

HENDRICKS' VOICE.

Democratic Principles Eloquently Defined.

An Economical Administration and Lower Taxes Demanded—Blaine not a Friend of Naturalized Citizens.

Hon. Thomas A. Hendricks, Democratic candidate for Vice-President, delivered the subjoined address before an immense assemblage at Indianapolis, Ind., frequent outbursts of tremendous cheers greeting his remarks. He spoke as follows:

FELLOW-CITIZENS—I appreciate the privilege and the honor of addressing you, and I recognize the duty of speaking frankly and without concealment or exaggeration of any material fact or opinion. May I first ask your attention to the necessity and importance of revenue reform? The power to levy and collect taxes is among the highest and most responsible of the attributes of government. How far may government go in the exercise of the power to tax the people? Freely and cheerfully we all answer that there shall be no limitation or restraint upon the absolute and entire maintenance of public authority, with all of its faculties and functions unimpaird. Whatever the government can lawfully do, and of right should do, the taxpayers will furnish it the means to accomplish. Beyond this is the province of private right, to invade which is usurpation.

When the war came taxation was necessarily and rightfully increased. But with the war and the expenditure consequent upon it, there passed away the necessity for a war standard of taxation. Why, then, has such a standard continued? The party that has held almost unbroken power for nineteen years of peace must respond to that inquiry. In his message of Dec. 4, 1882, President Arthur admonished Congress that at the prior session he had urged upon its attention "the importance of relieving the industries and enterprises of unnecessary taxation." For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1881, the surplus revenue amounted to \$100,000,000; for the fiscal year ended on the 30th of June last the surplus was more than \$145,000,000. What say you, my countrymen? Did that showing not call for revenue reform? During that Congress the House was made positively Republican, largely by partisan action. Not much heed was given by it to the startling statement made by the President of the enormous excess in the revenue. The modification of the internal revenue system and of the tariff made in the March following left an excess of \$85,000,000 of revenue. In his last annual report (3d December last, the secretary of the treasury estimates the surplus of the current year at \$85,000,000, and adds: "So the question still presses, what legislation is necessary to relieve the people of unnecessary taxes?" Yes, it is the question of \$85,000,000 unnecessary taxes in one year. The accumulation is constant. In a speech recently made at Richmond, Mr. Calkins, the candidate for governor, boasting of the achievements of his party, made the statement which I adopt without examination, that the "Republican party found an empty treasury; now it has a surplus of \$400,000,000." That great sum of money lies idle in the treasury. If it had been left with the people it would become the willing and active servant of labor. In the language of the secretary of the treasury: "The question still presses, what legislation is necessary to relieve the people of unnecessary taxes?"

It is the question of revenue reform. Solve this question, my countrymen, by reducing the taxes, and thus leaving the money not needed by the government in the pockets of the people, and in the channels of trade and commerce. The party in power will not give us this reform.

May I ask your attention to the plan and principles of revenue reform to which the Democracy are pledged by the Chicago platform? Federal taxation "shall not exceed the needs of the government economically administered." Do you approve that? If not, would you have the government wastefully and corruptly administered, to make room and pretext for higher Federal taxes? "Federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes." Would you have it otherwise? If taxation can have for its object other than public purposes, then what purposes? May the object and purpose be individual and private gain? I do not question that it may be and often is an incident that one man receives a greater benefit or carries a greater burden than another because of a prescribed tax. Nor do I question that in the adjustment of the details of a tariff law the legislative mind and judgment may and will be influenced not only by considerations of general policy but also by the probable effect of the measure upon the business interests of the country. It is in accordance with the sentiment that the Democratic party stands pledged in its platform "to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all interests," and that "any change of law must be at every step regardful" of the labor and capital employed in the industries of the country, and that custom house taxes shall bear "heaviest on articles of luxury and the lightest on articles of necessity," and that "the necessary reduction in taxes can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor."

These principles of the platform are plainly written and easily understood. They present the conservative purpose of

the Democracy touching revenue reform. When expressed in the laws their beneficent influence will become active and universal. Lower taxes will signify lighter burdens upon the people; money returned to the channels of trade; enterprise restored and stimulated; renewed demand for the products of industry, and the consequent increased demand for labor and universal prosperity. If the four hundred millions now locked up in the treasury were restored to the channels of trade and commerce, who can doubt that labor would find employment and the manufacturer a market for his fabrics?

The obituary of our merchant navy is written in our tariff and shipping laws. Its spirit of enterprise and daring that once brought wealth to our shores and pride to our people and that furnished congenial employment to thousands of our brave and hardy sons, is now buried in the treasury vaults under those \$400,000,000 of which Mr. Calkins vaunts.

The lamentable condition in which our war, navy, and coast defenses are found at the end of nearly twenty years of Republican rule is well described by Senator Harrison in his able speech delivered in this city. He says: "The highest military and naval authorities of the country have again and again, in official reports to Congress, declared that we are without a navy, and that our sea-coast defenses are not worthy of the name. We have no guns for our ships, none for our coast fortifications." What party held the reins of political power while the navy was rotting down and the coast fortifications were passing into dilapidation? Senator Harrison did not charge that the Democratic party suffered this condition of things to come about, or that it was responsible for it. He could not do that. What he charges is that a late session of Congress, after the navy had practically ceased to exist, and the coast defenses had become worthless, Democratic Congressmen defeated a bill providing for a small addition to the navy. I understand opposition was made because of the want of confidence in the department as organized for the best construction of new vessels and a completion of old or unfinished ones upon the best plans, and not upon the ground that a navy was required for public security. Nothing in its history could justify the charge that the Democracy opposed to the maintaining of a strong and efficient naval armament. It looks with shame and humiliation upon our anxiety our unprotected seaboard. A nation, itself just and peaceably disposed, can better preserve its peace and honor, and can better secure its citizens, wherever they may be on the face of the earth, from wrong and insult when its flag is a symbol of power adequate to the vindication of any right or the redress of any wrong.

May I ask you now to consider the question whether there ought not to be a change in the control and management of public affairs? What other remedy for the correction of possible abuses have the citizens of a free republic? There are many valuable reforms that cannot be accomplished by a party that has been long in power. As an illustration, consider our army of officeholders, now about 110,000. Reform in the civil service requires reduction, perhaps 50,000. It seems to be constantly increasing. Who can check the evil, and discharge all who hold positions and receive pay without useful employment? Not the party that created the positions and appointed its favorites to fill them. That is impossible. It is nineteen years since the close of the war—nearly five presidential terms. During all that period the executive and administrative service of the country has been under the control and management of one party. Should it so continue? We know enough to justify the suspicion "of ways that are dark," but I do not choose to consider the exposures that have been made. I prefer rather to appeal to your judgment that a change is necessary, because in the management of business so large, so varied, and so complicated mismanagement and corruption were possible and probable. The books should be opened. I believe that good policy and justice unite in demanding a change, and without it we need not hope for administrative reform. But I would not imitate the Republican party in its proscription of all but party adherents. I repeat what I formerly said, "that I hope never to see the cruel and remorseless proscription for political opinions which has disgraced the administration for the past eight years. Bad as the civil service now is, as all know, it has some men of tried integrity and proved ability. Such men, and such men only, should be retained in office, but no man should be retained on any consideration who has prostituted his office to the purpose of partisan intimidation or compulsion, or who has furnished money to corrupt elections."

May I ask your attention to one other subject? Much is said about the probable foreign policy of the presidential candidates, and for Mr. Blaine it is claimed that he will be more American and dashing. His South American interference was neither. Of course, we know what vote this claim is intended to reach. I think it will fail. The vote is too intelligent. The platforms do not differ materially. The Republican declares: "We believe that everywhere the protection to a citizen of American birth must be secured to citizens of American adoption." The Democratic platform is: "The Democratic party insists that it is the duty of this government to protect with equal fidelity and vigilance the rights of its citizens, native and naturalized, at home and abroad. It is an imperative duty of this government to efficiently protect all the rights of persons and property of every American citizen in foreign lands, and

demand and enforce full reparation for any invasion thereof."

Let the merit of this claim be decided upon the comparison and contrast of two cases, one under a Democratic administration and the other under Mr. Blaine as secretary of state. In 1849, Martin Koszta was engaged in the Hungarian revolt against Austria. Upon the suppression of the revolt he became a refugee and sought an asylum and a home in the United States. He declared his intention to become a citizen of this country. In 1854, without having completed his naturalization, he returned to Europe. At Smyrna he was seized by the emissaries of Austria and carried on board an Austrian vessel of war. His release was demanded by the American officials and refused. At once Captain Ingraham, of our navy, prepared his sloop of war, the St. Louis, for action, and would have destroyed the Austrian vessel had not terms been agreed to whereby Koszta was placed in the charge of the French government to abide the decisions of the questions. The correspondence which followed, says one of our historians, was one of the ablest on record, and extended before its termination to almost every question affecting naturalization and citizenship. It was conducted on the part of Austria by the minister at Washington, Baron Hulsemann, and on the part of the United States by Mr. Marcy, a man of great power and thoroughly American. The same writer says Mr. Marcy was completely triumphant in his argument, and Koszta was remanded to the United States. You will observe that Martin Koszta was not an American citizen; had only declared his intention to become such, and that his return to Europe was voluntary on his part. His case would not fall within the letter of either platform. The platforms speak only of citizens adopted and natives. In that correspondence the right of expatriation became established. Under the authority in Koszta's case the European emigrant of whatever country is protected by the authority of the United States from the day of his settlement and declaration of his intention. This was during the Democratic administration of Franklin Pierce.

In striking contrast is the case of McSweeney. McSweeney was a citizen of the United States. He had lived in this country in pursuit of legitimate trade for more than a quarter of a century. With his family he visited Ireland. Without the charge of crime or the violation of law he was seized by the officers of the British government and cast into prison. This occurred on June 2, 1881. For more than ten months his imprisonment was continued. On August 16 there was received at our state department a letter from his wife. McSweeney immediately forwarded his naturalization papers, together with a solemn protest against this British outrage, to the American minister at London. Mrs. McSweeney's appeal was not answered, nor was the minister at London instructed to give it attention. The case received no attention at the state department until Mr. Blaine had retired from office, which was, as I understand, in the December following, four months after Mrs. McSweeney's appeal was received. The duty in such a case is clearly declared by the laws of the United States. Was it not enough that Mr. Blaine was informed that an American citizen was confined in a British jail, and that he had been guilty of no violation of the laws, and that no charge of violation of the law had been made against him? Should duty be plainer, or its neglect more flagrant? Had Marcy been the secretary of state at the time would McSweeney have languished in prison for ten months? Would his wife's letter have lain unnoticed in the state department? Under Marcy American rights were vindicated. Under Blaine they were neglected.

Not long since I made the acquaintance of Governor Cleveland. I found him affable and courteous. Clear and distinct in his views, and strong and direct in the expression of his purposes; he seemed to me as free from concealments and the arts of a demagogue as any man I know. As far as I could judge in a single conversation I thought him in a marked degree governed in his official life by his convictions of duty. You do not expect him to escape criticism upon his official life; that can hardly be the fortune of any candidate. Touching that I believe his motives have not been impugned nor his honesty questioned. In respect to his private life we will not accompany his defamers in their search for ground of accusation back of the overwhelming vindication by his neighbors in three political contests of extraordinary brilliancy and success.

What Morrill Thought of Blaine.

The New York Herald of recent date contained the following dispatch from Augusta, Me.:

The late Senator Lot M. Morrill, of Maine, represented the purest and best methods in politics, as his successor, James G. Blaine, represents the worst. The clear facts of Blaine's ten years' leadership of the party in Maine leaves no doubt on that point. When Senator Morrill resigned the senatorship to accept the treasury portfolio under Grant, as will be remembered, Mr. Blaine was appointed his successor. Senator Morrill died here eighteen months ago. His widow, who is the daughter of the late Mr. Vance, who in his day was one of the most prominent citizens of this section, lives in a pleasant home on Winthrop street, this city. She is a lady evidently of great force of character, and was the valued associate, confidant and helpmate of her distinguished husband, both in the executive mansion of this State and during the many years of his residence at Washington as Senator and secretary of the treasury.

Mrs. Morrill was recently surprised to receive from Ohio an official letter directed to her late husband. Opening it, she found it to be a very importunate appeal to Senator Morrill to visit Ohio and to lend his aid in saving the State to Mr. Blaine. Mrs. Morrill turned the sheet over and wrote on its back an indignant reply, and mailed it forthwith to the gentlemen who had signed the appeal.

The Herald correspondent called on Mrs. Morrill at her residence this evening. She is still in deep mourning, and consented to receive the visit with great reluctance, but she said that the exigency created by Mr. Blaine's nomination is so important that she was convinced all private feelings should be subordinate to it. As her husband had been one of the most distinguished, loyal, and upright members of the Republican party, as he had assisted in its formation, had been one of its first governors elected in this State and held its traditions and its principles faithfully until his last conscious moment, she knew that if alive to-day he would feel that it was disgraced by the nomination of Mr. Blaine as its candidate for President, and that it had let go of all that made its existence necessary to the country.

"When Garfield was nominated," said Mrs. Morrill, "he said to me sadly and seriously, 'My dear, the Republican candidate will be elected this time; but, unless new methods are used in the party and new and better men become its leaders, he will be the last one. You will live to see a Democrat elected four years hence; I will not.' My husband," continued Mrs. Morrill, "died of his devotion to the party of which he thus so sadly spoke. It is unquestioned that the breaking down of his health dated from his, perhaps, too faithful performance of his duties in the treasury department."

To a question of the Herald correspondent as to the Ohio letter Mrs. Morrill said:

"Some six weeks ago I received a letter from Columbus, Ohio, on a sheet with printed head representing some political organization. I was so surprised and indignant at its contents that I did not particularly notice whether it was from a State committee, a county committee, or some political club, but it was signed by a Mr. Brown, as chairman, and a Mr. Ogden as secretary. It was, as well as I can remember it, about as follows:

Senator Lot M. Morrill: DEAR SIR: The situation in Ohio is a critical one. The party is in trouble on account of the attacks on Mr. Blaine as the candidate of the party. Your well-known character as a pure and upright statesman, and coming from Blaine's own State, you could refute the charges as no one else can. We hope you will come to us in this emergency, and make as many speeches as possible.

"I was indignant and amazed that any Republican should be ignorant that my husband was dead. I was more indignant that he should be asked to assist in making Mr. Blaine President. I at once sat down and wrote on the back of the sheet this reply, as near as I can remember it. I am now sorry that I did not keep copies of both the letter and of my answer:

To Brown, Chairman, Columbus, Ohio: "I am surprised and shocked to receive such a communication. I thought every citizen of this country knew my husband was at rest. I am in mourning for him, but, as much as I mourn his death, I thank my Father in Heaven that he called him home before the party he loved so well and did so much for had so disgraced itself as to nominate so wicked and corrupt a man for the highest office within the gift of the American people, as I know and my husband knew James G. Blaine to be. If he were alive he would not support Mr. Blaine or any such man, even at the bidding of his party."

"CHARLOTTE MORRILL." "My husband," continued Mrs. Morrill, "was visited by Mr. Blaine at the congressional investigation into the Little Rock railroad bonds. Mr. Blaine, as he did to Mulligan, impudently my husband with tears and entreaties to use his influence to save him. When my husband resigned to go into the cabinet it was generally understood, and my husband so understood, that Governor Chamberlain would be appointed to fill the vacancy. Instead, and to the surprise of every one, Governor Connor appointed Mr. Blaine, then a Representative in Congress and under charges in that body, to the vacancy."

As Mrs. Morrill intimated, the appointment of Mr. Blaine to the vacancy was evidently to save him from further investigation and the inevitable incriminating verdict of the committee. Governor Connor had his reward. He is now pension agent for this State, the best office next to the collectorship.

"Save Me From My Friends."

If Mr. Blaine wishes to make any headway between the present time and election day, he had better borrow General Butler's infallible receipt for bottling up the too exuberant "Joe" Hawley, who put his loot into it inconspicuously at a Blaine meeting in Brooklyn. After ringing the changes on slavery and the war until his hearers became bored with subjects dead and buried, Senator Hawley broke forth into the alarming remarks: "Our party can purify itself. It is doing it; it has been doing it. I was not a Blaine man, but I tell you that I never had the idea that James G. Blaine made a dishonest dollar in the world." This was not enough for the effusive Hawley, but he must add to it by suggesting that Blaine had said in a private letter something that indicated that he might have been tempted to do so. "I wish he hadn't written that," continues this indiscreet orator. "It would have been better if he had not connected his private with his public business." Such language from the Blaine stump is calculated to give the candidate another sunstroke like that which the Mulligan letters produced, and to make him groan in bitterness of spirit. "Save me from my friends."—New York Telegram.

MORE MULLIGAN LETTERS

Blaine's Shameless Acts of Public Jobbery.

Selling Services as Speaker for Stocks, Bonds and Cash—Pleading for Mercy When Fears of Exposure Haunted Him.

BOSTON, September 12, 1884.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES:

Believing that it is our duty to lay before our fellow countrymen the following documents which have been in our possession, we have placed the originals for safe keeping in the hands of Messrs. Sohler and Welch, counselors, of Boston, and herewith submit their contents without comment. The letters from Mr. Fisher are letter-press copies of the originals.

The words "Indeed, I am sure that no one received bonds on any other terms," were interlined in the foregoing letter in Mr. Blaine's own handwriting.

We hereby certify the following to be true and correct copies of the originals.

WARREN FISHER, JAMES MULLIGAN.

AGUSTA, Me., Oct. 4, 1880. MY DEAR MR. FISHER—Find enclosed \$10,000 check in pay of A. & P. Coburn's subscription.

I presume you will receive by same mail the 20 per cent. due on all the subscriptions already forwarded to you, and also on the following:

Philo Hersey	Belfast	\$5,000
A. W. Johnson	"	5,000
R. C. Johnson	"	5,000
Nahum P. Munroe	"	5,000
C. B. Hazeltine	"	5,000

This makes \$125,000 in all I have disposed of. It is doubtful if I dispose of any more, but I shall know by to-morrow. So there will be no delay to embarrass you in any way. No one will ever know from me that I have disposed of a single dollar in Maine. So there need be no embarrassment in talking with Mr. Caldwell. I don't wish you to settle that matter with Mr. Caldwell till you hear from me again. Please send receipt to A. & P. Coburn, Skowhegan, Me.

Yours truly, JAMES G. BLAINE.

W. FISHER, JR., Esq. After I rec'd the letter in regard to Mr. Adams' case I telegraphed again. Delano had rec'd it, and I think the suspension was at once ordered by him. J. G. B.

P. S.—I send only \$5,000 this morning. Will send \$2,000 remaining to-morrow morning.

NOT INDELIBRATE. AUGUSTA, Me., 5th Oct. 1880.

\$5,000.

MY DEAR MR. FISHER—I enclose you two thousand-dollar check, balance of A. & P. Coburn's installment; two thousand dollars in pay of Anson P. Morrill's installment; one thousand dollars in pay of Lot M. Morrill's installment. Lot M. Morrill's subscription of \$5,000 is additional to those already advised, making in all \$130,000. There may possibly be \$20,000 more, but \$150,000 will be my limit.

I received yours enclosing P. R. Hazeltine's letter from Belfast. By mail succeeding this you will receive Cashier Check for \$1,000, and hereafter you will have no trouble with any of the Maine subscriptions. All will come to you in Cashier Checks or money direct by express.

I note what you say about the importance of my keeping all quiet here. I fully appreciate your wisdom and your kindness, and shall endeavor to do just as you desire in the premises. The letter enclosing the Globe by same mail with this can be read by you to Mr. Caldwell if you think it expedient. I have endeavored in writing it not to be indelicate.

I shall see you in Boston Thursday noon. Don't send any receipts to Maine folks till I come.

Yours, J. G. BLAINE.

W. F. JR., Esq. These two letters of October 4th and 5th, 1880, are in continuation of the two letters of October 4th, 1869, which have been already published.

CASTING AN ANCHOR TO THE WINDWARD.

AUGUSTA, Me., 18th Nov. 1869.

MY DEAR MR. FISHER—It is quite evident to my mind that at the approaching session of Congress there will be an expansion of the currency to the amount of fifty to seventy-five millions of dollars. The form it will take, I think, will be an addition to the National Bank circulation West and South.

My object in writing is to ask in season if your friends would desire to establish a Bank at Little Rock? It will be to some extent a matter of favoritism as to who gets the Banks in the several localities, and it will be in my power to "cast an Anchor to the Windward" in your behalf if you desire it. Please think over the matter, and confer with Mr. Caldwell; and let me know your desires as soon as you reach any conclusion. There is, of course, no special hurry; but I thought I would suggest the matter in order that you might mature your thoughts in good time.

It would be well to determine the amount to which you might wish to go. I suppose it might be practicable to secure a \$500,000 bank; but in that locality you would hardly wish to go so deep. But they are very profitable institutions—say \$250,000.

Yours very truly, J. G. BLAINE.

WARREN FISHER, JR., Esq.

FORTY-FIRST CONGRESS, U. S.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 7, 1870.

MY DEAR MR. FISHER—You have rec'd Mr. Bondwell's answer.

I presume you will deem it necessary to come on here; if so, let me know of it a day or two in advance.

I have written Mr. Caldwell about the Bank; no trouble in securing a Bk of \$500,000.

Sec'y of War will not allow the use of the Arsenal at Little Rock,—says it is impossible.

Very hastily & truly, J. G. B.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WASHINGTON, D. C.,

December 9, 1870.

MY DEAR MR. FISHER—I wrote very

hastily, both to yourself and Mr. Caldwell, in regard to the Bank. A further conference with the Comptroller of the Currency gives some additional facts which are of interest, and this letter is intended alike for yourself and Mr. Caldwell. Please show it to him.

They are now allowing 90 per cent. circulation on 10-40 Bonds, instead of 80, and then 85 at different periods in the past. They give me the assurance that you shall have full \$450,000 circulation on a Bank of half a million capital.