The Centre Democrat.

BELLEFONTE, PA.

The Largest, Cheapest and Best Paper

PUBLISHED IN CENTRE COUNTY.

SPEECH OF

HON. ALLEN G. THURMAN.

Delivered at Columbus, Ohio, on Saturday Evening, September 6, 1879.

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW-CITIZENS: The persistent efforts of the Radical leaders to destroy the plainest rights of the States and of the people, and thereby to overthrow local self-government in the United States, will justify me in asking your attention to-night to some observations that have been repeated a thousand times, and have therefore no charm of novelty to recommend them, but which can not be repeated too frequently if we would preserve our system of government and the liberties of the people.

STATE RIGHTS.

In the first Constitution of this State it was declared: "That a frequent recurrence to the fundamental principles of civil government is absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty." And with equal truth it may be declared, that a frequent reccurrence to the fundamental principles of our system of government is necessary to its preservation and the preservation of liberty. The purpose of the Radical leaders to overthrow the rights of States and the people, and to vest in the General Government all the substantial powers of government, is proved by act after act of Congress, by numerous party platforms, by a multitude of speeches almost daily delivered, and by their denunciation of the plainest doctrines upon which our system is founded, and which in the better days of the Republic were seldom if ever questioned by any public man. Let a Democrat use the term "Sovereign State," and he is forthwith denounced by the Radical leaders and the Radical press as a nullifier or a secessionist. Let him speak of the reserved rights of the people under the Federal Constitution, and he is forthwith denounced as assailing the just powers of the Federal Government. Let Congress pass laws in plain violation of the Constitution, and the man who questions their authority is assailed as an enemy of the National Government and of the perpetuity of the Union. In a word, in every form in which it can be manifested, those who govern the Radical party have shown their intention to reduce the States to the mere category of counties or townships, leaving them no sovereign powers whatever, that may not be overthrown at the will of a majority of Congress; thus effectually destroying what the founders of our Government considered its greatest merit, the right of local self-government. Of course, these enemies of our system do not openly avow their purpose. But whoever shall carefully scrutinize the laws they have enacted, the doctrines they have made, the denunciations they have uttered, can not fail to discover that purpose, and to find that it aims at nothing less than a practical destruction of the Government of the States.

Now, my friends, let us consider for a moment what is our sytem of Government, and then further consider what would be the result of overthrowing local self-government and consolidating all powers in the hands of the General Government. We have in this country two Governments—the Federal or National Government, whichever term you prefer, deriving all its powers from the Constitution of the United States; and the State Governments, deriving all their power from the State Constitutions. The nature of this system was expressed with admirable brevity by Chief Justice Marshall delivering the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, in McColloch vs. the State of Maryland, 4 Wheaton, 420. He said: "In America the powers of sovereignty are divided between the Governments of the Union, and those of the States. They are each sovereign with respect to the objects committed to it, but neither sovereign with respect to the objects committed to the other." In the same opinion, page 405, speaking of the General Government, he said:

"This Government is acknowledged by all to be one of enumerated powers. The principle that it can exercise only the powers granted to it would seem too apparent to have required to be enforced by all those arguments which its enlightened friends, while it was depending before the people, found it necessary to urge. The principle is now universally admitted. But the question respecting the extent of the powers actually granted, is perpetually arising, and will probably continue to arise, as long as our system shall exist."

In Texas vs. White, 7 Wallace, 725, Chief Justice Chase, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court said: "But the perpetuity and indissolubility of the Union by no means implies the loss of distinct and individual existence, or of the right of self-government by the States. Under the articles of Confederation each State retained its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right not expressly delegated to the United States. Under the Constitution, though the powers of the States were much restricted, still, all powers not delegated to the United States, nor prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the poople. And we have already had occasion to remark at this term, that 'the people of each State compose a State, having its own Government, and endowed with all the functions essential to separate and independent existence,' and that 'without the States in union, there could be no such political body as the United States.' Not only, therefore, can there be no loss of separate and independent autonomy to the States, through their union under the Constitution, but it may be not unreasonably said that the preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their Governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National Government. The Constitution in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States."

You thus see, my friends, that according to the highest authority, the rights of the States are as indestructible, if our system of Government be preserved, as are the rights of the Federal Government; that the one is just as sacred as the other; and that he who assails the plain rights of the States is just as much an enemy of our system of free institutions as he who assails the just powers of the Federal Government. Indeed, so sensitive upon this subject were our forefathers that within less than two years after the organization of the Federal Government ten articles of amendment to the Constitution were adopted, every one of which was intended to limit the powers of the possible pretensions of that Government, and the ninth and tenth articles of which expressly declare:

"Article IX. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

"Article X. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Now why were our forefathers so jealous upon this subject, and so careful to preserve the rights of the States and of the people? It was, among other things, because of all the countries in the world, America, for the preservation of the liberties and prosperity of the people, needs local self-government. Should Congress continue successfully its career of usurpation until, practically speaking all the powers of Government should be absorbed by it, what would be the necessary result? Then the laws that would govern the people of Ohio in regard to their domestic concerns would be made, not by their own chosen representatives in their own midst, but by a Congress in which the State of Rhode Island has as much weight in the Senate as the State of Ohio; by a Congress in which the six New England States would have six times as much power, in the Senate, in framing a law relating to the domestic affairs of our State as Ohio herself would have. Let no one, my friends, imagine that such a state of things can never come to pass. I myself do not believe that it will come to pass; but the reason of my belief is my faith in the power of the principles of Democracy to prevent it. Were it not for Democratic opposition, it might come to pass. The forms of State Governments might remain. Your legislatures might sit from year to year, passing laws and levying taxes, but their legislation would be met and controlled at almost every step by the legislation of the Congress of the United States.

The forms of the Roman Republic continued to exist for centuries after every particle of Roman liberty had been destroyed. And so the forms of our State Governments might continue to exist after every substantial exercise of local self-government had been overthrown. Now, mark it, my friends, the doctrine of State rights or, in other words, local self-government, for which the Democracy contend, is wholly different from the doctrines of nullification or secession. The Democracy of the North never believed in either of those doctrines; they never believed in the right of nullification or secession. And until the breaking out of the civil war I believe it may be truly affirmed that a large majority of the people of the Southern States were also opposed to those doctrines. It is true that when the war broke out almost every Southern man took sides with his section. That was the natural consequence of such a strife, which overwhelmed for the time almost every dictate of sober reason. But, whatever may have been the opinions of the Southern people before the war, no candid man can deny, no honest man will deny, that the Southern people have abandoned the doctrines of nullification and secession now and forever. They have accepted the result of the war as determining that no State has a right to nullify the valid laws of Congress and no State has a right to secede from the Union. It is therefore the baldest hypocrisy or the most deplorable ignorance to pretend that there is any danger of the revival of the doctrine of secession. One great cause that endangered the Union—slavery—has ceased to exist. To re-establish it is a manifest impossibility. No man, North or South, imagines that it could be re-established. The Southern people would be among the first and the most earnest to oppose such a measure. Their political power is largely increased by the emancipation of the negro, and they are fast coming to the conclusion that their material prosperity is likewise improved by the emancipation. It is not, therefore, a fear of secession or of the re-establishment of slavery that prompts the Radical leaders to degrade and debase the States. The cause lies far deeper than that. It grows out of the long and never-ending effort of consolidated capital, seeking special privileges by means of legislation; privileges that the mass of people do not enjoy. The holder of Government bonds desires a strong National Government in the belief that such a Government would give greater security and value to his bonds. The mammoth railroad corporation, running through many States, feels restive under what it considers the annoyances of State legislation. It would greatly prefer to State charters or State licenses a National charter rendering it independent of the States. The National Bank interest with its two thousand and odd banks, destined, if the system continue, to be tripled or quadrupled in number in no long period of time, looks with complacency on the legislation of Congress that has destroyed the banking institutions of the States and given to the National system a monopoly of the issue and profits of bank paper money. The high tariff protectionists and the seekers of subsidies alike desire a Government of almost unlimited power to gratify their wishes and foster their schemes. In a word, almost or quite every form of concentrated wealth, except real estate, desires, by construction or otherwise, to add new new powers to the already tremendous powers possessed by the National Government. Do not understand me as saying that every man of wealth desires the annihilation of the State Governments or their practical overthrow. There are thousands upon thousands of such men who are intelligent enough to see that the preservation of the rights of the States is essential to the maintenance of freedom and prosperity and is one of the greatest safeguards that can be conceived of the Union itself. But on the other hand I fear that there are thousands and tens of thousands of men in this country who would prefer even a limited monarchy to the form of Government under which we live. They do not believe in the rule of the people; they do not believe in universal suffrage; they do not believe in the rights of the States; but they do believe in a strong centralized Government, backed by a standing army and presided over or ruled by a Chief Magistrate chosen for a long term or even for life. They are too sagacious to expect their hopes to be speedily realized. They know that a government like ours can not be subverted in a day, but they also know that, even if its form be left untouched, its essential principles may be day by day weakened or destroyed until in the end it shall be in substance and in practice the consolidated Government they desire. Hence they favor and applaud every usurpation of Congress and the President, and regard with satisfaction every thing that tends to weaken or destroy the reserved rights of the States.

THE ARMY AT THE POLLS.

My friends, I have said that the purpose of the Radical leaders to overthrow local self-government is shown, among other things, by numerous acts of Congress. To speak of these acts in detail would require not one speech, but many. I can not, therefore, undertake that task to-night. But there are some laws to which I must ask your attention, not only because of their deep reaching effects, but also because they are prominently brought under consideration at the last two sessions of Congress, and are among the most prominent issues now before the people. And first let me say a few words about the law enacted in Febuary, 1875, authorizing the use of the army of the United States to keep the peace at the polls. When that law was enacted, the Government of the United States had been in existence for more than three-quarters of a century. We had passed through two wars with foreign countries, and through a civil war of four years' duration, and almost unequaled in magnitude in the annals of mankind; and yet, during all this period, nearly seventy-six years, neither in peace nor in war had it been deemed proper, or even admissible, by our law-makers, to use the standing army of the United States to interfere in any manner in the elections of the people. But when, in 1865, the Radical leaders resolved to overthrow civil government in the South, and to divide that portion of the Republic into military departments, to be ruled by five Generals of the army, and to permit no elections, unless sanctioned by those Generals and supervised by them, then this law authorizing the use of the army at the polls was first enacted. How it was executed is now a matter of history. Its professed object was to preserve the peace; its practical operation was to disturb the peace. It is said to be in the interest of free and fair elections; it was used as an instrument of terror to destroy free elections. And this commencement being made in the art of bayonet rule we soon saw a wider scope given to the employment of military force; we saw lawful Legislatures overthrown by the bayonet; we saw lawful State officers kept out of the possession of their offices by the same means; we saw usurping Legislatures and usuping Governors installed into office by the same instrument; we saw thousands of our soldiers, needed on the Western frontiers to protect the people from their savage foes, kept in the Southern States in order to carry elections for the Republican party and maintain Republicans in their usurpations of the State Governments; and all this, years and years after the close of the civil war; all this, at a time when not one hostile hand was raised against the Federal Government from one end of the Union to the other. If there were any justification for this law while the Radical process of reconstruction was going on; while Congress was dictating State Constitutions and State Governments; while elections were held under the supervision of Generals of the army; if at a time like that the law could be justified, what justification is there now, nine years after reconstruction was completed, and when all the States are represented in the Congress of the Union? My friends, there is no justification for this law at all. It is vain to say that it is a mere instrumentality to preserve the peace. No such instrumentality is needed. The people of the United States have been able to preserve the peace at elections ever since the Government was formed as well, nay better, than it has ever been preserved in any other country of popular institutions. The only effect of the law is to enable the President to overawe the people who are opposed to his Administration. It makes the army an instrument of party instead of being what it ought to be, and what, constitutionally, it can only be, the army of the whole United States. It is a law not only repugnant to liberty, but greatly injurious to the army itself. I have never heard an officer of the army speak of it except to deplore its existence. Why, my friends, such military interference as our statute contemplates would not be tolerated even in monarchical England for a single day. Of this assertion the proof is ample and conclusive. The English people have never assented to the use of troops at the polls. As early as the reign of Edward I, a statute was passed to prevent it.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Now, my friends, the Democracy at the last session of Congress, did all that was in their power to repeal the statutory provision authorizing the use of the army at the polls. For that purpose we passed bill after bill, but they were successively vetoed by the President and thereby defeated. The General Appropriation Bill for the support of the army was thus vetoed, the President, by defeating it, declaring in effect that he would let the army go without support rather than lose the right to use it at the times and places of elections. Thus thwarted by an unparalleled exercise of the one-man power, we had nothing left for us to do but to withhold appropriations from the army when used at the polls. But this remedy is, in its nature, but temporary, and may be too easily evaded by a hostile Executive to be securely relied upon. Nothing short of a repeal of the obnoxious provision will suffice, and the question whether it shall be repealed is one of the great questions to be decided by the people. This issue is made and sharply defined. The Republicans in Congress, as well as the President, are opposed to the repeal, as their speeches and recorded votes amply show. The Democrats and Nationals are to a man in favor of the repeal. What say you? If you are tired of freedom and wish the ballot-box to be interfered with by the bayonet, vote to keep the law upon the statute book. But if you still cherish your liberties and wish to cast a free and untrammeled vote, unawed by military force, vote to repeal it. And do not imagine, my friends, that because you have never seen the polls in Columbus surrounded by troops, therefore there is no danger to be apprehended. To say nothing of what has occurred in the Southern States, it is but a few years since large bodies of Federal troops were massed in New York City, upon election day, for the avowed purpose of executing the law we seek to repeal. And if the people once become accustomed to such an employment of military force, and tamely acquiesce in it, it will not be long before the interference of the military will become far more direct and effective and far more extended. The first steps of despotism are always stealthy, but each successive step becomes more and more audacious, until at length liberty finds itself in a death struggle for existence. The only safe rule is to resist despotic power from the very outset. The trite old maxim that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," is a true maxim—there never was a truer one. Therefore it is that I appeal to you to speak out now, before it is too late. Let the voice that comes from your ballot-boxes while they are yet free, declare, in unmistakable tones, that they always shall be free.

NATURALIZATION AND ELECTION LAWS.

I now turn to some other statutes to which your attention should be called. But before doing so it would be well to refer to the hostility so long manifested by our political opponents toward the people of this country who are of foreign birth. For it is in part owing to their utility that these laws were enacted and are found upon your statute book.

You have all heard of the famous Alien and Sedition Law enacted by the Federal Congress eighty-one years ago which gave to the President of the United States the power to banish at his mere pleasure any alien whom he saw fit to banish. The Democratic party of that day opposed the enactment of this law with all its vigor, and subsequently, by a mighty effort, succeeded in repealing it. And the triumph of Democracy in the election of Mr. Jefferson seemed for a time at least to have put an end to any attempt to renew such persecution. And, so long as the Democratic party retained power no such attempt was to be seriously apprehended. But the spirit of hostility to the foreign-born had not died out; and hence within the life of the present generation we saw the Know Nothing party spring into existence as it were in a single night and threaten to obtain possession of all our Governments, State and Federal. The Democracy, however, proved themselves equal to the occasion, and this new attempt to revive and put in practice the spirit of the old Alien and Sedition Law, was signally overthrown. When, however, the Republican party, after the first election of President Grant, had the most absolute control of the Government that any party ever possessed—the President being a Republican, nearly all the Judges of the Supreme Court and the other Federal Courts being Republicans, more than six-sevenths of the Senators being Republicans and over two-thirds of the House of Representatives being of the same party—the Radical leaders conceived it possible to once more assail the rights of the naturalized citizen. This time the attack was made under the guise of preserving the purity of elections. The object was to bring all elections under the control of Congressional law and Federal officers, and to use the whole power of the Federal Government and the Treasury, too, to maintain the ascendency of the Republican party. They began by the introduction of a bill professedly to enforce the provision of the fifteenth article of amendment to the Constitution, and that bill, originally introduced in the House, after being greatly amended and enlarged, was passed by both Houses and approved by the President on May 31, 1870. It is entitled "An act to enforce the right of citizens of the United States to vote in the several States of this Union, and for other purposes;" and it contains not less than twenty-three sections. I have no time to-night to speak of this law in detail. I can only say in a general way that it assumes to control the action of the election officers of the States when performing their duties under State laws, and to punish them by indictment in the Federal Courts and by numerous other penalties for any violation of the act, notwithstanding the existence of State laws to punish them for the same thing; thus inflicting upon them a double punishment—one under the laws of the State and the other under this Congressional act. It creates a host of Federal officers and employes to be paid out of the public Treasury for interfering in the elections of the States, and it seeks to confer upon the Circuit or District Courts of the United States a right to try contested elections in the case of every office whatsoever, except that of Elector of President or Vice President, Representative or Delegate in Congress or Member of the State Legislature. If this provision be constitutional, the right of your Governor to his seat, of all your Judges from the highest to the lowest, to their offices, of every county and municipal officer, might be drawn into litigation before one of the Federal District Judges at Cincinnati or Cleveland. But I need not dwell upon this statute further. Some of its most material provisions have been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States to be unconstitutional, and the validity of others has been seriously brought into question and will no doubt be in like manner tested. My principal object in referring to the statute at all is to show the purpose of the Radical leaders to interfere by Congressional laws and Federal officers in the elections of the States. Having passed this act, the Radical leaders next turned their attention to the subject of naturalization. They passed through the House of Representatives, at the same session, a bill, No. 2,201, to amend the naturalization laws and to punish crimes against the same. In the Senate the bill was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, who reported a substitute for it.

To some of the provisions of this substitute, which was earnestly pressed for adoption, I want to call your attention, for of all measures ever introduced into the American Congress hostile to the foreign-born citizen or denizen, this substitute was the worst. Had it become a law its plain effect would have been to greatly deminish if not put an end to emigration to this country. It would have made naturalization almost an impossibility. It would have made the certificate of naturalization, even when obtained, almost worthless. By its very first section it took from every State Court the right to grant certificates of naturalization, and vested that power in the Circuit and District Courts of the United States and Registers in Bankruptcy, as Commissioners, alone. The consequence of this provision, had it become a law, would have been to compel the person seeking naturalization to travel possibly hundreds of miles and incur a great loss of time and money in order to make his first declaration, and afterward his final application. The bill next provided "that any alien intending to apply for naturalization shall at least one month before such application file or cause to be filed with the Clerk of said respective Courts or with the said Commissioner (Register in Bankruptcy), to whom such application is to be made, a notice that he intends to apply, which notice shall be verified by the oath of such alien, and shall state the time at which such application is to be made, the name of the town or place within the State or Territory, or within the District of Columbia, in which said application is intended to be made; also, where the applicant has resided for the year previous to such application, his residence at the time, with the street and number (in case he resides in a place having streets named and houses numbered), and name and keeper of the house in which he lives, the name, age, occupation and nationality of the applicant, together with a description of the applicant, age, height, complexion, color of the hair, color of the eyes and any other distinguishing fact." The object of this provision, with all its particularity, was to interpose another obstacle to naturalization by the trouble and expense that the giving of notice might impose, put principally by enabling any person whomsoever to interfere and oppose the granting of the naturalization. For the bill went on to provide "that the application must be heard at the time specified in the notice, and that any person might contest the application; that no affidavits should be admitted, and that any attorney-at-law should be permitted to cross-examine any applicant or his witnesses, and to offer counter evidence conformably to the rules of law; that for taking and filing a declaration of intention to become a citizen, the fee should be fifty cents; for determining whether the alien should or should not be naturalized, $1.50; and for each day's services by any Commissioner in taking testimony, $6; and for authenticated copies of proceedings in naturalization, the same fees as in other cases, that of twenty-five cents per hundred words. And it further provided that the fact of residence for four years and six months in this country should, in addition to the oath of the applicant, be proved by a citizen of the United States. And then, after all, if the applicant obtained his certificate, it was declared that it should not be effective until six months had elapsed after it was granted. Now, my friends, think for one moment what a man, seeking to become naturalized, would have had to do, had that bill become a law. In the first place, he would have had to declare his intention to become a citizen, not in the State Court within a few miles of his residence, but in the Federal Court, perhaps hundreds of miles from his residence. That is the first loss of time and money to which he would have been subjected.

Next, at least one month before making his application to be naturalized, he must have filed the notice of which I have spoken either in Court or before one of the Commissioners of the Court. That might subject him to a second journey and further loss of time and money. Then, when his application came on to be heard, he would have been required to prove that he had resided in this country four years and six months by the testimony of a citizen. He might produce men of the highest character who were not citizens to prove the fact; their testimony would be rejected. Men upon whose testimony a man might lose a life, upon whose testimony the most important property rights could be decided, would have been utterly disqualified by this bill, had it become a law, to prove the simple fact of how long a foreign born man had resided in the United States. The bill was an insult to every man of foreign birth, for it assumed that in a case of naturalization the oath of an alien could not be trusted. His testimony might be taken in a case of murder, it might be taken in the greatest property trial in the Courts, but in a case of naturalization it should not be taken. Such was the provision of this bill. Its inevitable effect would have been to make it impossible in many cases far an applicant to prove the fact of his residence. He could prove it by the men who came to this country with him easily enough, but how could he be expected to prove it by a citizen of the United States when he was a total stranger to all our citizens at the time he landed on our shores? But there was a still more deadly blow at naturalization contained in the bill, which provided that affidavits should not be received. Now, there is no statute in the United States providing for taking depositions in cases of naturalization, but it has always been the practice of the Courts to receive properly authenticated affidavits to prove any material fact, such as the length of residence in this country, or the like. There is nothing novel in this, for it is the common practice of Courts to receive affidavits on the hearing of mere motions, and an application for naturalization is a motion to be admitted to citizenship. But by forbidding the use of affidavits the bill would, in a vast multitude of cases, have made it practically impossible for an applicant to prove the length of his residence. The only persons by whom he could prove when he came to the United States might live in another and a distant State. If he could not use his affidavits he could not procure his naturalization, unless, indeed, he could procure their personal attendance at a cost of hundreds of miles of travel and of their reasonable compensation. But this was not all. The applicant might be ready and have his witnesses in attendance when any one might interpose and contest the application. Any pettifogging lawyer employed by a Know Nothing Lodge or moved by his own vindictive feelings, might go to work to examine and cross-examine the applicant, and for the purpose of continuing such examination and the taking of testimony the Commissioner might adjourn the hearing from day to day, receiving six dollars for every day he sat. It was estimated by some of the Senators in the debate upon the bill that the average cost of naturalizatien, should the bill become a law, would not be less than one hundred dollars a case. But let us suppose the applicant successful and the certificate granted and the six months which were to elapse before it should be effective, expired. Then you would think all his troubles were at an end. But not at all; for the bill provides that at any time thereafter a District Attorney of the United States might drag that man into the Federal Courts to show cause why his certificate should not be revoked.

Now, it may be asked, why do I dwell so much upon this bill, or rather the substitute of the Senate Judiciary Committee, since the substitute failed to become a law? I do so for two reasons: First, to show what kind of a measure a large number of the most distinguished Republican leaders were anxious to adopt; and in the next place, to show that the election laws of which we complain and this Know-Nothing anti-naturalization bill were twin brothers; for then you will be better able to comprehend how it is that, in the execution of the election laws, they have been turned principally against the naturalized citizen.

Having failed to destroy naturalization by the bill to which I have referred, they now seek, by a corrupt and tyrannical execution of the election laws, to throw every possible obstacle in the way of the naturalized citizen's right to vote. The purpose to thus use election laws disclosed itself the moment the substitute bill of which I have spoken was defeated. That, as I have said, was proposed as an amendment to the House bill. As soon as it was voted down, the Senator who had the bill in charge moved two additional sections to it: one providing for Supervisors of Elections, and the other providing as follows: "And be it further enacted, that in any city having upward of twenty thousand inhabitants, it shall be lawful for the Marshal of the United States for the district where such city shall be, to appoint as many special deputies as may be necessary to preserve order at any election at which Representatives to Congress are to be chosen; and said deputies are hereby authorized to preserve order at such elections, and to arrest for any offense or breach of the peace committed in their view."

The bill thus amended passed both Houses, and was approved by the President July 14th, 1870. This bill was the entering wedge for the enactment of the voluminous Congressional laws that have since been passed. It introduced the United States Deputy Marshals upon the scene, under the pretense of preserving order at the elections, but it stopped far short of the powers conferred upon them by the subsequent acts, to which I will shortly refer.

At the next session of Congress the Radical leaders returned to the charge, and by the act approved February 21, 1871, containing twenty sections, set up the vast machinery of Federal interference in the elections of the people that now exist. This act provides for a Chief Supervisor of Elections, for two other Supervisors in each district or voting precinct in any city or town having upward of twenty thousand inhabitants, all to be appointed by a Federal Judge; and it then confers upon the United States Marshal, on the application of any two citizens of any such city or town, power to appoint as many Special Deputy Marshals as he shall see fit to aid and assist the Supervisor of Elections to keep the peace, to support and protect the Supervisors in the discharge of their duties, to prevent fraudulent registration and fraudulent voting, or fraudulent conduct upon the part of any officer of election, and with power to arrest and take into custody, with or without process, any person who should commit, or attempt to offer to commit, any of the acts or offenses prohibited by the act, or any offense against the laws of the United States; provided that no person should be arrested without process for any offense not committed in the presence of the Marshal or his general or special deputies, or either of them, or of the Supervisors of Elections, or of either of them. And for the purposes of arrest or the preservation of the peace the Supervisors of Election, and each of them, should, in the absence of the Marshal's deputies, or if required to assist such deputies, have the same duties and powers as Deputy Marshals. And it is further provided that the compensation of Deputy Marshals shall be at the rate of five dollars per day for not exceeding ten days. The tremendous powers conferred by this law upon these officers—Supervisors, Marshals and special deputies—can not be understood without a reference to the entire statute and the multitude of offenses that it creates. It interferes with the registration of voters and with the election, and undertakes to punish the

[*Continued on 5th page.*]