

THE EUGENE CITY GUARD.

ESTABLISHED FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES, AND TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING BY THE SWEAT OF OUR BROW

VOL. IX.—NO. 55.

EUGENE CITY, OREGON, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1876.

\$2.50 per year IN ADVANCE.

THE PEOPLE CONGRATULATED.

The National Democratic Committee to the Voters of the United States.

FELLOW CITIZENS: We congratulate you as patriots, as partakers with us in the common destiny of American freemen, upon the results of the October State elections. We rejoice in the victory which the people's ballots have bestowed upon the friends of reform, in the valley of the Ohio, where the Republican hosts had an overwhelming ascendancy in every Presidential election since 1856. We rejoice in the assurance these elections convey that your ballots will bestow decisive majorities to the allied forces of Democracy and Reform in the November elections throughout the Union. But we rejoice not as partisans; we rejoice with you as fellow citizens.

And when the decision of this week of one million voters along the valley of the Ohio shall be ratified next month, by the fiat of eight million voters throughout the whole republic, we shall still rejoice, chiefly for the reason that not one of its citizens can miss an equal share with us who are Democrats in the political peace and good will which will then and there be established among all sections, races, classes, and conditions of men, and in the prosperity of which political peace, based on equal rights and fraternal good will, is the first condition.

Upon the three States of West Virginia, Ohio and Indiana, were concentrated all the influence of the Administration, all their efforts and all the vast sums of money forced from the one hundred thousand officeholders of the party in power.

These were fearful odds, not again to be contended against so concentrated, for in the November elections the contest will be in every one of thirty-eight States on the same day. Nevertheless, against these odds, the Democrats and Reformers of West Virginia and Indiana have been victorious, and in Ohio have all but rescued a State hitherto deemed hopeless, and have created an assurance of victory in November.

If it falls to our lot as a National Democratic Committee to congratulate the people of the Union upon this victory in the first battle of the reform campaign, it is only because Democrats have been honored to be the leaders of the people in the work of national regeneration.

The victory won, the victory still to be won, will be a deliverance as much to Republicans as to Democrats.

The patriotic masses of the Republican party may be thankful that the misdeeds of their unworthy leaders have been rebuked and are to be arrested. The suffering whites of the South may lift up their heads to greet the dawn of a better day for them, as well as the nation at large. The colored citizen may share the general joy that he will soon cease to be the stock in trade of corrupt politicians, but shall enjoy his rightful liberties and his equality before the law amid universal good will.

As for the Reform Democracy, to whose standard victory has been tied, with all her garlands on, it only remains for them to welcome every ally, every friend, close up the ranks and press on, shoulder to shoulder under the banner and with the one watchword, Reform.

Fellow citizens, peace between all sections, prosperity in all our homes, of these you have for years, been deprived by the mistaken solicitudes of patriotic Republicans, played upon by selfish and corrupt leaders, who have kept fanning the dying embers of civil strife in order to escape inspection of the trusts which they have betrayed.

For eleven years you have had the name of peace. At no time have you had the substance of peace. In lieu thereof you have had the grinding taxation and wasteful expenditure of war. Just before every election every year you had the preaching of a new crusade against a section utterly defeated in war, and anxious only to be completely reconciled in peace.

For eleven years the power of the men who have seized away the control of their party from the hands of its statesman and founders has been supreme in almost every department of the federal government.

Discarding the hope of prolonging their domination by beneficent public measures, they have created and trafficked upon public calamities. The policy they adopted has been worked out. Its failure has been absolute.

In place of past performances these same corrupt and selfish leaders now proffer promises already broken as their titles to further trust.

Having prostrated our manifold industries by the vast aggregates and the worst methods of federal taxation, they now again solicit your confidence as the instruments of retrenchment and reform.

Having debauched the public service, and having just now, in the face of open day, assessed their army of a hundred thousand officeholders—the people's servants—paid by the peo-

ple's taxes—in order to create immense corruption funds to frustrate the people's will, they now profess to be the champions of civil service reform. Having imposed up the Southern States the rapacity, fraud and plunder of the carpet-bag governments, having almost ruined the prosperity of the North, by destroying the prosperity of the South, having created terror, uncertainty and confusion in all the productive industries of the South, which furnish most of the exports of our whole country, keep in motion the commerce and manufactures of the North and East, and furnish a market for the agricultural products of the West, they now propose, by renewal of the same fatal policy, to prolong their own power in the hope of concealing their misdeeds, and for this purpose they do not hesitate to renew the cry of intolerance; to revive the dying memories of fraternal strife, and to appeal to the fears and prejudices of the timid and the ignorant.

Fellow citizens, these men and their measures have been completely tried and have completely failed. An oppressive taxation, an exhausted South, an impoverished North, a fluctuating currency, the enterprise of an industrious people looked fast in the paralysis of hard times—such is the outcome of their political policy, such are the achievements of their long supremacy. Your ballots in November can alone dictate a change of measures and a change of men. Shall not the uprising of patriotism along the valley of the Ohio go on to a complete and beneficial revolution in the administration of the government of the United States?

Will you not, by the voice of overwhelming majorities at the polls, proclaim your invincible faith, after all these years of corruption and passion, in the high immortal principles of government by the people for the people, in simple honesty and strict economy, as the supreme wisdom of public policy, in justice as the mother of power, and in civil liberty as the be-all and end-all of a true republican nationality.

Will you not build up a new prosperity for all the people on the old foundations of American self-government, on peace, reconciliation and fraternity between all sections of American commonwealths; on frugality and economy in all governments; on honesty and purity in administration, and having lost your prosperity through governmental misrule, regain that prosperity through governmental reform? We commit this great issue to the intelligence and conscience of the American people, with an unflinching trust in the wisdom and justice of their decision.

By order of the National Democratic Committee.

ABRAHAM S. HEWITT, Chairman.
FREDERICK O. PRINCE,
Secretary.

NEW YORK, Oct. 13, 1876.

RUTHERFORD B. HAYES AS A STATESMAN.

From the N. Y. Sun, Oct. 6.

During the three years that Mr. Hayes served in the House of Representatives, he never rose above the dead level of mediocrity, or gave the least sign of being anything more than an average partisan, who cheerfully obeyed the orders of Thaddeus Stevens, then the autocrat of that chamber; who never kicked in the traces; who recorded his votes like a regular, without question, and who was regarded as "a reliable Republican."

As a public man this is all the record he left behind him in Washington. He was in Congress when the last gun of the civil war was fired, and for more than two years after that event; yet his voice was not heard in connection with any of the measures of policy, nor was his position such as to call him into the councils of his party. Schenck, Lawrence, Shellabarger, Ashley, Delano, Bingham, Spaulding, and Garfield were members of the Ohio delegation at the same time, and completely overshadowed Hayes, as did even Ben Eggleston, his colleague from Cincinnati.

Hence, in all the jobbery of that time, and the enormous subsidies and land grants to railroad rings and corporations, he merely followed the lead of his superiors, swallowed their prescriptions, and voted straight through without looking to the right or to the left. In no instance did he venture to raise an objection, to dissent from any proposition which bore the party stamp, or to dispute the justice or honesty of giving away the public domain to an organized band of monopolists, who cared for nothing but their own interests, and who notoriously bought their way through Congress.

Mr. Hayes could not have been ignorant that these grants and subsidies were corruptly procured; that his associates were growing rich upon the spoils, by interests in shoddy contracts during the war, and that he

was in the midst of a legislative body where the majority, to which he belonged, was venal, unscrupulous, and bent on individual plunder. If he did not know these things, he was imbecile. If he did know them, and remained silent, he is now unworthy of confidence.

While in Congress, Mr. Hayes made but one speech on any subject, and that we propose to reproduce, in order that the country may see him at his best, and understand precisely what kind of a man is now seeking the first office in its gift. He was a member of the Committee on Private Land Claims. In the closing hours of the Thirty-ninth Congress, a bill reported from that committee confirming to the heirs of John A. Bouligny a sixth part of a large land claim in the State of Louisiana, was passed. Nine days after its passage, and at the beginning of the new Congress, Mr. Washburn, of Wisconsin, offered a joint resolution in the House, directing the Secretary of the Interior to suspend the execution of this same act, saying, by way of explanation:

"I served on the Committee of Private Land Claims for four years, and this is an old acquaintance of mine. I will say to the House a more fraudulent claim was never presented to the Congress of the United States; if gentlemen will only read a decision of the Supreme Court referred to, they will see it is a fraudulent claim. The bill passed not merely sanctions these claims to the amount of 75,000 acres of land, but a claim to the amount of 450,000 acres, and other claims will be legalized which require millions on millions of acres to satisfy them."

After this attack by a leading Republican, of course the joint resolution passed without much show of opposition. Mr. Hayes had passively favored the bill which Mr. Washburn thus denounced; and he now attempted to explain away his action in the following speech which is the only one which attests his presence in Congress, and which is not destined to descend to posterity as a model of eloquence, or an example of "pure English undefiled."

"The committee was called together to consider this matter during, I think, the last week of the last session; the majority of the committee had examined the matter, and were ready to report in favor of the measure. Two members of the committee the gentleman from Illinois [M. Baker] and myself, had no opportunity to examine it; the papers were very voluminous; the case was one requiring a good deal of investigation; and my memory is distinct that the gentleman from Illinois, as well as myself, declined at that time to take any part in deciding the case. We had no opportunity to make such examination as was required to form an intelligent judgment, but a majority of the committee having examined the case, the Chairman, as I understood was authorized, to report as the opinion of the majority, that the measure ought to pass. The papers, it is said by the gentleman from Illinois, can't be found. I recollect that upon that occasion I was not able to get the papers for examination because another member of the committee desired them for the same purpose. I will state further that, after coming out of the committee, I went into the law library and found the case referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [5 Howard, containing the decision of Judge Nelson]. I read it hastily, and the impression was made upon my mind corresponding precisely with the statement embraced in the resolution presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I went to the chairman of the committee and said that such was the impression made upon my mind; but the majority of the committee had decided the matter, and I could do nothing. I did not know till I saw the statement in the papers that the measure had been called up and passed. If my attention had been directed to the bill at the time of its passage, I should have stated the impression I had received from reading the case in 15 Howard. I will say further that my present impression is that if the claim is a perfectly good one, as perhaps it may be, if it will bear examination, it seems to me right that we should, if possible, procure a postponement of action by the department, and that the resolution of the gentleman of Wisconsin or something similar to it should be adopted."

This may be called a remarkable "effort" for its style, for its contradictions, and for its glaring contradictions. First of all, Mr. Hayes says, "the committee was called together to consider this question during, I think, the last week of the session." Now the bill passed on the 2d of March, the day preceding the end of the session. So, according to Mr. Hayes the report from his committee and the vote in the House must have followed in quick succession. Bearing these things in mind what did he do in the matter? He states that "after coming out of the committee I

went to the law library and found the case referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin," who upon that decision had pronounced it the "most fraudulent claim ever presented to Congress." He agreed with Mr. Washburn's impression, and so told the chairman of the committee. But, says he, "the majority of the committee had decided the matter, and I could do nothing!"

Herein the feeble and passive character of the man is revealed. He knew this to be a fraudulent claim after reading the decision of the Supreme Court, but because the "majority had decided the matter," he accepted their judgment and the fraud together, dismissed the case, and excused himself by saying, "I could do nothing." Why did he not make a minority report, or, knowing what he did, watch the calendar, and expose the fraud? It was in his power to prevent the passage of this bill, but as in the case of the railroad jobs, he did not dare to lip a syllable against what the "majority had decided."

But this is not all. Mr. Washburn had declared: "I served on the Committee on Private Land Claims four years, and this is an old acquaintance of mine; I will say to the House, a more fraudulent claim was never presented to the Congress of the United States; if gentlemen will only read a decision of the Supreme Court referred to, they will see that it is a fraudulent claim." Mr. Hayes in his explanation said: "I went to the law library and found the case referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I read it hastily, and the impression was made upon my mind corresponding precisely with the statement embraced in the resolution presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin." So they agree "precisely" that the claim was a fraud under this decree of the Supreme Court. Yet, after uttering this positive opinion, he winds up this singular discourse in these words:

"I will say further that my present impression is that if the claim is a perfectly good one, as perhaps it may be, if it will bear examination, it seems to me right that we should, if possible, procure a postponement of action by the department."

These utterances need no comment. They speak for themselves, and exhibit a commonplace politician, with small capacity, and no moral force, lifted up into the position of a candidate for the Presidency, and put forward by a powerful party as a "statesman" fitted for this great crisis. If anything was needed to determine the qualities and fitness of this aspirant, the foregoing speech would supply the deficiency. It ought to settle the pretensions of Rutherford B. Hayes.

THE OCTOBER ELECTIONS.

What the Newspapers say about the Result.

From the New York Sun of Oct. 12.

The vote in the West shows that the Germans are deaf to the appeals of the bloody shirt orators, that Carl Schurz has lost power with them, and that they discern that the overmastering issue of this campaign is the reform of the abuses which sixteen years of Republican dominance has established in the administration of the Government. The Germans of the East are of the same mind with their brethren of the West. This fact, with others, gives promise of a heavy majority for Tilden in this State where the great battle will be fought. The Republican canvass, rebuffed by the close of the canvass in Ohio and Indiana, will be brought hither to wave the bloody shirt; but they will find it is not a standard which will stir the enthusiasm of our voters. The citizens of New York know Governor Tilden. They personally benefit by his reduction of taxes and the reforms he has introduced at Albany.

From the New York Herald, Oct. 12.

The Republicans founded their appeal on what is popularly called the "bloody shirt." With the exception of Mr. Schurz and Mr. J. D. Cox, we remember no prominent speaker in either Ohio or Indiana who brought into prominence those reforms which the country needs. Civil service, currency, economy, respectability, all went by the board, and press and speakers urged only and continually the danger of a "united South," the danger of rebel war claims, and attempted to arouse the old war fever, the feelings of bitterness, hostility and suspicion toward the Southern whites. Now, of course, this was done deliberately. It was no chance work. In July there was still reason to hope and even to believe that the "bloody shirt" would not appear in this campaign. Suddenly and simultaneously it was raised in both States by all the Republicans, without cause, and without any reason except one—that they believed that, on the whole, this was their strongest card. The field of argument lay open to them to choose. They could have planted themselves on civil service reform, on

currency reform, on general goodwill and confidence, but they preferred an appeal to dying and dangerous passions that seemed to them their surest, and, we must believe, their only way to success.

Well, it has failed them. Substantially their campaign with the "bloody shirt" is a defeat. It was a desperate enterprise, set on foot by the anti-reform wing of the party, which assumed command and had its own sweet will in the campaign. It was the plan of battle of the Chandlers, Mortons, Logans, the "war horses" of the Republican side; and the subordinate leaders, not even excepting poor Mr. Schurz at the last, fell obediently into line and fought it out, and substantially got beaten. Undoubtedly they deserved it; but will it teach the Republican party no lesson? Will not Governor Hayes and those leaders of his party who desire reform, now see that the old appeal to the "bloody shirt," to prejudice, hatred and unreason is a failure, and that it is high time for them to oust the false leaders, to return to the true issues and question, and make their struggle for November upon these?

From the Albany Argus, Oct. 11.

REPUBLICAN PRESTIGE BROKEN.

The Democratic party has struggled against terrible odds in Ohio and Indiana. It has had to confront unlimited resources of men and money. It has had to meet an unprincipled organization ready to sacrifice every great public interest to carry its own selfish ends. The spectacle of a great party selling its honor, and entering into an unholy alliance in defiance of its own professions, is degrading and disgusting, and will secure the contempt of the people of the entire Republic.

For the first time since the organization of the Republican party, the Democracy pass the critical period of the October elections without the influence of a depressing popular current against them.

The prestige of the Republican party is at last broken. At last it must face the people throughout the length and breadth of the land. At last it must give an account of its stewardship at the general election in November.

No longer can it enter into the November election with the impetus of an avalanche, sweeping everything before it. It must now face the sober judgment of the country. It must abandon its appeals to passion and prejudice. It must abandon its hopes of winning by personal calumny and scurrilous vituperation.

The questions are simple and easily comprehended by every voter.

1. Will this country prosper so long as sectional bitterness is permitted to load the South with heavy and oppressive burdens? Shall the relentless persecution of the South continue? Or shall fraternity and goodwill between the sections prevail?

2. Shall the general administration of the country be conducted upon the principles of the fathers, or shall the Republic be managed by those who have already brought it to the verge of ruin?

3. Shall Reform and Retrenchment be enforced; or shall the destinies of the nation be left in hands utterly unable to comprehend its needs?

The result of yesterday's contests in demonstrating the great impression made by the Democracy in the critical States gives bright promise of final success in November. The conservative, liberal, loyal, cultured States of the Republic will vote solid for Tilden and Hendricks, Reconciliation and Reform.

Victory is assured!

From the Boston Post, Oct. 11.

The back of the Grant-Hayes campaign is broken. Yesterday's work in the great Western stronghold of Republicanism, determines the attitude of the nation in November. What this work is, and what it means, can only be understood when it is remembered that Indiana and Ohio were claimed, less than two months ago, by the National Republican Committee; that they have been Republican States from the beginning; and that the average Republican majority in Presidential years since 1860 has been in Indiana, 7,566, and in Ohio, 24,285. It is no gust of transient passion that has wrought this great change in the minds of the people; it is the strong and steady flood that will sweep the land before it subsides. Now for Massachusetts!

The Herald on Hayes.

The New York Herald has not altogether so exalted an opinion of Mr. Hayes as the Journal would have its

readers believe. A correspondent recently wrote to the Herald a very eulogistic communication about the Radical candidate for the Presidency, which that journal published, but in the same issue editorially disclaimed any indorsement of the views of its correspondent. It said:

So far as we are able to judge from his record, Mr. Hayes is a man some parts of whose conduct may be approved, while no part of it can be admired. We look upon him as a mediocre, well intentioned gentleman, who has been lifted by the accidents of politics to a position to which he had no title founded on personal qualifications. He has none of the elements of a great and commanding character; neither the breadth of intellect, the force of will, nor the ascendancy over other men with which nature stamps a man born for leadership. He is immeasurably inferior to Morton, Blaine, Conkline, and half a dozen other Republicans that might be named, in the qualities which fit a man for influence over minds and make him felt as a potent force in politics. We believe Mr. Hayes to be honest, but not more honest than hundreds of thousands of citizens who are plain tillers of the soil, or who gain their livelihood by mechanical skill. He is not eminent as a lawyer, was not eminent as a soldier, he made no figure in Congress as a legislator, and there are probably few counties in Ohio which could not furnish as useful a Governor. We have nothing to say against the services rendered in public stations by well meaning mediocrity, but we are unable to see that a small man is rendered great or admirable by a nomination for the Presidency.

Our correspondent maintains that Mr. Hayes, if elected, will free himself from party trammels and exercise a noble independence, guided only by justice. We wish we could believe so; but we are unable to find anything in Mr. Hayes' career to warrant so pleasing an expectation. During the three years he was in Congress he was as obedient to party behests as the mob of ordinary members. That was the period of enormous land grants for railroads, and the record proves that Mr. Hayes voted for them all. It would be a poor compliment to his sagacity to say that he acted in ignorance; but not even this lame excuse can be pleaded, for Mr. Elihu Washburne, our Minister to France, was then in the House and distinguished himself by a bold and vigorous opposition to those wasteful, swindling grants of public lands. Unfortunately for the claim of independence which is set up for Mr. Hayes he never voted on such occasions with Mr. Washburne, but always with the majority of his party. Our correspondent seeks materials of eulogy in Mr. Hayes' action as Governor of Ohio, but he fails to adduce a single instance in which Gov. Hayes acted in opposition to his party.

Our correspondent asserts that on the Southern question the managers of the Republican canvass "audaciously misrepresent their candidate." We are told, with great emphasis, that Governor Hayes deprecates the waving of the "bloody shirt," and "does not believe in a new stirring up of suspicion, hatred and strife." Conceding that these are the real sentiments of Mr. Hayes they only prove what a cypher he is in the politics of his own party. The Republican stump speakers and party organs, one and all, are waging the campaign on the Southern issue, which we are assured Governor Hayes so strongly disapproves. Such contemptuous disregard of the wishes of their candidate proves that they consider him a weak man—a mere figure head in their canvass. It shows that he has no moral or political influence among his own supporters. If he has none now, can he be expected to exert any after his election? Among the able men of his party he cannot find the materials of a Cabinet which will endorse his own views; for all the able men of the party, including even George W. Curtis, are industriously waving the "bloody shirt" and trying to make the campaign turn on that issue. Can Mr. Hayes administer the government without a Cabinet? Is he strong enough to override all the able men of his party? If the Republicans elect the President they will also elect the next House, and Congress will enact a new enforcement law to take the place of that which has been annulled by the Supreme Court. Does anybody believe that Mr. Hayes would veto such a bill? Would a man of his moderate talents and peace-loving disposition venture to play the part of Andrew Johnson, and court Andrew Johnson's fate? Our correspondent may believe it, but we do not.

We are unable to see that the nomination of such a man for the Presidency "adds one cubit to his stature" or entitles him to a higher estimate than he enjoyed before.

Pyramids, though perched on a base of pyramids, still, and pyramids are pyramids, value.