

DIRECTORY.

DISTRICT AND COUNTY OFFICERS

Congress, Hon. Jno. Patton. State Senator, Hon. W. W. Hays, Clearfield. Representative, Hon. J. A. Woodruff.

LODGES.

Belleville Lodge No. 265, A. Y. M., meets on Tuesday night at 7:30 before every full moon. Belton Chapter No. 241, meets on the first Friday night of every month.

CHURCHES.

Presbyterian, Howard street. Rev. Wm. Laurier. Pastor. Services every Sunday at 10:30 A. M. and 7 P. M. Sunday School (Chapel) at 9:30 A. M. Prayer Meeting (Chapel) Wednesday at 7:30 P. M.

For Cleveland!

John Blanchard, Esq., of Bellefonte, Declares for the Democratic Candidates.

Tariff Revision Necessary to Protect American Labor and American Industry. A Logical and Eloquent Presentation of his Reasons for Supporting the President and his Policy.

We give to-day the full text of Mr. Blanchard's address delivered in the Opera House at Philipsburg on Thursday last. No stronger arraignment of the Republican policy of high taxation, that is impoverishing the many to enrich the few has been made in the present campaign. The speech is logical, eloquent and conclusive.

Mr. Blanchard comes of an old Republican family of Centre County, his father, E. M. Blanchard, still inclines to that faith. Hon. John Blanchard who many years ago represented the Whig party in Congress was the grandfather of the young gentleman who has declared his determination to support the policy of the president. Mr. Blanchard is highly educated, well posted and a close student of passing events. He has never taken any active part in politics but has watched with keen interest the different policies advocated by the Republican and Democratic parties. In giving his support to Democracy he does it from honest and patriotic motives. He is without political ambition, is not a disappointed office seeker or anything of that kind. He is a desirable acquisition to any party and his voice will be heard for tax reduction and Cleveland during the present campaign.

Fellow Citizens:

On the 4th of March, 1885, for the first time in a period of twenty-four years, the high office of President of the United States, devolved upon the candidate of the Democratic party. On that date Grover Cleveland took the oath of office and entered upon his duties as President. He had been called to this position by the suffrages of his countrymen after a campaign which will ever remain memorable in the annals of our political history. Sectional prejudice, partisan zeal, ill disguised demagogism and other baneful influences of a still deeper dye, were all drawn into this contest with the ardor that attends a life and death struggle; but against them all was arrayed, the intelligence, the common sense, the patriotism of noble

men, who braved the taunts and threats of former political associates and the estrangements that often accompany a breaking away from former political ties. Men of this stamp joined hands with the rank and file of the Democratic party to accomplish a high and worthy aim. That aim was none other than to wrest from the hands of partisans, some of them sordid, some narrow minded, some corrupt and all prejudiced, the posts of public trust and confidence, the administration of which should be for the benefit of the whole people, and not for the aggrandizement or exclusive proprietorship of any party, any clique or any section. Grover Cleveland himself gave the watch-word of the campaign.

"Public office is a public trust," he said; and this watch-word passed over the length and breadth of the land. It became the people's watch-word. It was discussed at the fireside, in the mill, in the counting room—everywhere. At last there stood a man before the people a man who represented a definite idea, a progressive sentiment. His straightforward, common-sense record, challenged the intelligence, and the patriotism of his countrymen and he won; and why? Because the Republican party, which at the beginning of its rule, represented a strong moral feeling, and stood for moral principles, had become a party whose chief aim seemed to be its own continuance in power and the subservience of all the functions of government to the accomplishment of this partisan purpose. Because the Republican party, which in the days of its true glory was recognized as the party of Lincoln, of Sumner, of Stanton, and of Chase had become the party of Steve Elkins, of Matt Quay, of Steve Dorsey and of James G. Blaine. Because the Republican party, behind which the patriotism of the nation had once marshalled itself and gone forth to deadly conflict, to battle for the preservation of the Union, had become a party, behind which skulked the indiscriminate pension seeker, the spoilsman in office, the supporter of cliques and factions, the political assessment functionary and others of a similar mould. Because the Republican party, which once could well boast that it represented men of sober thought, conservative action and sincere purpose, was fast giving itself over to the blind worship of a political charlatan and public trickster. When Republicanism had degenerated until it represented nothing better than mere Blaineism, it behooved all thoughtful Republicans to consider well, whether the political organization to which they had in past years given their allegiance, still continued to represent the principles in support of which that allegiance had originally been given. It behooved young men of Republican antecedents, whose party ties were yet unformed to consider whether the support which their fathers were giving to the Republican party, was grounded on substantial reasons or whether it sprang from force of habit and of associations, from love of a party which no longer deserved their respect. Men of independent thought pondered long and deeply on these questions. The Republican party stirred up the dying embers of sectional strife; struggled to fill men's minds with thoughts and feelings which the march of events had relegated to the domain of history; heralded through the land, dark foreshadowings of slavery re-instated, civil strife renewed, payment of Rebel debts and the whole category of reminiscences of the war which had done such valiant service in former campaigns. By such means as these the timid were cowed and the ignorant deluded; but these illusory fetiches, these bugaboos of by-gone times proved ineffectual to stem the tide of the awakened moral sense and the quickened intelligence of the country.

Fellow citizens, the election of Grover Cleveland, in 1884 was a mighty triumph for the cause of good government. By his election and subsequent administration a most discouraging public sentiment was effectually exploded. It was a sentiment honestly adhered to by a great many well meaning people. It was a nature's out-growth of the feelings engendered by our civil war. I believe it to have been at one time reasonable and just. But that time has long since passed away and the continued existence of this sentiment in the public mind was a perpetual menace to the very existence of a free government. I refer to the largely prevailing belief that the election of a Democratic president meant the destruction of the government and a subversion of all that was accomplished by the war; to the belief that the Republican party was the only party to which could safely be committed the management of public affairs; to the belief that no matter what might be the public or private character of a candidate, what his fitness or unfitness for positions of public trust, if he wore the halo of a Republican nomination, it was sufficient, and that this duty it was incumbent on all good citizens to support him; to the belief that from the Democratic party nothing was to be expected but rebellion, confusion, chaos and destruction. That such a belief was unfounded in fact was then the judgment of those whose votes decided that election; that their judgment was correct has been indisputably proved by subsequent events; that such a belief should be prevalent among a

large body of citizens when it had no foundation in fact, ought to be a source not only of regret but of deep concern to any one who believes in a free government and loves his native land. It meant nothing more nor less than that as to about half of the citizens of this great Republic, popular self-government was a failure; it meant nothing more nor less than that we were in such a deplorable state that we were compelled to look to the other half of our citizens exclusively, for the men who were to carry on the machinery of government; it meant nothing more or less than that we were to be saddled perpetually with a system of rule, carried out to its logical conclusions, it means nothing more nor less than absolutism in government and the rule of a dictator, he be small or large, boss or emperor; and it was the universal teachings of history that when a people clearly see that there is no other alternative but this, they prefer an emperor of enlightened views and of large capacity for statesmanship to a petty boss of commonplace intellect whose chief distinction is his ability to mould and control the organization of his party. In a word, in that direction lies the road to one-man power. Let him who has faith in a government by and for the people, look well to it that in giving credence to such pessimistic theories as I have just described, he is not casting his influence against the form of government in which he most sincerely believes and of which he considers the people of this great Republic to be entirely capable.

I say, therefore, that the election of President Cleveland in 1884 was a glorious triumph for the cause of good government and for the cause of popular self-government. I am not so foolish as to claim perfection for anything human, and I have no desire to cover up the deficiencies and short-comings of the administration of President Cleveland. I frankly admit that there are many points in it in regard to which much is to be desired; but I do here and now candidly declare my opinion that for sincerity of purpose, for fidelity to the interests of the whole people, for conservative and efficient business management, for a healthy, strong and enlightened financial policy, for a zealous regard and protection of the rights of all men, for freedom from sham and cant, for statesmanlike foresight, and grasp of the questions of the day, for being possessed of clear convictions and having the courage to frankly assert and maintain them, no administration since the days of Abraham Lincoln can compare or compete with the masterful administration of Grover Cleveland. In claiming this much for Cleveland's administration I am stating no new or startling proposition. It is no more than has frequently been admitted in off-presidential years by many candid Republicans. Throughout the Union there has been a spirit of satisfaction and contentment as regarded the management of public affairs. Outside of political rings, where it was to the interest of the ringsters to disseminate discontent, there has been a general feeling that the presidential office was in safe and efficient hands. Indeed, so strong had Cleveland grown with the people at large that until December 1887, there was a general consensus of opinion among enlightened observers that his re-election was a foregone conclusion.

But at that time the President's third annual message was sent to Congress. To the surprise of Congress and the country, it was devoted exclusively to the consideration of one subject, and that subject was the tariff. In a clear and concise manner the President pointed out the dangers threatening our financial prosperity in the existence of an ever increasing surplus lying idle in the public treasury. He urged that a reduction of this surplus is the plain duty of every enlightened statesman. Clearly and without flinching he declared his own belief that this reduction should be made by a revision of our present tariff laws. He indicated in plain terms the remedies that he thought proper and urged upon Congress the necessity of action.

This message fell like a clap of thunder from a clear sky. Republican leaders who had been looking in vain for something out of which to raise an issue against the popularity of Cleveland were at once filled with feelings of great joy; and the timid among the leaders of his own party who feared the effect of a tariff issue before the people were stricken with consternation. Was the President mad thus to jeopardize his own chances and the chances of his party? Such was the feeling of some of his party friends. But these friends had failed to truly gauge the temper of the people. Being at the time free from the excitement of a political campaign, the people saw nothing revolutionary or ill-advised in the President's proposals. On the contrary, his courageous course touched a chord in the popular heart. The people at once recognized a leader who discerned the needs of the times and who had the courage to unequivocally declare his position and allow the consequences to take care of themselves.

In compliance with this call of the President, what is now known as the Mill's Bill was subsequently introduced into the House of Representatives, and after a long debate, was finally passed

by the Democrats of that body against the most stubborn opposition of the Republicans. This bill now rests in the hands of the Finance Committee of the Republican Senate. What action they intended to take was, until yesterday, a matter of conjecture. Yesterday, however, they reported a substitute bill framed upon what they are pleased to call Protectionist principles.

By this action of the two parties an issue on the tariff was definitely raised. The position of the Democratic party was clearly and accurately defined. The President had declared himself in unmistakable terms. The Convention that nominated him had squarely endorsed his position, and the Democrats in Congress had introduced a bill in accordance with these views, and had done everything in their power to make it a law.

The Republican position was not so clear. That party started out in the campaign with a plank in its platform which declared in favor of the abolition of all internal taxes, including those on whiskey and tobacco, if necessary, rather than touch one feature of our present protective system. This astounding proposition at once scandalized the intelligence of the country. Such Republican papers as were not hide-bound organs were not slow to express dissatisfaction with it and to sound a note of warning to those who thought that they could delude their countrymen with anything but what is true, if it only possessed the tinkling sound and the glittering guise of that much abused word Protection. This was a position far more radical than had ever before been declared by any party. In all previous discussions on the tariff it had been an admitted fact, a common ground of assent that there were incongruities in the tariff and gross ones at that; that it was in many respects abnormally high and inconsistent; that it was essentially a war tax, and must be reduced. And only four years before both parties had pledged themselves to this reduction. But here was a proposition of a directly contrary import. The existing tariff was held aloft as if it were the perfection of human reason. As the heathen worshippers of old cried "Great is Diana of the Ephesians" so these great apostles of Republican doctrine seemed inclined to cry "Great is the Tariff of the Republicans;" and they might have added a curse and an anathema upon all who did not bow down and worship before this great goddess.

But this enthusiastic worship was not destined to endure. Republican Senators in Washington proceeded at once by their actions, if not by their words, to commit heresy against this wonderful dogma of their party. A secret and solemn conclave was held at the residence of Senator Everts and a unanimous conclusion was reached in favor of introducing a Republican bill reducing the revenues. Just what the features of the bill are, the public was not until yesterday and to-day authoritative informed of, but the indications were that it would not adhere to the heroic determination of the platform. And the bill as formally presented in the Senate yesterday conclusively shows that as far as the position of the Republican Senators is concerned the tariff plank of the platform has been abandoned.

Owing to this vacillation and change of front, the Republican position cannot be said to be clearly defined. Republicans will nevertheless tell you that it is so defined. They say "we are for protection to American industries," but until they define what they mean by "protection" the inquirer is as much in the dark as ever. So far as yesterday's action of the Republican Senators indicates anything, it would seem to imply that a reduction of the tariff in some particulars is not opposed to protection. What sort of reduction then, is opposed to protection? Some Republicans would answer, "Such a reduction as is proposed by the Mill's Bill;" others would resort to a subterfuge and would answer in some manner as follows: "While the actual reductions proposed by the Mill's Bill may not in themselves be destructive of what we consider protection, it is the tendency of the bill that we oppose."

Let us consider this latter answer first. The tendency of the bill? What other tendency can it have than that which is to be derived from its four corners. It is a specific piece of legislation. It makes certain definite and specific provisions. What are the results brought about by these provisions? Are they good or bad? If they are good, the tendency of the bill is good. If bad, the tendency of the bill is bad. To speak of the tendency of a piece of legislation in any other sense than this is a misuse of terms and leads to a consequent confusion of thought. To speak of the tendency of the bill, when you mean the supposed tendency of its supporters, is to confound two separate and distinct things, and to attribute to the bill, some thing that is not there. This is no mere hair-splitting, but is a valid distinction which will be borne in mind by any one who desires to think clearly and correctly on these subjects.

"Oh," say this class of our Republican friends, "we are in favor of a reduction of the tariff but we desire to see it reduced by its friends, and not by its enemies." In other words they can

find no valid objection to the reduction proposed, and they are determined to allow nothing to be done to alleviate the evils that are apparent to any candid person unless it is done under the auspices of their orthodox sanction. To adopt such a course of conduct in the ordinary affairs of life would in general be branded as childish, or at least as pharisaical; but the more severely should it be condemned when the interests of a nation are at stake. To such men, it may fairly be said, "if you admit the need of a reduction, your duty is plain. Support all propositions that are proper and just, regardless of the source from which they emanate. It will be time enough to combat supposed evil tendencies when they are actually incorporated in any projected legislation." So much for tendency of the Mill's Bill.

Let us turn to that other class of high tariff men who hold that the Mill's Bill proposes reductions which in themselves would be destructive to American Industries. The defenders of this proposition have a hard road to travel. They have to face the fact that while the Mill's Bill makes an average reduction of only four and thirty-two one-hundredths per cent, a Republican tariff commission, composed of the strongest protectionists the country could produce, after investigating the subject and listening to the pros and cons, advised Congress that a general reduction in our tariff rates of at least twenty per cent, would not be injurious to any industry and would be a very proper and desirable thing to do; and that this advice was given only six or seven years ago. They have also to face the fact that just such reductions and just such additions to the free list as are now proposed by the Mill's Bill, have time and again in past years been advocated by such Republican worthies as Allison, Sherman, Garfield, Arthur and a host of others.

But the believers in this proposition are a dauntless set; they care little for opposing facts. They call to their aid, a few unproved statements of a general and sweeping character and then dismiss the whole subject with a complacency that is quite pleasing to behold. But Mr. Chairman, the issue that has been raised is not to be dismissed in this summary manner. The sweet lullabies of protectionist dogma, with which we have been lulled to sleep for a quarter of a century, will no longer be tolerated by thinking people. Strong, substantial, cogent reasoning will be demanded for all positions taken upon this question. It cannot much longer be clouded and mystified before the eyes of the people. Clear statement and sufficient proof will be required. Silly forgeries of English news papers, cries of Golden club, and English free trade gold, will ere long be grouped in the minds of intelligent citizens along with the worn-out cries of Solid South, Rebel Debt, Confederate Brigadiers and the like.

What then is the scope of the Mill's Bill? It may be stated to be this; It reduces the rates from the present average of forty-seven and ten one-hundredths per cent to a general average of forty-two and seventy-eight one-hundredths per cent, a reduction of four and thirty-two one hundredths per cent, and in addition places lumber, salt, tin plate, raw wool, raw flax, hemp and jute, certain chemicals and a few other articles on the free list. This, then, is the proposed legislation that has been so bitterly opposed and denounced by Republicans. It would be perfectly fair to address our Republican friends as follows: Tell us some reasons outside of your quaking fear of England why this legislation would bring about anything but good? The proposed lists, both free and dutiable as before you. You profess to have adopted your protectionist principles from actual experience. Take up the proposed reductions one by one, point out specifically the damage that would follow. Show by your actual experience how the placing of raw wool, for instance, on the free list would be conducive of ill effects. You will have to do this from your own personal experience, for the experience of woolen manufacturers will not help you. They and their wage workers have again and again called for free wool, and only stopped when they found that if they didn't cease their attack the wool growers would turn against them and ask in turn for the abolition of the tariff on woolens. Both interests concluded that it was a game of give and take, so they joined hands for protection sake and asked for an immense duty sufficient to shut out foreign importations altogether. They decided to protect themselves and to allow the consumer to look out for himself. They adopted the course which inevitably leads to combines and trusts, for the purpose of controlling the domestic market and making the price to suit themselves. They have not yet accomplished this purpose, but before they do it, we should like to ask our Republican friends to give us some substantial reasons why they are opposed to free raw wool.

But fellow citizens, that is not the line of Republican defence. You cannot pin them down to anything, so specific as that. They look far across the seas to find out what the British are saying and thinking about us. They seem to believe that we are unable to solve these matters for ourselves, but are compelled to consult the keener insight of the wily Britisher. This is

their principal line of argument.

But if for any reason our high tariff friend is wretched in this line of argument, he begins to pour forth his sympathetic soul in behalf of the poor laboring man. He tells us that the ground-work and fundamental reason for the maintenance of our present high tariff is that it secures to our laborers higher wages and better living. He points with pride to the difference in the scale of wages between us and Great Britain. He dilates upon the superior condition of our workmen, but he fails to give any explanation of the fact that while wages here may be about eighty-four per cent higher than in Great Britain, the wages in Free-trade Great Britain are forty-two per cent higher than in protectionist Germany and sixty-five per cent higher than in protectionist France; nor does he account for the fact that under the same tariff rates, the wages in different localities of the United States vary indefinitely; nor does he waver the least in his position when it is shown him that while it is true that there has been a gradual increase in the wages paid our laboring men during the last twenty-eight years of high tariff during the same period there has been a corresponding increase of wages in free trade Great Britain and in some cases to a remarkable degree; nor does he credit anything to the wonderful resources and wealth of our country, to the freedom of our institutions, to the intelligence of our people and their ability to fight for themselves. The attempts to establish a relation of cause and effect between the rate of wages and the rate of the tariff cannot be proved; for the practical workings of business and trade, disprove it every day. He fails to appreciate, or if he does appreciate it he fails to acknowledge what the effects of business and trade indisputably show, that the fundamental basis of the rate of wages is the law of competition, the principle of demand and supply.

Mr. Chairman, this line of argument is specious and false. The Republican party is on the defensive in this campaign. It has always heretofore admitted that a revision and reduction of the tariff was necessary. A definite scheme of revision and reduction has been proposed in Congress and the Republican party has taken a stand against it. It is therefore incumbent upon that party to justify its course before the people.

In maintaining its position in favor of the present tariff the Republican party is driven to adopt one of two horns of a dilemma. It must either assert that the tariff rates do not increase the selling price of commodities or to admit that a tariff is essentially a tax; but if the former proposition is true, namely, that a tariff does not increase the selling price of commodities, what is the use of a tariff at all; at least so far as the protection of industries is concerned. If on the other hand, manufacturers can profitably make and sell their commodities at the same price as they bring in the markets of free trade England, what need have they for the protection of a tariff? Why continue a thing that is of no use to any one? This would be the natural inference to be drawn from such a proposition and therefore our high tariff friends will not lower their aim.

But if they abandon this position and try to the other horn of the dilemma they are compelled to admit that a tariff is essentially a tax; that in so far as it increases the price of commodities, so far as it is a tax; and admitting that it is a tax, it becomes incumbent upon it advocates to show that the tax is reasonable and just. What kind of a tariff tax then, is reasonable and just? Is the present tariff such a one? If not, why would not the revision proposed by the Mill's Bill tend to make it more so?

These are questions that are suggesting themselves to thoughtful minds all over the country. Men are taking their stand on one side or the other, concluding as conviction or interest dictates. Party lines are being broken through, the tariff is being discussed as it has never been discussed since before the war. Men are thinking more clearly and acting more definitely upon this great and vital subject. I deem it to be one of the first duties of citizenship for the voters of this country to declare themselves at this time fearlessly and without regard to party ties. And for this purpose, Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens, I am here to-night, as a young man of strong Republican antecedents, to declare myself in favor of the election of Cleveland and Thurman; and I do so declare myself because I heartily and sincerely believe in tariff revision and reduction. Because I believe that the needs of the country demand immediate action upon this subject. Because I believe that the Republican party has adopted a cautious and partisan course and is promulgating flimsy and specious economic doctrines. Because I believe that the course adopted by the Democratic party in this campaign is straightforward, honest, conservative, and wise. Because I believe that the tariff legislation proposed by that party is sound in principle, would be amply protective of our industrial interests and productive of great benefit to the country at large. Because I see no disposition in the Republican party to deal with the tariff in an enlightened and scientific spirit. Because that party has given itself over to the advocacy of projects for the expenditure of our surplus revenues, which projects, to my mind, are chimerical in conception, and if put into effect would lead to wanton extravagance, corruption in office, degeneracy of morals public and private. Because I believe that the plank of the Republican platform which advocates cheap whiskey and tobacco in preference to cheap bread-stuff and clothing, involves a theory which is inconsistent with any true system of taxation and totally disregards the plain moral aspects of the question.

Fellow citizens, if I voted in this campaign for any other presidential ticket than that of Cleveland and Thurman, I would set counter to the clear dictates of my convictions and conscience. And if I failed to raise my voice in favor of the ticket which I believe stands for good and safe government, and for wise and conservative legislation, I would be a coward and false to my manhood. Fellow citizens, I am heartily and unreservedly in favor of the election of Grover Cleveland and Allen G. Thurman.