governments, were all based upon this one idea of protecting the enfranchised black race against the wrongs anticipated from the disfranchised white race; and, as a matter of fact, therefore, this reconstruction legislation as conceived and enforced actually arrayed the two races into distinct and opposing classes, and drew the color-line as distinctly and perfectly as if such race distinction had been enjoined in the Constitution. The very first principle of government your new-made citizens saw in operation was the principle of race discrimination. The very first lesson in civil government which they learned was the proscription of the white race as an object of political distrust and resentment.

The strange spectacle of these two races locally intermingled, bound together by the strongest ties of interest and affection, yet as completely separated politically as if a deep gulf had sunk between them; the passions incident to party contests in which the contestants differ not in conviction, but in race, and now charged as one of the heavy items against the South, find their authorship and origin in the legislation of the Government and the action of its agents. One moment's consideration will convince any fair mind of this. The measures devised for the sole benefit, protection, and ascendancy of one race will surely command the support of that race; and if the same policy disfranchises the other race, hurls it from its proud tradition into a condition rife with all the elements of humiliation, and deprives it even of its ancient guarantees against the oppression of arbitrary power, the inevitable effect is perforce to drive that race into opposition to those measures. Thus, I repeat by a policy which drew one race to its support and drove the other into opposition, the separation of the two was produced without the voluntary agency of either and against the natural tendencies of both.

The report of every investigating committee sent to the South confirms this; for, sir, the South has been subjected to an ordeal that no other community in the world has ever been subjected to. It has been uncovered and subjected to a microscopic investigation into all the details of its society. I hold in my hand a report made by Messrs. HOAR, FRYE, and WHEELER, in which, speaking of the state of things in Louisiana, one of the causes there mentioned is the fact that the Administration party is made up by massing together almost entirely the black vote with a few whites, largely from other States. These few whites largely from other States are a class of men who came as agents of the Freedman's Bureau, thence transferred to the military department, from which they were carried over by the bayonet to the reconstructed civil government. And there they have been maintained by the power of the Federal Government ever since, gorging themselves with the spoils of that plundered people until recently their grasp upon our throats has been broken by the protecting force of an enlightened public sentiment at the North and West. It is not my purpose to describe the character of the governments which resulted from this policy. I call attention simply to two principles they embodied. Gibbon, in his history of Rome, speaking of Egypt, says that the most absurd and oppressive system of government that can be conceived of is that which subjects the natives of a country to the domination of its own slaves. John Stuart Mill, in his work on representative government, says that a government administered by rulers responsible to the governed may be a good government according to the character of the constituency which it represents; but that a government administered by rulers who are not responsible to the people of the government, but to some other community or power, is one of the worst conceivable systems of government; and, sir, these hideous structures in the South were a composite of those two vicious systems. The people there were subjected to the domination of our former slaves; we were ruled over by men not responsible to the people governed, but to the Federal Government. Governor Chamberlain and Governor Kellogg come here to make their reports, and to get their instructions, and they neither think nor care for the people of Louisiana or South Carolina. No man has ever had the temerity, since I have been here, to defend or apologize for these governments. I shall cite only republican testimonies as to their character.

Now, sir, but a short time ago a great cry was raised that the elections of Louisiana were carried by intimidation and fraud and violence and by organized murder, and a subcommittee was sent to Louisiana for the purpose of investigating and bringing before this body what had occurred in that State. Well, the committee went, and they came back with a report. It was composed of two republicans and one democrat. I see attached to the report the name of the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. FOSTER,] who addressed the House on the other day. His name was the first in the order of signatures to the report, and I presume he presented it. Here are his statements in relation to the condition of things in Louisiana. After speaking of one of the parishes that were taken as samples of these intimidations, taken by republicans, and selected as the worst cases that could be brought before the committee, Mr. FOSTER says:

It so happens that that parish was taken as a sample parish of intimidation. Many witnesses from both parties were examined in reference to it; they show beyond question that there was a free, full, fair, and peaceable election and registra-

tion there. There was no evidence of any intimidation of voters practiced on the day of election, although it was asserted that intimidation of colored men before election had been effected by threats of refusal to employ them, or discharge them, if they voted the republican ticket. No evidence, either of discharge or of refusal to employ, was produced. Certain witnesses, themselves every one office-holders, testified generally to such action; but hardly any one was able to specify a single instance in which he heard of any employer so threatening or discharging any voter, or knew of any employé being so threatened or discharged. Not one single colored man throughout the entire parish was produced to testify, either to such a threat or to the execution of such a purpose, whether before or after the election.

"Upon the general subject of the state of affairs in the South, and as to whether the alleged wrongs to colored citizens for political offenses are real or were asserted without due foundation," he says:

As a whole, they are constrained to say that the intention charged is not borne out by the facts before us. No general intimidation of republican voters was established; no colored man was produced who had been threatened or assaulted by any conservative because of political opinion, or discharged from employment, or refused employment. Of all those who testified to intimidation there was hardly any one who of his own knowledge could specify a reliable instance of such acts, and of the white men who were produced to testify generally upon such subjects, very nearly all, if not every single one, was the holder of an office. Throughout the rural districts of the State the number of white republicans is very few; it hardly extends beyond those holding office and those connected with them. No witness, we believe, succeeded in naming, in any parish, five republicans who supported the Kellogg government who were not themselves office-holders or related to office-holders or those having official employment.

But that is not all. He testifies in this report that there was intimidation, that there was fraud, that there was murder committed for the purpose of carrying the elections; not that it was practiced by democrats on republicans, but by republicans upon democrats; that the black men who wished to vote the democratic ticket were the subjects of intimidation. I read further:

On the other hand, it was in evidence that blacks who sought to act with the conservative party were on their part sometimes exposed to enmity and abuse. In the interior, one colored man was shot for making a conservative speech; and in New Orleans, it appeared from the testimony that colored men who sought to cooperate with the conservatives were subject to so much abuse from the police, and otherwise, that an association of lawyers volunteered to protect them, but with little effect.

That was not the only kind of intimidation, but that was an intimidation which of all others does more to keep down the public spirit of a people and to strike down the spirit of liberty, the spirit of independence in which our institutions were founded. I call special attention to it, for it is well for the country to know the appliances that have been, and may be again, used to bring about a fore-determined result.

I read again:

On the other hand, applications to the United States commissioners in the various parishes, not only for alleged crimes, but because of alleged threats of discharge, non-employment, or other interference with political preference, were frequent. Upon these affidavits warrants were often issued, and white citizens arrested and bound over for trial. In many localities the Federal troops were detained for service under the marshals and assistant marshals, and not only made large arrests immediately before the election, but the reports that they were coming to particular neighborhoods about the election time for the purpose of such arrests served, as the conservatives claimed, to intimidate, and sometimes even to produce a stampede among the white voters.

I want the House to recollect that this is the testimony and report of a committee of whom a majority were republicans.

"That served to intimidate and produce a stampede among the white voters." Sir, I have seen two hundred good, plain men mount their horses and ride out of town without depositing their votes for fear of just such persecution.

But that is not all; he goes on to tell that there was a perfect despotism over that people, eating up all their substance by exorbitant taxation, taxing their real estate in the city of New Orleans up to a point beyond the rents and in some of the rural districts 8 per cent., and he quotes approvingly as an indication of the government there that the political power vested in the governor of the State was such as is scarcely exercised by any sovereign in the world. But the gentleman from Ohio in his last speech said that in this report he told some truths that bore heavily upon his own party. I was astounded at that declaration.

What! Does it bear heavily upon his party to report that a people charged with fraud, intimidation, and murder are not guilty? Does it bear heavily upon the republican party to prove that there is no such state of lawlessness and intimidation among a people who are writhing under all the oppression which corruption can invent and tyranny inflict? Is it a condition of republican success that the country should be told that there is murder and intimidation, and that if they are not there the truth which states the opposite bears hardly upon his party? Mighty God! Is it true that that is the nutriment upon which the party must live?

Sir, it did strike his party with amazement at the time, and another subcommittee, a thing which I never knew of before, went down to revise and review his action. They came back and reported some things which the gentleman did not report, some things which did not bear so heavily upon the party. It is due to them to say that upon the searching investigation which they made they came back and said that there was an organized system of violence and murder there for the purpose of intimidating voters and carrying elections and for the purpose of remanding these blacks into a condition something akin to their former servitude.

But the gentleman from Ohio would not yield to that; that would not suit him. He made another counter-report, and said:

We cannot agree to the report made to the committee by Messrs. HOAR, FRYE, and WHEELER. All laws inimical to the colored people of Louisiana, referred to in their report, have been repealed for years.

And he goes on to state that—

In the absence of any direct evidence that the late election was not free and fair, the assumption by the minority that enough colored voters were therefore prevented from voting to change the result of the election throughout the State is an assumption so violent as not to be received.

But even this report of Messrs. HOAR, FRYE, and WHEELER contains admissions almost as startling as the statements of Mr. FOSTER, and shows a state of things which, without resorting to any theory of bloody conspiracies, would produce disorders and violence among the most virtuous people on earth.

In the State of Louisiana there is a governor in office who owes his seat to the interference of the national power, which has recognized his title to his office, not by reason of any legal ascertainment of the fact by legal process, but has based its interference upon the illegal order of a judge.

Here is what Mr. HOAR says about it. He says, in the State of Louisiana there is a governor in office. Remember that this is the governor who has the power of a monarch, according to the testimony of a Federal judge now there.

How did it recognize it? If the governor owes his place to the interference of the national authority and that authority has not ascertained it by legal process, how did the national authority ascertain it and upon what did it base its interference? Mr. HOAR says it based its action "solely on the illegal order of a judge." The judge who issued that illegal order, upon which the national authority based its action and interference, was driven to resignation by the fear of impending impeachment. But there sits that governor, who was put there by the national authority upon that illegal order, ruling that people with a scepter mightier than that of a monarch.

So much for the executive. How about the Legislature? Says Mr. HOAR:

In the same State there is a Legislature, one branch of which derives its authority partly from the same order.

What! The Legislature gets its authority from the same illegal order? Yes, sir; one branch of it does from the same illegal order. How about the other branch. Let Mr. HOAR answer:

The other being organized by a majority who have been established in power by another interference of the national Government, and which majority derives its title, not from any legal ascertainment of the fact, but from the certificate of a returning board which has misconceived and exceeded its legal authority.

Therefore, at the time that report was made every branch of that government exhibited to the American people the spectacle of an executive officer put there by national authority based upon an illegal order, one branch of the Legislature owing its authority to the same illegal order and the other branch having a majority based upon another illegal order. Illegality imbedded in illegality, and upon the whole a colossal despotism crushing down the rights and interests of that people.

Mr. HOAR. Will the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. LAMAR] allow me to ask him if he thinks he has fairly stated the conclusions of my report upon the point to which he has referred?

Mr. LAMAR. Upon that particular point?

Mr. HOAR. Yes.

Mr. LAMAR. I think I have.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think so.

Mr. LAMAR. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOAR. The report which the gentleman does me the honor to quote from states that, in the opinion of those who signed it, Governor Kellogg had a majority of the legal votes of the people of Louisiana; but that any ascertainment of the legal result by legal evidence was prevented by the frauds of his political opponents, who had so manipulated and treated the registrations and the returns—had finally carried them off, I think—as to deprive them of any legal authority whatever. Thereupon the judge of the United States court, misconceiving or usurping his power—I do not undertake to say which—ordered Mr. Kellogg to be put in office, and on that order the United States executive officer based his interference.

Now, the committee found, first, that Governor Kellogg was the lawfully-chosen governor of the State of Louisiana by all the evidence they could get at; second, that his political opponents had by fraud destroyed the returns or their legal value—that they had done wrong to that extent; third, that the judge was unjustified in his order and the executive was without justification in relying on that order as authority for interfering. That is the statement of the report. I agree that the gentleman from Mississippi has the right to cite my report as evidence of gross misconduct on the part of republican officials in the State of Louisiana. I do not agree that he ought to cite my remarks as admissions against my own party unless he quotes the conclusions with which they were necessarily connected.

Mr. LAMAR. I think I can appeal to the recollection of all present that I said the gentleman in his report did say that there was intimidation and fraud and murder, and that the elections were carried by those appliances.

Mr. HOAR. I also said that in my judgment Governor Kellogg was lawfully elected.

Mr. LAMAR. I have not time to wrestle with the gentleman on that point; but I think if he will examine the report he will find its statement to be that the result could not be ascertained, but that in his opinion Mr. Kellogg received the majority of votes. Now I think I have the right to receive the gentleman's admissions and reject his conclusions, especially when I give him the opportunity, which I am always glad to do, to interpolate into my remarks any explanation he may please.

Mr. HOAR. The gentleman is perfectly at liberty to receive my admissions and reject my conclusions. I think, however, that he should not state the admissions without the other.

Mr. LAMAR. I will allow the gentleman always to state for himself his own propositions and conclusions, and I have yielded the floor to him for that purpose in order that they might not be unfairly stated in passing through the medium of my brain.

Mr. HOAR. I thank the gentleman for the very great courtesy with which he has allowed me to do so; and I say to him that I made this interruption of his eloquent and interesting speech with very great reluctance.

Mr. LAMAR. Now, sir, as to the character of the government there we have the gentleman's acknowledgment; and I reiterate that it is not I, but the gentleman, who calls upon the American people to note the fact.

The American people are now brought face to face with this condition of things.

Then he goes on to show that the governor there owes his authority to the interference of the national power, not by the ascertainment of legal process, but by an illegal order of a judge, and that both the other departments of the government rest upon the same illegal basis. As to his opinion that the election was carried one way or the other, that is a mere matter of opinion; but when he himself proclaims voluntarily that the whole superstructure of executive and legislative power in that State is based upon the interference of the national authority, and that interference resting upon illegal orders, I think it is doing no injustice to him, nor to his conclusions, to hold that statement up before an astonished people.

The gentleman's report presents the state of things in Louisiana very graphically, and with telling effect against that people I admit. I do not think he rightly conceived their condition. He staid but a short time, and failed to note some of the most important elements of society there. He has concentrated his attention upon two classes: One the slaveholders, who are not the largest part of the white population, and the other the blacks. He overlooks that teeming population of non-slaveholders, the super-best race of men in the world. There is no order of men superior to those who were the non-slaveholders of the South. They were freemen and freeholders; free-soilers in the true sense of the term; for they worked their own land and reared families economical, independent, and virtuous; and they constitute one of the strongest forces of southern society at this time; yet the gentleman takes no note of them in his analysis of southern society.

What does the gentleman say about the character of this government that thus rests upon illegal intervention?

One fact is that there has been great maladministration by republican officials; there has been much dishonesty, much corruption in State and local administration in Louisiana. For this the republican party, especially under Warmoth's rule, are largely responsible, although in numerous instances their opponents have been equally to blame.

Again he says:

We do not overlook the causes which tend to excite deep feelings of discontent in the white native population of Louisiana. There has been great maladministration; public funds have been wasted, public credit impaired, and taxation is heavy.

What are these admissions? Illegal governments based upon interference of the national authority; maladministration, dishonesty, corruption, waste of public funds—which means embezzlement and the misappropriation of public money—loss of public credit. This is the despotism under which everything that is precious and beautiful and lovely in that State is withering and dying.

I have other testimony. The President of the United States in his last annual message said not a word upon the subject of the disorders of the South; for, sir, this cry of disorder, intimidation, and violence always comes up in this Hall and in this Federal metropolis just before an election when it is to be carried or just after an election when it is to be set aside. In the interim everything is quiet and orderly. But the President in his annual message before the last, speaking of these people in the South where these disorders occur, uses the following language:

I sympathize with their prostrate condition and would do all in my power to relieve them, acknowledging that in some instances they have had most trying governments to live under and very oppressive ones in the way of taxation for nominal improvements, not giving benefits equal to the hardships imposed.

Sir, take the features of that statement. What are they? Oppressive governments, burdens of taxation, and prostrate people. What greater woe can there be than this? What more accursed fate can befall a people than such a government as Mr. HOAR describes, illegal in its every department, marked by maladministration, and reeking with dishonesty and corruption; or, as Mr. FOSTER describes it, an infamous despotism, consuming all the resources of a people? Where, I repeat, on earth or in what age of the world have you not had violence and turbulence where a people are prostrated by the burdens of oppressive government, and tortured and impoverished by taxation? Where have you ever seen orderly, quiet, and peaceable citizens whose governors are lawless felons, whose ministerial officers are forgers and thieves, and their magistrates scoundrels?

And, sir, when this prostrate people writhing in their agony turn over and jostle these rickety establishments that would fall down of their own rot if let alone, when, as is almost inevitable, disorders occur, the national authority is called upon, the Federal Executive is

invoked—for what? To protect the prostrate people against these illegal, dishonest, corrupt, and oppressive governments? No; but to protect and maintain these governments and to hold the people down in quiet submission to them! What a policy! This great Federal Government powerless for the protection of the people against oppressions of local government, but omnipotent to maintain those governments and enforce their oppressions.

Now, sir, I have read all this testimony with reluctance. My purpose has been to show that ample cause exists for these troubles in the South without attributing them to a spirit of cruel vindictiveness, or wild, restless, unlawful ambition on the part of southern whites. I have appealed to this evidence of earnest, leading republicans that the sudden enfranchisement of 800,000 slaves threatened the very evils which have come upon us. I do not arraign your policy. Its attempted reversal now would lead to a shock and ruin even worse than that which has resulted from its establishment. All we ask in common justice to the South is that you will reflect and act upon the fact that the governments you contrived have by your own testimony proved to you and to the world their utter incompetence to solve peaceably and prosperously a problem the difficulty of which we do not deny. When you point me to acts of violence I acknowledge and deplore them. But I ask you, who has governed the States where this violence occurs for the last ten years? Have we? Who have taxed us, controlled our Legislatures, filled our courts, received the patronage of the Federal Government, ruled over us at home and represented us here?

Sir, you cannot by Federal and military intervention preserve those governments without trampling out the liberties of whole Commonwealths, because those governments are in defiance of that highest and most sacred of all constitutions, the law of nature. God had so identified the interests of these two races by the necessities of climate and labor and old associations that time would soon have re-adjusted their new relations. It is not yet too late for such an adjustment. You have given the black race the most delicate, the most dangerous, as well as the most sacred of all privileges. Let that privilege be maintained inviolably. But give him real freedom, and do not make him the Janizary of party tyranny. Allow that race to learn what you have learned in New England and carried with you into that new empire of the West which your energy has created, that moral worth, intelligence and industry and wealth are the true foundations of a people's happiness and liberty, no matter what their color. Let it no longer rely upon Federal bayonets. They inspire a contempt for law and disqualify for self-government.

Sir, this race problem is capable of solution. Two English statesmen such as Lord Derby and Earl Russell, or Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli, could agree upon a basis of settlement in three days; and we could do the same here but for the interposition of the passions of party in the contest for the power and emoluments of government. It could be settled in this District and throughout the South without abridging universal suffrage or subjecting either race to the control of the other. Take the question out of national politics and it can be settled on a basis which would consolidate all the rights of the black man, make him free and equal with every citizen before the law, protected in the fruits of his labor, safe in his person, happy in his household, secure in the enjoyment of whatever he can in fair competition achieve, whether it be of fortune or fame, and thus secure to him a higher and better life than he now leads as the misguided and deluded constituency of dishonest office-holders.

I have not intended to intimate that the capacity of the black race for freedom and the duties of citizenship should be determined by the considerations which I presented. The freedom of this race, its citizenship, have not had a fair opportunity for favorable development at the South. Controlled through the authority of the Government by the worst men as they have been, it would be unjust to them to form any estimate of their capacity to meet the demands of their high position by the events of the last ten years.

Sir, we know that one great cause of the jealousy with which the southern people are regarded is the fact that they stand between the ambition of a party and the glittering prizes of honor and emoluments and patronage which the control of the Government for another four years will give. I believe, sir, if they could do so consistently with their constitutional obligations, our people would willingly stand aloof and let the northern people settle the question of President for themselves, upon the condition that there shall be no further intervention in their local affairs. But, sir, they cannot abnegate their rights and duties as American citizens and impose on themselves a sullen and inactive inactivity. They must go forward and keep abreast with American progress and American destiny, and take their share of the responsibility in the settlement of the questions in which all parts of the country are alike interested.

But it is asked why we are united in support of the democratic party. A celebrated author in his work on political ethics says that in the history of all free countries there is no instance of a people being unanimous in sentiment and action, unless they were made so by the imminence of some great and common peril or by the inspiration of some enthusiastic sentiment.

The people of the South are not moved by the latter. Even if the events of the war and the sufferings since the war had not, as they have done, crushed out all their party attachments, nearly one-half the people of the South have no attachment to the democratic party,



and in acting with it for the time being, they only obey, as I said before, the imperious law of self-preservation.

The motive which prompts their co-operation is not the expectation of filling cabinets and directing policies, but simply to get an administration which will not be unfriendly to them, an administration which in place of the appliances of force, subjugation, and domination, will give them amnesty, restoration to the privileges of American citizenship; which will accord to their States the same equal rights with other States in this Union; equality of consideration, equality of authority and jurisdiction over their own affairs; equality, sir, in exemption from the domination of their elections by the bayonet and by soldiers as the irresistible instruments of a revolting local despotism. Give them that, give them local self-government, and you will then see at last what will be the dawn of prosperity in all the industries and enterprises of the North; you will see, sir, a true southern *renaissance*, a real grand reconstruction of the South in all the elements of social order, strength, justice, and equality of all her people. Rising from her confusion and distress, rejoicing in her newly-recovered liberty, prosperous, free, great, her sons and daughters of every race happy in her smile, she will greet your benignant Republic in the words of the inspired poet—

Thy gentleness hath made me great.

[Applause.]

#### APPENDIX.

[Extracts from the speech of Hon. O. P. MORTON, at Richmond, Indiana, September 29, 1865.]

##### NEGROES UNFIT TO VOTE.

I believe that in the case of 4,000,000 slaves just freed from bondage there should be a period of probation and preparation before they are brought to the exercise of political power. \* \* \* What is their condition? Perhaps not one in five hundred—I might say one in a thousand—can read, and perhaps not one in five hundred is worth \$5 in property of any kind. \* \* \* Can you conceive that a body of men, white or black, who have been in this condition, and their ancestors before them, are qualified to be immediately lifted from their present state into the full exercise of political power, not only to govern themselves and their neighbors, but to take part in the Government of the United States? Can they be regarded as intelligent and independent voters? The mere state of facts furnishes the answer to the question. \* \* \* To say that such men—and it is no fault of theirs; it is simply a misfortune and a crime of this nation—to say that such men, just emerged from slavery, are qualified for the exercise of political power is to make the strongest pro-slavery argument I ever heard. It is to pay the highest compliment to the institution of slavery.

##### THE RIGHT TO VOTE INVOLVES THE RIGHT TO HOLD OFFICE.

The right to vote carries with it the right to hold office. You cannot say that the negro has a natural right to vote, but that he must vote only for white men for office. The right to vote carries with it the right to be voted for. When that right is conferred, you can make no discrimination, no distinction against the right to hold office; and the right to vote in a State carries with it the right to vote for President and members of Congress and for all Federal officers. The right of suffrage being conferred in South Carolina, for State purposes, under our Constitution, as I have before pointed out, carries with it the right to vote for President and Vice-President and members of Congress.

##### COLORED STATE GOVERNMENTS THE RESULT.

If you enfranchise all the negroes in these States you will have at least twenty negro votes to one white vote, and in the work of reconstructing the States of South Carolina, Alabama, and Florida you will have a larger proportion—perhaps thirty colored votes to one white. Now, I ask you, what is to be the effect of that? The first effect will be, you will have colored State governments. Under such a condition of things the negro would no more vote for a white man than you up here would vote for a black man. They would no more elect a white man than you would elect a black man. Human nature is the same, whether in a white or colored skin. There could be nothing that would confer more pleasure upon a man of that race, of course, than the elevation to political power of a man of his own race and color. Having secured power, they would retort upon us that which we have so steadily practiced upon them. If you give them the vote they will elect men of their own color, and we would have no right to blame them. We would rather think badly of them if they did not. I would ask you if the negroes of Hayti, or any other place where they are in a majority, have ever elected a white man to office? Under Mr. Sumner's plan you will give them an overwhelming majority in every one of these States, and you will give them the political power of the South.

That they will exercise this power by electing men of their own color is absolutely certain. Believing that human nature is the same under different complexions, that the negroes are not differently constituted from ourselves, and that they have like passions with us, we cannot doubt how this power will be exercised. Some will say that it is all right; if they can find colored men qualified, all right. There are enough colored men of education in the North to go to the South and fill every office there, and I have no doubt they stand ready to do it. Here we deny to them almost every right except that of mere personal liberty; and it is so in Illi-

nois and many other northern States; and when you present to them the prospect of holding the highest offices in the gift of the people of the Southern States, rest assured they will embrace it. They will have colored governors and colored Members of Congress, and Senators, and judges of the Supreme Court, &c. Very well; and suppose they do send colored Senators and Representatives to Congress, I have no doubt you will find men in the North who will be willing to sit beside them and will not think themselves degraded by doing so. I have nothing to say to this. I am simply discussing the political effect of it. In every State where there is a colored State government, a negro for governor, and a negro for supreme judge, white emigration will cease; there will be no more white emigration to any such State. You cannot find the most ardent anti-slavery man in Wayne County who will go and locate in a State that has a colored State government. You will absolutely shut off at once and effectually all emigration from the northern States, and from Europe, too, whenever that event shall happen. Thus they will remain permanently colored States in the South. The white men who are now there would remove from them; they would not remain under such dominion.

##### EFFECT OF THEIR ENFRANCHISEMENT; A NEGRO BALANCE OF POWER.

Very well, say some; that is all very well if we can get the negroes to go there. But let me say that the colored States would be a balance of power in this country. I ask, is it desirable to have a colored State government? I say it is not; it is not for many reasons. One reason is that such States would perpetually constitute a balance of power. They would be held bound by that stringent tie that held men together; the tie of color and race, the tie of a down-trodden and despised race. As 300,000 slaveholders by a common tie were able to govern this nation for a long time, so 4,000,000 people, bound together by a much stronger tie, despised by the whole world as they have been, would constantly vote and act together; and their united vote would constitute a balance of power that might control the government of this nation.

I submit, then, however clearly and strongly we may admit the natural right of the negro—I submit it to the intelligence of the people that colored State governments are not desirable; that they will bring about results that are not to be hoped for; that finally they would threaten to bring about and, I believe, would result in a war of races.

##### THE SOLUTION OF THE DIFFICULTY.

Now the question turns up, how can this be avoided? If I had the power I would arrange it in this way: I would give these men a period of probation and preparation; I would give them time to acquire a little property and get a little education; time to learn something about the simplest forms of business and prepare themselves for the exercise of political power. At the end of ten, fifteen, or twenty years, let them come into the enjoyment of their political rights. By that time these States will have been so completely filled up by emigration from the North and from Europe that the negroes will be in a permanent minority. Why? Because the negroes have no emigration, nothing but the natural increase, while we have emigration from all the world and natural increase besides. Thus, by postponing the thing only to such times as the negroes are qualified to enjoy political rights, the dangers I have been considering would have fully passed away, their influence would no longer be dangerous in the manner I have indicated, and a conflict of races would not be more likely to happen than it now is in Massachusetts. In Massachusetts the negroes have exercised political rights for twenty-five years, and yet there has been no disturbance there, no conflict of races. Why? Because the negroes have been in the minority.

##### [Extract from Governor Andrew's valedictory address.]

Governor Andrew, of Massachusetts, in his valedictory address delivered on 5th January, 1866, speaking of the basis of reconstruction in the South, uses the following language:

"It may be asked: Why not demand the suffrage for colored men, in season for their vote in the business of re-organization? My answer is, I assume that the colored men are in favor of those measures which the Union needs to have adopted. But it would be idle to re-organize those States by the colored vote. If the popular vote of the white race is not to be had in favor of the guarantees justly required, then I am in favor of holding on just where we now are. I am not in favor of a surrender of the present rights of the Union to a struggle between a white minority, aided by the freedmen on the one hand, against a majority of the white race on the other. I would not consent, having rescued those States by arms from secession and rebellion, to turn them over to anarchy and chaos."

In urging the necessity of securing the participation of the whites, under a general amnesty, in the control of the new governments, he says:

"I only know that we ought to demand, and to secure, the co-operation of the strongest and ablest minds and natural leaders of opinion in the South. If we cannot gain their support of the just measures needful for the work of safe re-organization, re-organization will be delusive and full of danger.

"Why not try them? They are the most hopeful subjects to deal with, in the very nature of the case. They have the brain and the experience and the education to enable them to understand the exigencies of the present situation. They have the courage, as well as the skill, to lead the people in the direction their judgments point, in spite of their own and the popular prejudice. Weaker men, those of less experience, who have less hold on the public confidence, are comparatively powerless. Is it consistent with reason and our knowledge of human nature to believe the masses of southern men able to face about, to turn their backs on those they have trusted and followed, and to adopt the lead of those who have no magnetic hold on their hearts or minds? Re-organization in the South demands the aid of men of great moral courage, who can renounce their own past opinions and do it boldly; who can comprehend what the work is and what are the logical consequences of the new situation; men who have interests urging them to rise to the height of the occasion. They are not the strong men, from whom weak, vacillating counsels come; nor are they the great men, from whom come counsels born of prejudices and follies, having their root in an institution they know to be dead and buried beyond the hope of resurrection."