

The Centre Democrat.



SHUGERT & FORSTER, Editors.

"EQUAL AND EXACT JUSTICE TO ALL MEN, OF WHATEVER STATE OR PERSUASION, RELIGIOUS OR POLITICAL."—Jefferson.

TERMS: \$1.50 per Annum, in Advance.

VOL. 2.

BELLEFONTE, PA., THURSDAY, JUNE 24, 1880.

NO. 26.

The Centre Democrat.

Terms \$1.50 per Annum, in Advance.

S. T. SHUGERT and R. H. FORSTER, Editors.

Thursday Morning, June 24, 1880.

Democratic State Ticket.

FOR SUPREME JUDGE,
GEORGE A. JENKS, of Jefferson County.
FOR AUDITOR GENERAL,
ROBERT F. DECHERT, of Philadelphia.

MR. TILDEN'S letter declining a re-nomination for the Presidency by the Cincinnati convention will be found in another column. Like everything that bears the impress of Mr. Tilden's name, it is a carefully prepared and well written document and will command universal attention.

SECLUSIVE and aristocratic James Milliken, in his speech at the Court House, on last Thursday evening, praised De Golyer Garfield for having once been a plow boy, and as coming from "the people." It's only after the "plow boy" has received the Republican nomination for President of the United States that Mr. Milliken is willing to take him to his bosom. "Plow boys" are not in his line.

ALL efforts, says the Washington Post, to explain away the ugly facts of Mr. Garfield's record serve only to make them more conspicuous, and to demonstrate their utterly indefensible character. It would be better for his friends to frankly enter the plea of guilty in his behalf and appeal to the generosity of the voting masses to cover his transgressions with the broad mantle of tolerant charity.

A WASHINGTON despatch to the Republican newspapers asserts that "Gen. Garfield as soon as he ascertained that the Credit Mobilier scheme was in conflict with his duty as a legislator he dropped all connection with it." The trouble with Garfield is that he did not "drop all connection with it" until the disgraceful "scheme" was exposed and received, as it deserved, the righteous indignation of the public. He held on to his dividend for a long time.

GENERAL BEAVER said in his ratification speech, that a prominent Georgian told him in Chicago, that if General Grant was nominated, Felton, Stephens and Speer of that State, would support him. These gentlemen are all Democratic members of Congress. We question the veracity of General Beaver's "distinguished" informant as to Mr. Speer. Stephens and Felton might have, and possibly will, throw themselves into opposition to the Democratic party. Felton is an "independent" and Stephens is a decayed monument of the past, but Emory Speer is a Democrat, and his whole career in Congress refutes the imputation that he will under any circumstances, be found acting in opposition to the universal sentiment of his people.

At the recent serenade given to Gen. Garfield, at Washington, after his return to that city from Chicago, he appeared before the department of office holders, who made up the crowd in attendance on the occasion, leaning upon the arm of Secor Robeson, Secretary of the Navy under the Grant administration and at present a Republican member of Congress from New Jersey. There was a propriety in Garfield and Robeson thus parading themselves arm in arm before the public that will be duly appreciated. Robeson's management of the navy department was the most corrupt and scandalous in the history of the government. His career of eight years as head of that department was a continued series of corrupt jobs and violations of law. It was therefore eminently proper that so notorious a representative of the principle of official debauchery should present to the admiring place holders of Washington a candidate for the Presidency tainted with the disgraceful scandals of the Credit Mobilier and the De Golyer paving contract.

The Adjournment of Congress.

It was said at the close of the 45th Congress by our opponents that the whole session had been a conspicuous failure and that the people would set the seal of their condemnation upon the party for whom the majority in that Congress had spoken. The re-election of another Democratic Congress effectually dissipated the charge of inefficiency and corruption so glibly charged upon the 45th Congress by the Republican press. There was one honorable exception to be found in the New York Evening Post, which frankly acknowledged that the 45th Congress had made a memorable record in that it had utterly exterminated the corrupt and powerful lobby built up and fostered by the Republican party while in power in the House. The Post further said that not a vestige remained of the old Huntingdon, Gould ring that had so long and faithfully debauched legislation in the interest of the giant monopolies controlled by these men. Upon this voluntary tribute to the great work accomplished by the 45th Congress, coming as it did from an uncompromising Republican journal, the Democracy were disposed to rest their case, and the judgment rendered by the people in the following elections more than justified their confidence. But to the 46th Congress so far as it has progressed will come a whole volume of unstinted praise. While it has not accomplished any measures of great National importance it has conscientiously and carefully addressed itself to such legislation as would best benefit the country with out distracting it by angry discussion or embittered personal antagonisms. While it will be universally regretted that the deputy marshals bill did not become a law, there is great satisfaction to be found in the fact that the veto of this measure was a direct snub to General Garfield whose amendment the Democracy had accepted. One of the most important facts demonstrated by the two sessions of the 46th Congress, was that no leader on the Republican side was found able to cope with the parliamentary leaders of the majority. Mr. Garfield was accorded the mantle of Mr. Blaine as the head and front of his party upon that gentleman's promotion to the Senate, but he has had the humiliation of seeing the only measure he introduced during both sessions endorsed by the Democracy and repudiated by his own party. This was certainly an anomalous position for a great party leader to find himself in at the close of this arduous session. In England when such a thing occurs the leader thus overthrown is compelled to resign and new men are brought to the front. But here, under the enlightenment of free institutions, the defeated leader in Congress is advanced to the head of his party and with the cruel marks of his discomfiture still upon him is brought conspicuously forward as the standard bearer of the party he had but just lead to disaster. The Democrats, with a clear majority in both branches patriotically submitted a bill for the count of electoral votes, to the end that the dangerous scenes of 1876-'7, during which the business interest of the country suffered untold loss by the agitation and uncertainty that succeeded the election, should never again be re-enacted. But the Republican minority resorted to disgraceful filibustering and defeated action upon this most just and much needed measure.

In every instance in which the majority have come in conflict with the executive they have been absolutely right and he wrong, as he took the pains to demonstrate in the message submitted vetoing the deputy marshals bill. The "political" bills passed were not intended to inure to the benefit of the Democratic party, but to prevent any further arrogation of unconstitutional power upon the part of

the Federal government. The reduction made in the appropriations for the last fiscal year but carries out the promises made by the Democratic party to the people that when it came into power economy would be practiced and retrenchment enforced. Altogether the Democratic masses have reason to congratulate their representatives in congress for the able, faithful and conscientious manner in which they have discharged their responsible duties during the dual sessions of the forty-sixth Congress.

Democratic National Convention.

The Democratic National Convention met at Cincinnati on Tuesday, and shortly after twelve o'clock was called to order by Ex-Senator Barnum, chairman of the National Committee. After an impressive prayer by Rev. C. W. Wendt, Senator Barnum, by the unanimous request of the committee, announced that Hon. Geo. Hoadly, of Ohio, had been selected for temporary Chairman. As Mr. Hoadly ascended the platform he was received with hearty cheers. He made a ringing speech which was received with great applause by the convention. The usual committees were then appointed and other preliminary business transacted, when, at 2 o'clock, the convention adjourned until 10 o'clock, A. M., Wednesday. The convention met yesterday pursuant to adjournment and proceeded immediately to effect a permanent organization. The committee on organization reported in favor of Ex-Gov. J. H. Stevenson, of Kentucky, for permanent Chairman, with one Vice President from each State and continued the Secretaries, reading clerks and other officers of the temporary organization. This report was adopted and the permanent officers assumed their duties. The first business taken up by the convention was the consideration of the report of the committee on contested seats, there being two reports from the committee in the case of New York—the majority against giving seats to the contestants and the minority in favor of seating twenty of them. After a sharp discussion of the merits of this case there was a call of the States on the minority report and it was rejected by a vote of 205 in favor and 457 against its adoption.

The report of the majority was then adopted, and the committee on resolutions not being ready to report it was decided to receive nominations for candidates for President and the roll of States was called over for that purpose. The following are the names presented in the order in which their States were called: Field, of California; Bayard, of Delaware; Morrison, of Illinois; Hendricks, of Indiana; Thurman, of Ohio; Hancock, of Pennsylvania. A ballot was then taken resulting as follows: Hancock, 161; Bayard, 165; Payne, 90; Field, 65; Thurman, 64; Morrison, 62; Hendricks, 47; Tilden, 30. After this first ballot the convention adjourned until Thursday morning. The vote of the Pennsylvania delegation was cast for the following candidates: For Jewett, 1; Field, 1; Seymour, 3; Randall, 1; Hancock, 28; Bayard, 7; and Tilden 15. At this writing—Wednesday evening—it is impossible to predict who will be nominated. It is gratifying to be able to state, however, that while the contest is earnest and animated, the best of feeling prevails and everything bids fair for results that will be entirely satisfactory to the party. The nominees will be such as cannot fail to lead the party to a grand victory in November.

OAKES AMES is dead but yet he liveth,—in that little memorandum book, which is now making the pious heart of Garfield yearn for that age of the world, when the records of passing events were inscribed on the leaves of the trees. If that custom still prevailed what a tornado would sweep through our forests.

GOVERNOR FOSTER, of Ohio, seems to be so much concerned about his friend Garfield, the Republican candidate for President and the Credit Mobilier business, that he is continually making explanations that don't explain worth a cent. Foster says that one of the principal objects of his late visit to Washington was to confer with Judge Wilson, who was a member of the Credit Mobilier investigating committee, respecting the charges against Gen. Garfield, and he asserts that Wilson "went over the entire ground and gave facts to show that the charges were absolutely false." Gov. Foster might have ascertained the facts without going to so much trouble. The Poland investigating committee embodied them in its report to the lower branch of Congress; and so far from showing that "the charges were absolutely false" the report of this committee fixed the truth of them upon Garfield so firmly that he has never been able to explain them away. In his testimony before the committee Gen. Garfield made the following sworn statement:

"I never owned, received, or agreed to receive any stock of the Credit Mobilier or of the Union Pacific railroad, nor any dividends or profits arising from either of them.—Garfield's sworn testimony before the Poland Committee, January 14, 1873.

Now what did the committee find to have been the real state of the facts? The following is the report of the committee so far as Garfield is concerned:

The facts in regard to Mr. Garfield, as found by the committee, are that he agreed with Mr. Ames to take ten shares of Credit Mobilier stock, but did not pay for the same. Mr. Ames received the eighty per cent. dividend in bonds and sold them for ninety-seven per cent., and also received the sixty per cent. cash dividend, which, together with the price of the stock and interest, left a balance of \$329. This sum was paid over to Mr. Garfield by a check of the sergeant-at-arms, and Mr. Garfield then understood this sum was the balance of dividends after paying for the stock.—The Poland Committee's Report, January 18, 1873.

Did General Garfield swear to the truth? Or did a committee of his own party wilfully pervert the evidence before them to make a false charge against a fellow member of Congress? Certainly the committee did not make a false report. Its truth has never been denied, and public sentiment will decide that it is rather late in the day for Gov. Foster to be going "over the entire ground" with members of the committee to prove a different state of facts from those reported by them to Congress.

THERE is a striking contrast, remarks the Harrisburg Patriot, between the worldly wisdom and craft of the late James A. Bayard, of Delaware, and the lamblike innocence of James A. Garfield, in the matter of the Credit Mobilier. When General Garfield was solicited to take some of the Credit Mobilier stock he consented and took his share of the profits, as the Poland committee reported, though he afterwards pretended to be entirely ignorant of the nature of the operation. In his extreme simplicity he never supposed he would be called upon to act as a representative on a question in which the interests of the corporation would be involved. When Mr. McComb invited Senator Bayard to invest in the Credit Mobilier he made the following reply dated January 14, 1868, which is printed in the report of the committee on the investigation:

"I received this evening your letter of this date, informing me that Mr. Ames, of Massachusetts, had \$1,000 or \$2,000 of stock in the Credit Mobilier for me. My son (now Senator Thomas F. Bayard), in a letter which I received this morning, informed me of your short conversation with him, and that it was to your friendly feeling I was indebted for the subscription to what you tell me is 'a good thing.' I am, however, utterly in the dark as to the nature and object of this corporation, and you will oblige me if you will give me as much information as you have in relation to them. I do not know Mr. Ames personally and must wait, of course, until he addresses me on the subject. I take it for granted that the corporation has no application to make to congress on which I shall be called to act officially, as I could not consistently with my views of duty upon a question in which I have a pecuniary interest. Whether I become the owner of this stock or not, I am obliged

to you for your intention to benefit me. As I must, of course, pay for any stock I get please let my son have full information as to its prospective value. Your communication I consider, as you have indicated, confidential except to him, and he and I are almost one person."

This letter closed the correspondence. It is needless to say that Senator Bayard took none of the stock which was so kindly offered to him as "a good thing" through "a friendly feeling." The committee in the report say of this letter: "We commend to all men the letter of the venerable Senator Bayard in response to an offer of some of the stock." Had General James A. Garfield been actuated by the nice sense of honor that marks this letter he would not stand before the country in his present lamentable plight as a sharer of the bribe of Oakes Ames seeking to save himself by prevarication and falsehood.

THE Pittsburg Commercial-Gazette says that "Garfield is only an alleged free trader." Did Mr. Errett, the editor of the Commercial-Gazette think so when he refused to vote for this alleged free trader for Speaker of the House of Representatives?

TILDEN'S FAMOUS LETTER.

A Patriotic Review of Politics Past and Present.

CINCINNATI, June 20.—To-night the New York delegation held a meeting at the Grand Hotel, and organized by choosing Daniel Manning chairman, and S. B. Halliday secretary. Mr. Peckham read the following letter from Samuel J. Tilden:

New York, June 18.—To the delegates from the State of New York to the Democratic National Convention: Your first assembling is an occasion on which it is proper for me to state to you my relation to the nomination for the Presidency, which you and your associates are commissioned to make in behalf of the Democratic party of the United States. Having passed my early years in an atmosphere filled with the traditions of the war which secured our National independence, and of struggles which made our continental system a government for the people and by the people, I learned to idolize the institutions of my country, and was educated to believe it the duty of every citizen of the Republic to put his fare allotment of care and trouble to public affairs. I fulfilled that duty to the best of my ability for forty years as a private citizen. Although during all my life, giving at least as much thought and effort to public affairs as to all other objects, I have never accepted official service except for a brief period and for a special purpose, and only when the occasion seemed to require of me that sacrifice of private preferences to public interests. My life has been substantially that of a private citizen. It was, I presume, the success of efforts, in which as a private citizen I had shared, to overthrow a corrupt combination then holding dominion in our metropolis and to purify our Judiciary, which had become its tool, that induced the Democracy of the State in 1874 to nominate me for governor. This was done in spite of the protests of a minority that the part I had borne in those reforms had created antagonisms fatal to me as a candidate. I felt constrained to accept the nomination as the most certain means of putting the power of the gubernatorial office on the side of reform and of removing the impression wherever it prevailed, that the faithful discharge of one's duty as a citizen is fatal to his usefulness as a public servant. The breaking up of the canal ring, the better management of our public works, the large deduction of taxes and other reforms accomplished during my administration doubtless occasioned my nomination for the presidency by the Democracy of the Union in the hope that similar processes would be applied to the Federal government. From the responsibilities of such an undertaking, appalling as it seemed to me, I did not feel at liberty to shrink. In the canvass which ensued, the Democratic party represented reform in the administration of the Federal government and a restoration of our complex political system to the pure ideas of its founders. Upon these issues the people of the United States, by a majority of more than a quarter of a million chose a majority of the electors to cast their votes for the Democratic candidates for President and Vice President. It is my right and privilege here to say that I was nominated and elected to the Presidency absolutely free from any engagement in respect to the exercise of the powers or disposal of its patronages. Through the whole period of my relation to the presidency I did everything in my power to elevate and nothing to lower the moral standards in the competitions of parties. By what nefarious means the basis of a false count was laid in several of the States I need not recite. These are now matters of history, about which whatever diversity of opinion may have existed in either of the great parties of the country at the time of their consummation has since practically disappeared. I refused to ransom from the returning boards of the southern States the documentary evi-

dence by the suppression of which and by the substitution of fraudulent and forged papers a pretext was made for the perpetuation of a false count. The constitutional duty of the two houses of Congress to count the electoral votes as cast, and to give effect to the will of the people as expressed by their suffrages, was never fulfilled. An electoral commission, for the existence of which I have no responsibility, was formed, and to it the two houses of Congress abdicated their duty to make the count, by law enacting that the count of the commission should stand as final, unless overruled by the concurrent action of the two houses. Its false count was not overruled, owing to the complicity of a Republican Senate with the Republican majority of the commission, controlled by its Republican majority of eight to seven. The electoral commission counted out the men elected by the people and counted in the men not elected by the people. That subversion of the election created a new issue for the decision of the people of the United States transcending in importance all questions of administration. It involved vital principles of self-government through elections by the people. The immense growth of the means of corrupt influence over the ballot-box, which is at the disposal of the party having possession of the executive administration, had already become a present evil, and a great danger tending to make the election irresponsible to public opinion, hampering the power of the people to change their rule and enabling the men holding the machinery of the government to continue and perpetuate their power. It was my opinion in 1876 that the opposition attempting to change the administration needed to include at least two-thirds of the voters at the opening of the canvass in order to retain a majority at the election. If, after such obstacles had been overcome and a majority of the people had voted to change the administration of their government, the men in office could still proceed to a false count founded upon frauds, perjury and forgeries furnishing a pretext of documentary evidence on which to base that false count, and if such a transaction were not only successful, but if after allotments of its benefits were made to its contrivers, abettors and apologists by the chief beneficiary of the transaction, it was condoned by the people, a practical destruction of elections by the people would have been accomplished.

The failure to install the candidate chosen by the people, a contingency consequent upon no act or omission of mine and beyond my control, has thus left me for the last three years and until now, when the Democratic party, by the delegates in the national convention assembled, shall choose a new leader, the involuntary but unnecessary representative of this momentous issue, as such denied the immunities of public life without the powers conferred by public station, subject to unceasing falsehood and calumnies from the partisans of an administration laboring in vain to justify its existence. I have nevertheless steadfastly endeavored to present the same to the Democratic party of the United States. The supreme issues before the people for their decision next November are whether this shall be a government by the sovereign people through election or a government by discarded servants holding over by force and fraud; and I have withheld no sacrifice and neglected no opportunity to uphold, organize and consolidate against the enemies of the great party which alone under God can effectually resist the overthrow. Having now borne faithfully my full share of the labor and care in public service, and wearing the marks of its burdens, I desire nothing so much as an honorable discharge. I wish to lay down the honors and toils of even quasi-party leadership, and to seek the repose of private life. In renouncing a renomination for the presidency I do so with no doubt in my mind as to the vote of the State of New York or of the United States, but because I believe that it is a renunciation of the re-election of the presidency. To those who think my nomination and re-election indispensable to an effectual vindication of the right of the people to elect their rulers, violated in my person, I have accorded as long a reserve of my decision as possible, but I cannot overcome my repugnance to enter into a new engagement, which involves four years of ceaseless toil. The dignity of the presidential office is above a merely personal ambition, but it creates in me no illusion. Its value is a great power for good to the country.

I said four years ago, in accepting the nomination: "Knowing as I do, therefore, from fresh experience how great the difference is between gliding through an official routine and working out a reform of systems and policies, it is impossible for me to contemplate what needs to be done in the Federal administration without anxious sense of the difficulties of the undertaking. If summoned by the suffrages of my countrymen to attempt this work, I shall endeavor with God's help to be the efficient instrument of their will." Such a work of renovating after many years of misrule, such a reform of systems and policies to which I would cheerfully have sacrificed all that remained to me of health and life, is now, I fear, beyond my strength. With unfeigned thanks for the honors bestowed upon me, with a heart swelling with emotions of gratitude to the Democratic masses for the support which they have given to the cause I represent and their confidence in every emergency, I remain your fellow citizen.

SAMUEL J. TILDEN.