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Fred. Douglass.

His Great Speech Yesterday.

His Political Views Plainly Expressed.

A Splendid Campaign Document.

Hancock’s Statesmanship Portrayed.

Why all Voters should support Garfield.

Read and Circulate.

The speech of Hon. Frederick Douglass, at the Emancipation celebration yesterday, will be found below. It deals first on historical matter pertaining to the processes of emancipation, and then proceeds to fully touch upon political matters. It plainly shows why Garfield and not Hancock should be elected. It is a stalwart document throughout, and shows plainly that this gray haired and venerated statesman and patriot has lost none of his youthful vigor, or parted with none of his sturdy Republican views. We commend its perusal to our readers, and especially to all colored voters.

Speech of Frederick Douglass.

Mr. President and Friends:-- I thank you for this cordial greeting. I hear in it something like the thrilling notes of a welcome home after a long absence. More years of my life and labors have been put into this State than in any other State in the Union. Anywhere within a hundred miles of the goodly city of Rochester, I feel at home. Within that circumference, for enlightenment, liberality and civilization, the people have no superiors in this country or any other.

Allow me to thank you, also, for your generous words of sympathy and approval. In respect to this important support to a public man, I have been unusually fortunate. My forty years’ work in the cause of the oppressed and enslaved has been well observed, well appreciated and well rewarded. All classes and colors, at home and abroad, have in this way held up my hands. Looking back to those long years of
toil and conflicts, during which I have had blows to take as well as
blows to give, and have sometimes received wounds and bruises, both in
body and mind, my only regret is that I have done so little to lift up
and strengthen my long enslaved and still oppressed people.

I make these remarks, personal to myself, because I am standing
mainly before a new generation. Most of the men with whom I labored
five and thirty years ago have passed away. There are but few left
to tell the story of the early days of anti-slavery. Scarcely any of
the colored men who advocated the cause thirty years ago are now on the
stage of active life, and I begin to feel lonely. But while I have
the sympathy and approval of men and women like those before me, I
pledge you my latest breath in behalf of justice, liberty and equality
of all men.

The day we celebrate is pre-eminently the colored man's day. The
great event which has distinguished it for all time, from all other
days of the year, has justly claimed the thoughtful attention and study
of statesmen, scholars and social reformers throughout the world.

To the colored people of this country, however, so recently under
the yoke of bondage, this grand event speaks to feeling as well as to
thought. It stirs the heart and fills the soul with warm and grateful
sentiments.

In the history of our struggle with American slavery, West India
emancipation played an important part. It was the first bright star
in a very dark, stormy and threatening sky; a smile from the inner
folds of a frowning Providence. It brought to us the first ray of
hope of the possibility of freedom to our race, in this and in all oth-
er countries.

Whoever else may forget or slight its claims, it will always be
held memorable and glorious by the colored people of the United States,
as well as by the colored people of the West Indies. Though familiar to
most who hear me, the story of it may be briefly told for the edification of our young people, who may know but little about it, and who ought to know all about it.

Six and forty years ago the first of this month, there went forth from old England a great message over the Carribean Sea. That message was hailed with startling shouts of joy and thrilling songs of praise, for it brought freedom to a great multitude of people who for centuries had sighed and groaned in vain for deliverance. On that day they were liberated, set free, and brought within the pale of law, light and human brotherhood.

Mr. Douglass then at great length proceeded to enlarge on historical matters of emancipation import, and discussed the moral aspects and results of freedom upon the colored race, and justified in an ample manner the American celebration of English emancipation, as in a measure the opening wedge to the birth, so to speak, of American disenfranchisement. Mr. Douglass also touched, in an eloquent manner, upon the condition and prospects of his people in this country. In reference to the state of affairs in the South, Mr. Douglass said:

To-day, in all the Gulf States, the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution are practically of no force or effect. The sacred rights which they solemnly guaranteed, are held in contempt and are literally stamped out in the face of the Government. By means of the shot gun and midnight raid, the old master class has triumphed over the newly enfranchised citizen and put the Constitution under their feet. In South Carolina, Louisiana and Mississippi, the colored people who largely outnumber the whites, and who are Republican in politics, have been banished from the ballot box and robbed of representation in the councils of the nation, and according to the best information from that quarter the social condition of the colored people in that section is but little above what it was in the time of slavery. In fact,
the chain-gang has reappeared in those States, and persons of color, for the most petty offences, are put in these gangs and made to work the farms of their former masters under the lash. There is but little trouble in convicting a Negro in Southern courts, and in fact anywhere else.

Greatness does not come to any people on flower beds of roses. We must fight to win the prize. No people to whom liberty is given can hold it as firmly or wear it as grandly as those who wrench their liberty from the iron hand of the tyrant. The hardships and dangers involved in the struggle give strength and toughness to the character, and enables it to stand firm in storm as well as sunshine.

One thought more before I leave this subject——and it is a thought I wish you all to lay to heart. Practice it yourselves and teach it to your children. It is this:—Neither we, nor any other people will ever be respected till we respect ourselves, and we will never respect ourselves till we have the means to live respectably. An exceptionally poor and dependent people, will be despised by their opulent surroundings and will despise themselves. You cannot make an empty sack stand on end. A race which cannot save its earnings, which spends all it makes when it is well, and goes in debt when it is sick, can never rise in the scale of civilization no matter under what laws or civilization it may chance to be. Put us in Kansas or in Africa, and until we learn to save more than we spend, we are sure to sink and perish.

It is not in the nature of things that all should be equally rich in this world’s goods. Some will be more successful than others, and poverty in many cases is the result of misfortune rather than crime, but this race can afford to have all its members the victims of this misfortune without being considered a worthless race. Pardon me, therefore, for urging upon you, my people, the importance of saving your earnings——of denying yourselves in the present, that you may have
something in the future, considering less for yourselves that your children may have a start in life when you are gone.

With money and property comes knowledge and power. What we call money is only stored labor. A poverty stricken class will be an igno-

rant and despised class--and no amount of sentiment can make it other-

wise. This part of our destiny is in our own hands. Every dollar you lay up represents one day's independence, one day of rest and security in the future. If the time shall ever come when we shall possess among the colored people of the United States, a class of men noted for enterprise, industry, economy and success, we shall no longer have any trouble in the matter of civil and political rights. The battle against popular prejudices will have been fought and won, and in common with all other races and colors we shall have an equal chance in the race of life.

But I cannot dwell upon topics of this nature any longer. While this is not a political gathering, it is not improper on this free oc-

casion, to call attention to the fact, that we are now fairly within the rapid currents of a political canvass of vast and commanding impor-
tance to the whole country and of special and pressing interest to us as a party of an oppressed and proscribed people.

On the 2d of November next a President and a vice-President of the United States are to be chosen. The candidates for the high offices are already in the field. The National Republican Convention held in Chicago, nominated and commended James A. Garfield of Ohio, and Chester A. Arthur, of New York for these high offices. The first for Presi-
dent and the second for Vice-President.

On the other hand, the Democratic party meeting at Cincinnati, a few weeks later, nominated for the same offices, Gen. Hancock and Mr. English.

As these two parties mainly divide the votes of the whole country,
the alternative now before us is James A. Garfield, the Republican, or Winfield Scott Hancock, the Democrat.

Both parties are calling upon us in common with all other citizens, for our voice, our work and our vote for their respective candidates.

What answer shall we make, what answer should we make, to these two political parties? Shall we say James A. Garfield of Ohio, or Winfield Scott Hancock of Pennsylvania? Shall it be the National Republican party, or the sectional Democratic party? Where shall we go?

Before answering this question, allow me a word in respect to the nature of the canvass. To my mind it is not so much a canvass of the merits of candidates as a canvass of the merits of parties. It is not so much who or what is Garfield or Hancock, but what is the character, composition, tendencies, principles, end and aims of the respective parties by which they have been brought to the front and by which they are commanded and supported. In other words, which of the two great parties shall dictate the policy and administer the National Government during the four years succeeding the 4th of the next March?

Experience has demonstrated that this is not a Government of persons, but of parties; that ours is not an aristocracy, but a Republic. There is in it one man power, but it is a power qualified by a written constitution, by political parties, and by the declared and settled judgment of the American people.

If at any time a President of the United States should take it into his head, that he is the State, that he is wise enough and strong enough to carry on this Government without the support and co-operation of a party, or that he can make or unmake parties at his pleasure, he will find himself in deep water and in a sinking condition.

All who have tried the experiment have miserably failed. John Tyler tried it, and failed, Andrew Johnson tried it and failed, and no man will try it hereafter and succeed. Parties are not made but grow.
They do not originate with rulers, but with the people. And hence their power and vitality. In politics as well as elsewhere, the whole is more than a part, the many more than the few. Elihu Burritt used to say, it was better to be a small piece of something than a large piece of nothing. As the nation is more than a party, so a party is more than an individual. The creator is ever more than the creature. The candidate is not the creator of the party, but the party is the creator of the candidate. They have the power to lift up, and they have the power to cast down, and they have generally shown a pretty strong disposition to retain this power and to exercise it when required to do so.—In a word, the party, whether it be the Democratic party or the Republican party, will be the power behind the Throne greater than the Throne itself. Hence we should not exalt the importance of the candidate above the party, and enter into a contest about mere personal qualities or achievements, but should weigh and measure the parties which are to mould, guide, command and control them.

But let there be no misconstruction here. Let no man imagine that in thus subordinating the candidates to the great parties to which they belong, that I either under-estimate their importance or shrink from a comparison of their respective merits. I see nothing in the situation to suggest or impose this prudence. I hardly think that James A. Garfield has anything to fear from the most rigid and searching comparison with W. S. Hancock. Equally certain am I that Chester A. Arthur cannot suffer by comparison with William H. English.

It is said in praise of Gen. Hancock that when this country was in the throes of rebellion, and many of those who had been educated at West Point at the public expense were going over to the enemy, that he remained faithful and loyal; but so did James A. Garfield. It is said that Hancock fought bravely, skillfully and successfully to suppress the rebellion; so did James A. Garfield. Thus in loyalty to the Union and in bravely fighting to maintain it against the slaveholding oligarchy
that sought to overthrow it, Hancock gains nothing over Garfield in the comparison. Both men are entitled to the respect and gratitude of the American people for the part they took in that supreme crisis in our history. It is hard for men to be just. Hard for an Englishman to be just to an Irishman, hard for an Irishman to be just to an Englishman, for a Christian to be just to a Jew, a white man to a Chinaman, or a Democrat to be just to a Republican, -- but I propose to be just to this loyal, fighting Democrat, at least. If either has the better of the other in the comparison thus far, the palm must be awarded to James A. Garfield.

Hancock was under special obligations of honor and duty to go into that war. He had been educated and trained at the public expense for that very contingency. That he did not meanly, traitorously and cowardly skulk away or wamper away to the enemy, as many of his Democratic brethren did, is creditable alike to his head and heart. But neither the act nor the motive places this man one hair's breadth above Garfield. A West Point graduate, a military man by profession, in search of reputation at the cannon's mouth, must have felt it a small sacrifice and very strong temptation to take a hand in the war to suppress rebellion.

On the other hand, there were special reasons why Garfield should hesitate, and even decline the fiery ordeal. He was a man of peace by profession, taste and inclination. He was devoted to art and science, but not to the art and science of war. For him the tented field had no attraction, and the blast of the bugle no music. Now, for such a man, unschooled by any special obligation, to drop all, at the first cry of danger and distress of his country, and bare his breast to the storm of war, should give him a higher place in our respect and esteem than would be due to the educated, trained and necessarily ambitious warrior.

When Garfield went to the war it was not because he was, in legal
phrase, held and firmly bound to go. He went not as a bondman, but as a freeman. The motive and mainspring of his action was instinctive, spontaneous loyalty and patriotism.

I think well of military schools and standing armies; important to public order, as they may be, the best defence of free American institutions is the hearts of the American people themselves, as happily illustrated in the character and conduct of James A. Garfield and the patriotic millions at the North during the late Rebellion, the men who could leave the plow, the desk, the plane, the factory and the peaceful walks of life and march in defense of their country to any field however remote, and assail any point however dangerous.

I do not undervalue the trained soldiers. To my mind, no grander man now walks this continent than the trained soldier and tried statesman, U. S. Grant. Always true, always modest, always magnanimous, always wise, he is to-day as is every stalwart Republican in the land, a firm supporter of Garfield and Arthur.

We have now seen how our candidates stand as soldiers and as loyal men. It would be easy to carry the comparison further and illustrate by a patient statement of facts. These however, can be found in documents, and need not occupy our time here and now. Let us now get a little nearer to these men, and see how they compare in some other important respects. How do they stand as to ability and statesmanship? Here most manifestly we have everything in favor of Garfield and simply nothing in favor of Hancock.

No honest Democrat, however enthusiastic in his admiration of General Hancock, will venture a comparison as to statesmanship between him and General Garfield, or will undertake to claim him as the equal of Garfield in general knowledge. Such a pretension would be simply ridiculous.

General Hancock is a good soldier and a patriot. In the hour of
trial he did his duty, and that is all. Equally meritorious with him in this respect General Garfield is immeasurably superior to him in all those qualities and attainments which are supposed to fit a man to be President of the United States.

Theodore Parker classifies greatness into three grades:—First, greatness in administration; second, greatness in the ability to organize; thirdly, greatness in the discovery of truth, and this last was the greatest of all greatness. It does not appear that General Hancock has shown himself great in either of these grades of greatness—certainly not in the highest grade. The only statesmanlike sentiment with which he is credited, even by his political friends, is that the military power should be subordinate to the civil power. That is a very good sentiment, but it is neither original nor profound. It has floated on the surface of American politics from the beginning of our government. The only significance it had when uttered by General Hancock was due to the circumstances that surrounded him. It was uttered in the South, when the embers of rebellion were still smoking; when Andrew Johnson, the Moses (?) of the colored race, had betrayed that race into the blood-stained hands of the old master class; when he had betrayed the Republican party, by which he had been elected; when he was plotting the organization of a new party upon its ruins; when he was seeking the destruction of the Freedmen’s Bureau; when outrage, riot and murder held sway in the South; when the only protection to the colored people of the South was the arm of the Federal soldier. And it was uttered with a view to deprive our people even of this imperfect protection, and to make their subjection to the old master class full and complete.

Now, to this utterance, more than to all his services to the Union cause, General Hancock is indebted for his nomination to the Presidency of the United States by the Democratic party. His services to the Union cause is to blind the North, and the order in which this senti-
II

ment appears, is to win the South--but the main element which has brought him to the front, is that he has, (since the war) on the all-important question of protection to the Freedmen, sympathized with the old master class. This is the statesmanship by which he is commended. One idea, alone, and that is the subordination of loyal military power, to rebel and slaveholding civil power.

Now, how stands the case of General Garfield? He has been in office and in the public eye ever since the suppression of the rebellion. He has during the last few years since James G. Blaine left the House of Representatives, been the leader of that body and the most conspicuous and commanding figure seen there. His name is a household word. His voice and vote have been given on every important question which has engaged the attention of the House of Representatives during the last sixteen years. I need not refer in detail to his record as a clear-headed and thoughtful statesman, nor to his frequent and powerful vindications of the principles of justice and liberty in that body. The time would fail me if I attempted any such work here.

Now it is but just to General Hancock to state here, that since preparing this part of my speech I have read his letter accepting his nomination by the Democratic party, and that I am favorably impressed by that letter. It is not only able, eloquent and manly, but it is sound at the very points where his party is rotten. He says: - "The thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, embodying the results of the war for the Union are inviolable. If called to the Presidency I shall deem it my duty, to resist with my power, any attempt to impair or invade the full force of the Constitution, which in every article, section and amendment, is the supreme law of the land."

Now, what business has any man who honestly holds this doctrine, and declares a purpose to carry it out, in the Democratic party?
He has no more business there than Horace Greeley had eight years ago.

I thank General Hancock for this noble utterance. It is creditable alike to his head and heart. His resolution at this point is a righteous one, and if elected to the Presidency, I shall watch to see how far he fulfills his pledge. Pledges before the election have not meant quite as much as pledges afterward, and I have no faith in his success in executing this one. He has stolen our thunder, but will find it too heavy for him. He is a strong man, but in a morass; a good swimmer, but in the rapids. He is great, but his party is greater. It is far safer to have our principles and our interests in the same vessel. When a man's soul is in one place, and his body in another, he is not long among the living. Horace Greeley tried it and died. Hon. Carl Schurz and the late Charles Sumner tried it, but both made haste to retrace their steps. The current was too strong for them, and it will be too strong for Hancock. Mr. Sumner came ashore at once. Mr. Schurz lingered awhile, but he, too, soon got safely back into the Republican party. His tastes and tendencies are all here.

In James A. Garfield and Chester A. Arthur, we have candidates in full accord with the history of the party they represent. These candidates occupy solid ground, and are supported, and will be supported, by the power of the whole Republican party of the nation. Now, I come back to the question, the all-important question started a few moments ago; and that is; what answer ought we to make, and what answer shall we make to these appeals for our voices and our votes? We sustain no relation to our fellow-men more important than our political relation, and none in which we require more sound sense. A thoughtless and foolish exercise of our political power, has become a fountain of trouble to our fellow-men and ourselves. On the other hand, a wise exercise of this great right will exalt the nation and lift up our down-trodden race.
Certainly to vote intelligently we must know something of the character, composition and tendencies of the parties that ask our votes. When we take passage on a ship we should know to what port she is bound and whether she is sea-worthy. We have no business to fool away our time or to fling away our lives.

We are told to get wisdom, get knowledge, get understanding. How shall we get all these in respect to our political parties? I answer; just as we get all other knowledge, not by shutting our eyes and stopping our ears, or stopping our intellect; not in a blind trust in the professions of interested partisans. It is surprising what lies will be told by men in politics; by men who would scorn to lie and cheat in other walks of life. Our duty here is plain. We must search the very heart and history of the two great political parties, and then choose between them. We must not expect to find absolute perfection in either, for they are composed of men; but when we find one that is nearly right, one that is better than any other, we should fasten to it, and go for it with all our might.

Let me first call the attention to the characters, compositions, principles and aims as revealed in the Democratic party. In dealing with this party, I find no place for soft speech, or delicate compliments, or patronizing disclosures. It is a rough and tough old party, hoary with years and gory with crime. To deal with it honestly we should put away the elegant circumlocutions of the drawing-room and parlor, and talk as men talk under the shed of a stone cutter or in a blacksmith shop while hammering red hot steel.

It is shocking to hear men talk of honest Democrats. Talk about there being as good men in one party as in the other, talk as if they would gladly keep an open door between one party and another, so that they may easily glide from one to the other, as interest or inclination should dictate—men like our old friend Porney—who goes for Hancock therefore without a why or a wherefore.
It is sometimes said that this tough old Democratic party has re-
formed— that it is no longer what it once was, and what by its history
I mean to show it to be.

Well, in the abstract, I will not deny the possibility of the ref-
 ormation of a political party. It is as I have said, composed of men,
and men may, I trust, be a little wiser and better in one generation
than in another.

But in respect even to this, we must take a rational view of
things. We must remember that what is possible is not always proba-
ble. We should remember that all is not gold that glitters, and es-
pecially should we remember that the sins of the fathers descend to the
children even unto the third and fourth generation. From its very na-
ture, the course and character of a party, is not easily or suddenly
changed. It is more likely to go from bad to worse than from good to
better. A stream flowing through a given channel wears it deeper and
deeper the longer it runs, and the more a party transgresses against ab-
solute right, and in the face of increased and increasing light, the
more difficult it becomes for it to repent and change. The voice of
my race has been sounding for fifty years in the ear of the Democra-
tic party, "Democracy! Democracy! why persecute thou me?" And
though this has been accompanied with a light that filled the whole
heavens, it does not appear that any repentance has taken place, or is
likely to take place.

The character of a great political party is not worn like a loose
robe, put on or off at a moment's warning. It is not even a porous
plaster, that can be easily removed by a warm iron or a little tepid
water. It is a part of the body and soul, the bone, muscle, fat and
 fibre, and takes more years than we have yet seen to change and reform
it.

It is quite true that the Democratic party can easily change its
form and front. It can assume a virtue if it has it not. This facil-
ity is a part of its character and history, and one of its tricks to gain success. It is a sly old dog, and can play the part of a lamb or lion, saint or sinner, and has more than once illustrated--

When the devil was sick,
The devil a saint would be,
But when the devil got well
The devil a saint was he.

In its lean, hungry condition, eager and restless, more reduced in weight and size than Tanner after his fasting experiment, the Democratic party has several times since the war surprised and startled the country by a sudden and violent charge of fraud. I have seen a dancer on the stage who was to outward seeming a man at one moment and a woman the next, yet it was the same person, and the deception only deceived for a season. The Democratic party is like Barnum's dancer. It turns about and whirls about, and does just so.

To know the character and the true inwardness of the Democratic party we must not limit ourselves to its present appearance and professions. Political parties, like individual men, are governed and will be governed by their antecedents. We must go back to such times and such events as reveal its animus.

I know that its leaders will howl and gnash their teeth if we go into their closet and drag out the ghastly skeletons; but we must do it nevertheless. What a party has done when it had the power that party is likely to do when it again gets power.

I admit that the American people have a tolerably good memory, but they are more likely to forget too soon than remember too long the actions of parties during the late war.

Twenty years ago the Democratic party of the South, then, as now, the controlling power in the party, told us if it failed in the pending election to keep the control it then had, of the Federal Government, the South would secede. Anticipating resistance to their meditated treason and rebellion, the Democratic party of that section,
long before the election, organized and armed itself for the bloody contest.

The Democratic party being then in power, holding in its hands both the purse and the sword of the nation, not only did nothing to check this frightful and devilish purpose, but did all it could to cripple the nation and strengthen its enemies. Jeff Davis was busy in the Senate and Floyd in the war office, the one by speech and the other by acts—worked in a common cause of treason, while the Democratic President sat trembling in the Presidential chair, telling us that there was no power in the Constitution to coerce a State.

Oh, Fellow Citizens! Those were terrible times and we do well to remember them, and to remember what followed. I need not tell you that the bloody threat of the Democratic party was literally carried out. The contingency arose, the good and great Abraham Lincoln was elected, the Loyal nation refused to confide the government to the Democratic party, and the Democratic party did precisely as it said it would. It sundered the Union at the centre, confronted the sections with hostile armies, murdered a half a million of men, filled the land with widows and orphans, and piled up a debt against the nation heavier than a mountain of gold.

No wonder that the Democratic party now covers its bleared eyes with its hands; no wonder that it shrinks from its blood-stained path; no wonder that the nation remembers and shudders, for where under the whole heavens was there ever such a crime committed and its perpetrators treated with such amazing leniency?

The blood of patriots, the tears of woe-smitten widows and orphans, cry from the ground, but not for vengeance; they only implore us to swear, and to faithfully perform our oath, that with the help of God no representative of the Democratic party, under what guise soever he may come, shall ever sit again in the Presidential chair and dictate the policy and shape the destiny of this great nation.
But, fellow citizens, I will, if you please, continue the story of the Democratic party. While it was vigorously carrying on the war at the South, it was not idle at the North. While our recruiting sergeants were marching through our streets, with drum and fife, banner and badge, from morning till night, foot-sore and weary, calling for men to fill up the gaps made by rebel bullets in the loyal army, this party was fomenting riot and bloodshed against the draft here at the North—creating a reign of terror in New York and doing all it could to embarrass the government and dishearten its friends. Had the doors of all the prisons in the land been opened, and all the thieves, thugs and murderers turned loose to prey upon the country, the evil would have been far less than that inflicted by the Democratic party.

And now where is the evidence that this party has repented? Where is the proof that its character has changed for the better? Is it to be found in the fact, that when the war was over, it opposed with might and main all the measures of the government to secure, not indemnity for the past but security for the future? Is it to be found in the fact that it opposed the abolition of slavery, the enfranchisement of the freedmen, and the maintenance of the public credit by resumption and the payment of the national debt? Is it to be found in its refusal to pay Deputy Marshals for doing their duty in the enforcement of the laws plainly written in the statute book of the nation? Is it to be found in the fact that they find in the Solid South, made solid by lawless violence and murder, hope for the election of Hancock? Is it to be found in the fact that as soon as they got possession of the Senate and House of Representatives, it promptly turned out all the minor officers of those bodies and put rebels in their places? These and a hundred other facts show that we have to-day the same old party to fight that confronted us during the war and nothing else.

Of the Republican party I need not speak. It is the same as during and before the war, the same enlightened, loyal, liberal, and
progressive party that it was. It is the party of Lincoln, Grant, 
Wade, Seward and Sumner, the party to which we are to-day indebted for 
the salvation of the country, and to-day it is well represented in its 
character and composition by James A. Garfield and Chester A. Arthur. 

Now, fellow citizens, I have done. I leave you to decide as to 
which of these parties you will have, to shape the policy and control 
the destiny of this country during the next four years. The people of 
no State in the Union have the power so largely to decide this question 
as the people of the State of New York, and with you will be the lar-

gest responsibility.

I have no charge to give to the colored voters of this state. 
You are fifteen thousand in number, and your vote may turn the scale 
one way or the other, and say whether this country shall be ruled by a 
party of liberal ideas, by justice and fair play, or by a party distin-
guished by its devotion to slavery, rebellion and bitter prejudice 
against the race to which you belong. Each colored voter of this 
State should say in scripture phrase, "may my hand forget its cunning 
and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth if ever I raise my voice 
or give my vote, for the nominees of the Democratic party."