The Democratic Advocate.

WESTMINSTER, MD.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1880.

Democratic Ticket

FOR PRESIDENT,
WINFIELD S. HANCOCK,
OF PENNSYLVANIA.

FOR VICE PRESIDENT,
WILLIAM H. ENGLISH,
OF INDIANA.

ELECTORAL TICKET.

FOR THE STATE AT LARGE:
1. NEVITT STEELE,
J. THOMAS C. HOPKINS.

FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS:
1. LEVIN L. WATERS,
2. PATRICK H. WALKER,
3. JOHN R. McNULTY,
4. WILLIAM H. WELSH,
5. RICHARD W. W. BOWIE,
6. WILLIAM M. PRICE.

FOR CONGRESS,
J. FREDERICK C. TALBOTT.

The Business Scare.

The "business scare" gotten up by Republicans in all parts of the North and West is the silliest device ever invented, when examined, yet in some sections it has availed that party many votes. The great business panic of 1873 alarmed the people, and in 1874 a Radical majority in the lower house of Congress was changed into a Democratic majority of about sixty. In 1876 the people further demonstrated their desire for a change, and not only continued a Democratic majority in the House of Representatives but elected a Democratic executive. Their will in the latter was overthrown by the grossest fraud ever perpetrated in any country. But the people were undaunted. In 1878 the country for the third time pronounced in favor of Democratic rule. It was the extravagance and wilful waste of the people's money, together with corruption and fraud which had grown up under successive Republican administrations, and the continual tampering with the finances, which led the people to resolve upon a change. The Democrats went in in December 1875, but as the appropriations are made about fifteen months in advance, the economy of Democratic legislation did not show itself until 1876–7. They effected a reduction of many millions, in spite of the opposition of a Republican Senate. So well did the people like the change that they never halted in their work of political revolution until the Senate, also, was made Democratic. The economic showings of the past year or two have been so favorable that the people desire to continue the work of changing. If the result has been agreeable to the people with a Democratic legislature, how much more acceptable would the change be if the President and Cabinet were in accord with Congress! The people are aware of this, and have resolved upon a Democratic executive and heads of departments. They who desire this change are in the majority of many thousands all over the country, and are determined to consummate their design. If there is a free vote and a fair count the change will be made. The Democratic party itself numbers largely more than half of the voters in the country. With Hancock as our leader the ranks have been reinforced all along the line, and the cry goes up from more than a million majority of the legal voters "give us a change."

Too Cheap to be Good.

"Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty"—but Garfield's price was only **$329.**

Col. Webster's Equivocal Position.

Col. Edwin H. Webster, in his letter of acceptance of the Republican nomination for Congress, declared himself "in full sympathy and affiliation with the National Republican party." But, he also said, in the same letter,—"At the same time I wish it to be understood that I can never surrender the right to exercise my individual judgment upon all questions that might come before me as a representative of the people."

What does this mean? Does it not distinctly imply, that, although, as he says, he is in sympathy and affiliation with the Republican party, if questions should arise in which his individual judgment should run counter to the judgment of his party, that he will take his own course independent of the action of his party. Let us read his letter in the light of his past record, and it becomes plainer still that such is his position. Col. Webster was formerly a Know Nothing. He is not a Democrat, but acted with that party just after the war, and for some time subsequently. More recently, he has occupied a sort of independent position, not affiliating entirely with either party. His nomination by the Republicans caused him to step down on that side of the fence, with the reservation of the right to exercise his private judgment, should questions arise which might place his judgment in antagonism to the judgment of his party. That is Col. Webster's position, as we understand it, and the only legitimate deduction from his letter of acceptance. Certain Republicans here have avowed their intention not to vote for him on account of his equivocal position. They say, and with much force, that they cannot trust him; that he was but lately a Democrat, and may turn his coat again, whenever it suits his "individual judgment to do so."

Garfield a Free Trader.

The friends of a protective tariff ought to know that Garfield is a free trader. He is a member of the Cobden Free Trade Club, an English organization started expressly to promote that idea. Garfield's free trade record was so odious to Pennsylvania Republican members of Congress, that they bolted his nomination in caucus for Speaker of the House. He was also supported by the free trade organs of New York and Chicago on account of his free trade principles. No laboring man or factory employee who believes in protection to manufacturers, can consistently vote for him. Read Mr. Henry McCormick's letter on Garfield's record in another part of this paper. Mr. McCormick was a Republican, and is an extensive manufacturer, but has come out for Hancock.

A Difference of Opinion.

Federal soldiers generally have a high regard for General Grant, but in regard to the South the great soldier differs with the little generals, colonels, captains, corporals, army sutlers and hangers-on, who did but little fighting and seized the first opportunity to get out of the army and run for office, where there was greater security, and who always shirked duty when a battle, or even a skirmish, was imminent. To them the South is disloyal still, though not one in a thousand has been there to see since the surrender. Gen. Grant, who made an extended tour of that section the past spring, had this to say on his return:

"We have no reason to doubt that those who wore the gray will fulfill all they have promised in loyalty to the flag and the nation. Good order, security, good feeling and reviving prosperity are evidenced on all sides."

Col. Webster, Radical candidate for Congress, announces that he is still an independent, though he heartily endorses Garfield and Arthur. Politically, then, he is not a party man. If elected he will vote with the Democrats, Republicans or Greenbackers, as his changeable mind shall dictate; for tariff or free trade; for States rights or centralization; for federal interference or against. In other words he is not to be counted upon to go in any direct course.

Mr. Talbott, the Democratic nominee, will always, as he has been, be found on the Democratic side. His course will be straightforward, working for the best interests of the country and the party, along with Whyte, Groome, Bayard, Thurman, Randall and other Democratic leaders.

Secretary Sherman, in a speech in New York, connected Gen. Wade Hampton with the Ku Klux. Gen. Hampton wrote Secretary Sherman upon the subject, and the latter made a lengthy reply, reiterating what he said by implication, though clothing his language in generalities. Gen. Hampton sent a note by special bearer to Mr. Sherman, stating that he (Sherman) had uttered what was false and knew it to be false when he uttered it, adding that his address would be Columbia, South Carolina. To this Secretary Sherman made answer by repeating that the records would sustain his assertions. In other words he skulked, after uttering bitterly malignant falsehoods, and sought to make capital in the North by publishing the correspondence. He comes out of the controversy with crest considerably fallen. He raised the issue and was afraid to meet it. He belongs to that school of cravens who hesitate not to use their tongues, and cower when held to responsibility.

Garfield's DeGolyer Record.

$5,000. $5,000. $5,000.

On Saturday night last a Democratic torchlight procession in Wilmington, Delaware, was attacked by negroes, and some eight or ten of the paraders were wounded. The Democrats turned upon their assailants, who were armed with pistols, razors and other weapons, and routed them after a stubborn fight, and tore out their headquarters. It is generally believed that this attack upon the Democrats by the negroes was prearranged by the Radicals in order to invoke federal aid on election day. The Radicals are playing a desperate game everywhere and will stop at nothing to carry the November election, be it fraud, bribery, perjury or violence. Democrats must be on the alert throughout the country.

Another Falsehood Exposed.

An idle report has been circulated here, that Hancock and English and Webster clubs have been formed in Baltimore county. It is needless to say that there is not a word of truth in it. Mr. Talbott will receive an earnest support throughout the district.

Turn out to the Democratic Mass Meeting in Westminster this (Saturday) afternoon, and at the torch-light procession and meeting to-night.

A fresh assessment of Federal office-holders is in progress to prepare another corruption fund for the November election. The October expenditures were so lavish that they were "dead broke" when the elections were over. They are making the effort, however, to fill up their coffers again.

No matter what may be the outcome of the November battle, no Democrat should fail to cast his ballot for the party nominees. It is a duty he owes to himself, to his country and his party. If the party stands firm to its work, there need be no fear of the result.

Gen. Grant was down among the Republican money-bags in Wall street, on Tuesday, and on the same day the Presidential Fraud was in California. They are both running about the country with an eye to the Presidential election.

Fraud was the recourse of the Republican leaders in 1876. Money and fraud is their dependence now. Their purpose is to buy the Presidency, if they can.

The Democrat who votes for Hancock and does not vote for Hon. J. Fred. C. Talbott, neutralizes his vote. Gen. Hancock cannot carry out the objects and aims of the Democratic party without a Democratic Congress to aid him.

It has been given out that Virginia, North Carolina and Florida are to be the points of special attack by the Republicans in November. The Democrats are forewarned and will thus be forearmed.

The Baltimoreans enjoyed their sesquicentennial to the fullest extent. Wonder if the *News* is satisfied with "Young Probabilities" and his "chunk of good weather?" Were brighter October days ever seen?

The Republicans seem to enjoy hugely their PURCHASED VICTORY in Indiana. They would not have enjoyed it more, perhaps, had they achieved success without buying a vote and by an incorruptible ballot.

Will Grant or Jay Gould be Emperor in 1884? Jay Gould bought the October elections, and may claim his reward in 1884.

Democrats, Look Out for Them.

The Republicans of Maryland have no hopes of carrying the State for Garfield, and will make no effort to do it. Congressmen are what they are after. They hope by trading and buying to hold on to the sixth district, and will endeavor to elect Col. Webster in this district. To do this they will offer to trade votes for Hancock in exchange for votes for Webster. With what they can trade and what they can buy they hope to defeat Mr. Talbott. No Democrat ought to trade, even if they offer ten votes for one, for Hancock does not need them here, and any Republican offering to buy votes should be arrested. The law forbids any such offer, and Democrats knowing of any should report the fact at once. Democrats should be on the alert, and head off the nefarious practices of the Radical party.

The real business men of New York are moving, and moving for Hancock. A call for a meeting, signed by some eighty-odd members of the Stock Exchange and by many of the leading business firms, was issued on Tuesday for a meeting on Thursday. "Trade and commerce, labor and capital have made their safest ventures and reaped their richest rewards under Democratic rule," says the call, and it closes thus:—We therefore most heartily recommend the election of Hancock and English."

The defeat in Indiana and Ohio, we believe, has been the salvation of the Democratic party. It has showed up Republican tactics and aroused the Democracy everywhere to renewed activity. The party has resolved to win on Tuesday week, and win it will. Indiana will be redeemed, and New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey will be carried for Hancock, which will secure his election by a considerable majority in the electoral college.

$329.

"Let it be considered as a loan."—GARFIELD.

It is not uncommon to hear Radicals say they desire free elections and fair counts. It is but a few years since that they wanted neither. Many Democrats were not allowed to vote, and the ballots were counted just as the Radicals needed them. Had they the same power in Maryland to-day they had prior to 1867, Democrats would again be turned away from the polls.

Turn out to the Democratic Mass Meeting in Westminster this (Saturday) afternoon, and at the torch-light procession and meeting to-night.

The Republican party has demonstrated, in this canvass, that it is now the only sectional party in the country. It was organized in the beginning as a sectional party, and it remains true to its organization. Its cry of a "solid South" is now supplemented by the claim of "a solid North against a divided South."

An Explanation Wanted.

Mr. Garfield said in a speech in Congress on the tariff:

"I am for protection which leads to ultimate free-trade. I am for that free-trade which can only be achieved by a reasonable protection.

The New York Democracy completed a union this week and have a ticket in the field unanimously endorsed by both wings of the party. The result of this will be a majority for Hancock of 40,000.

The *Sentinel* last week advertised the Hancock flag and poles in this city for sale. The Radical party may have enough money to corrupt elections with, but they have not enough to buy our flag and poles, though the Custom House officials have bled freely.

No good, constitutional loving Democrat will falter in his duty now. More than ever should he be active and energetic. The repulse of last week should only nerve him for the fray in November, resolved to win the victory which now seems to be within our grasp.

Turn out to the Democratic Mass Meeting in Westminster this (Saturday) afternoon, and at the torch-light procession and meeting to-night.

Glorying in their Shame.

The Republicans are trying to make the "329" respectable by wearing it as a badge. It is a badge of Garfield's shame.

The forge fires went out under a Republican Congress and were relighted when the Democracy got control of both houses.

If you want a change from the prosperity of 1880 to the panic of 1873 vote for a return of Republican control in Congress.

Rising genius can't well be suppressed; it will crop out. Vide the illustration in the last issue of the *Sentinel*.

Cruikshank outrivalled by the Westminster Nast. We commend him to Puck, or the next edition of Punch and Judy.

A high Protective tariff—a tariff for Protection solely—robs the farmer for the benefit of the manufacturer.

On the first page of this issue are several political articles, to which we direct the attention of our readers.

It won't do to say that Grant was drunk, as an excuse for his unmanly and indecent attack upon Hancock.

Nast will have to look to his laurels or the artist of the *Sentinel* will throw him into the shade.

A DEMOCRATIC MANUFACTURERS' OFFER.—Hon. Orestes Cleveland, in addressing a democratic meeting at Jersey City, N. J., Tuesday evening, explained the tariff plank in the Cincinnati platform. He said that if any manufacturing concern that possessed an element of success was closed after Hancock's election, he would open the establishment the next morning, and continue with a full force of laborers at their old wages. Mr. Cleveland has in his employ fully 1,000 hands, and they are being paid the same wages as during the war.

The unbounded enthusiasm of the department clerks at Washington over the republican victories in the West came suddenly to a halt Saturday, as it was their excuse for another political assessment.

Professor Sumner on the Tariff.

Editor of the New Haven Register:—It is always pleasant to be told by somebody that you have a grievance, and that he is going to take care of you. Hence when it is said that manufactures are to be protected, that we of New England are manufacturers or mechanics, that therefore something nice is to be done by the Government for us, it is a very plausible and popular inference that this action must be beneficial to "working" and "business" men. The test of it is to come to facts.

The proportion of the population which is engaged in labor is, no doubt, the same now as in 1870, and the population is distributed between the occupations substantially now as then. Out of 40,000,000 12,500,000 were then reported as engaged in all occupations. These 12,500,000 were the "working and business men" and women (1,836,288) of the country. Each of these "laborers," therefore, had to support, on an average, 3 1-3 persons. Forty-seven per cent of these were engaged in agriculture. Twenty-two per cent. of them were engaged in "professional and personal services," which class includes unskilled laborers and professional men. Nine per cent. were in trade and transportation. Twenty-two per cent. were in "manufactures, mechanical and mining industries." Out of all the productive laborers of the country, therefore, there are nearly four in other industries for every one in "manufactures." Taking the whole country over, therefore, four "working and business" men are victims of the tariff, while one belongs to the class who possibly gain by it. I submit that when four out of five would be relieved of a grievous burden by overthrowing protection and laying only taxes for government support, *all of which must be paid now in addition to the protection*, I have shown the "benefit" of the change. Taking the New England States by themselves there were in 1860 1,298,000 persons in all occupations, of whom 557,000, or 43 per cent., were engaged in manufacturing, etc. So that even here there were persons otherwise engaged than were engaged in manufacturing.

But when we look over the list of occupations classed as manufactures, and employing 2,700,000 laborers, we find that they are by no means all protected industries. Carpenters, masons, painters, plasterers, printers, plumbers, millers, saw-mill operatives, coopers, tanners, engineers and firemen, fishermen, tailors and seamstresses, wheelwrights, milliners and dressmakers, blacksmiths, large part of the machinists and "mechanics not specified," and half the miners must be stricken out as persons who either cannot be "protected" by a tariff on account of the nature of their industry, or as only in exceptional cases affected by it. A machinist in a railroad shop, or a job shop, can get no good from protection. On the contrary, all these classes are injured by the enhanced cost of raw materials. If glass, nails, paints and hardware cost more on account of the tariff, it is harder for people to build houses, or they must build smaller ones. Hence the building trades are hindered of their full growth. So of other occupations. As for merchants, the merchant not only bears his share of the burden of the tariff, but it also cripples his business. For every merchant knows that it is for the good of his trade to handle as good goods as he can, on terms as favorable as possible to the customers. Everything which forces poorer goods on the market or increases price hurts trade. As to where the goods are made, that does concern the man who buys and sells them at all.

Now the classes just named, selected from amongst the "manufacturers," include over a million and a quarter of workmen. The masons and bricklayers alone outnumber all the employes in all branches of the great protected iron and steel industries (80,000.) There are also other great branches of mechanical industry which are entirely beyond the power of protection to do them any good. Such are manufactures of carriages and wagons, boots and shoes, blinds, doors and sash, clocks, cigars, all "Yankee notions," hardware of all staple descriptions, shovels, axes, nails, and I should add cottons as conceded and affirmed by the best producers, although denied by others. I wish here to mention only what cannot be at all reasonably questioned. It is absurd to speak of needing protection on hardware, brass goods or Yankee notions. The supremacy in these branches as regards processes of manufacture, economy of material with all requisite strength, grace of form and design, ingenuity in machinery, is completely demonstrated. The enhanced cost of raw materials by protection to pig iron and copper is a heavy clog which prevents those industries from expanding to the proportions which they ought to have, especially in the direction of an export trade to the West Indies, Mexico and South America.

If the number of persons engaged in the last-mentioned industries be taken into account it will be found that the number of persons who can be regarded as profiting by protection cannot be put at more than one-quarter of those who are returned in the census as engaged in the mechanical industries. It follows that out of twenty "working and business men" in the country one only is benefitted by protection, and the other nineteen would be benefitted by getting rid of it, and it follows that, even in New England, where the protection affects a larger proportion of the mechanical industries than it does on the average of the whole country, and where, therefore, perhaps half the persons in that class may profit by it, there are four "business and working men" who would be benefitted by getting rid of protection for one who would profit by retaining it. The politicians who are forcing this issue and bringing public attention to the facts may take notice accordingly. If the appeal to the selfishness of the protected to vote so as to hold their advantage over their neighbors is a legitimate appeal, then it is legitimate to appeal to all the others to vote so as to defend themselves.

I do not drop the matter here, however. I turn to the "protected" themselves, and I maintain that protection for them is a delusion. I maintain that it brings no true and permanent benefit, and that free trade would be far better for all of us. Protection has been adopted, and it has forced a vicious twist in all the industry of the country. Under the existing order of things the protected industries prey upon the others and profit by it. I maintain that they would prosper far better if the whole industry of the country were brought back to a natural state and left to run its course in all its branches with the utmost freedom. I affirm this not on general principles, because liberty is the very atmosphere of life to industry, or because we are sure of doing the best we can do with the means we have if we use the means freely, but I come down to fact and detail again here. It is a total error to suppose that a man who works in a shop where a protected industry is carried on profits by protection. He gets no more wages in that shop than in any other. I reserve the wages question, however, for separate treatment, and here I will assume that a woolen weaver gains by protection. When he goes to buy a hat, however, he finds that it is protected, and that he must pay an enhanced price for it. He must do the same for all the carpets, the blankets, the tools, the stoves, the schoolbooks, the paper, the glass, the underwear, and almost all the other staple objects for which he exchanges his earnings. The same is true of the glass or paper or iron workmen in his turn when he goes to buy woolen cloth, or any of the other articles in the protected class.

Even as I write the day's paper contains the report of a meeting at Boston of ship owners, etc., to devise means to revive the American shipbuilding and carrying trade. These industries have been crushed by the protective system, and this meeting proves itself a new combination to prepare a new assault on Congress. What is the means proposed for reviving the industries mentioned? Nothing but a demand on Congress to tax us all—protected and unprotected—in order to collect money to be paid in bounties to the men who own ships. First, commerce was sacrificed to manufactures; now manufactures and agriculture are to be sacrificed to commerce.

I will put it to the common sense of every intelligent man. Do you believe that it is a wise arrangement for us to try to abstract something from each other in this way? If A abstracts something from B C and D, and B abstracts something from A, C and D, and C in his turn from A, B and D, and D finally from A, B and C, do you think they will all get rich and prosper by it? Do you not believe that they, as wise men, should say:—Let us have done with this system altogether. Let each work for himself, get what he can and keep what he gets. There cannot be a doubt that, if they should make this change, they would prosper far better on the whole and in the long run. For all systems of mutual plunder or cheating or imposition of any kind involves loss and waste, and injure both trade and production. The four men in the illustration above would not abstract a little each from the others without resistance and a kind of friction which would waste capital, impair their energy, check their cheerfulness in labor and so lessen the production of wealth.

This mutual plunder of one another by the protected interests is not the end of the matter. As a group or body they do enjoy the plunder of other groups. The protectionist says that an industry is carried on under the tariff which could not be carried without it. This must mean that the industry returned profits on account of the tariff which it would not otherwise have returned. The protectionist always tries to escape this interpretation of his language, and takes refuge in some metaphysical or sentimental generality. There is nothing in the tariff question, however, but a question of dollars and cents. Whenever any one tries to bring into it a grand generalization or vague sentimental consideration it is a signal to take warning. We are talking about trade and industry—the proper and only proper object of which is to "make money." Whenever any one tries to mix up general beneficence or rhetorical sentimentalism with business it is a warning to look out for fraud on his part. An industry can be carried on if it pays, and not if it does not. A protected industry does pay, as the protectionist alleged, *solely* on account of the tariff. If now one cent comes to the manufacturer on account of the tariff which would not have come to him without the tariff, we must enquire *from whom that cent comes*. The protectionist always evades this and tries to account for the gain in some way which would really be niggle-making something out of nothing. If there is a cent's worth of wealth in existence it was produced somewhere by somebody who applied labor and capital to land. If now the tariff has caused this cent's worth to come to the manufacturer, where did the tariff obtain it, and from whom? Who was the man who produced it, and who gave it up, not in fair and free exchange, not by way of gift, but by the operation of the tariff? He must be some man who is producing wealth under natural conditions of strength. The industries which do not pay cannot lean on one another. They must find some independent support in industries which are strong enough to stand alone, and to hold them up besides. The protected industries are such a burden on the agricultural industries of the country. Formerly commerce shared the burden, but commerce had no wide margin of natural advantage as agriculture has, and commerce was crushed out by the protective system. The protected industries waste part of the product which the independent industries of the country produce, and so lessen the wealth of the whole. The cent of gain which the tariff brings was taken from some agriculturist who probably wondered why, with such a favorable soil and climate and such faithful industry, he had to live so poorly. *If we cannot make something out of nothing, then it is certain that all the gains that the protected win on account of protection are abstracted from the products and legitimate property of the other classes of producers in this country.*

Hence, for nineteen out of every twenty producers a change to a revenue tariff would be a great benefit. It would be a benefit for all the agriculturists, *i. e.*, nearly half the workmen. It would be a benefit to all the professional men, all the unskilled laborers, teachers, clerks, bookkeepers and all others engaged in personal services, *i. e.*, to 22 per cent. more of the workmen. It would be a benefit to all the persons engaged in trade and transportation, *i. e.*, 9 per cent. more. It would be a gain to all those mechanics, etc., who are independent of protection. Therefore when it is said that the change would benefit working and business men, the assertion is as true as any general proposition of the kind ever can be. It is true in ninety-five cases out of a hundred.

Let me now, in passing, note two or three points:

1. The monstrous assertion has been made that we owe our prosperity as a nation to the protective tariff. We owe our prosperity to the possession of a great continent, rich in things useful to man, from which we have as yet hardly taken the first and richest store, and to the energy of a population strong in industrial virtues and not yet dense enough to feel any severity in the struggle for existence. The tariff has never done anything but destroy and waste wealth and subtract from the degree of comfort which the people might have enjoyed. To set off one section of the population to carry on business which, by their own avowal, issues in a loss, is no way to increase the total wealth of the whole.

2. New England is being exhorted to stand up for the tariff as the source of its wealth and prosperity. If that is true, if New England needs the tariff to sustain its industries, and if they could not exist without it, then New England is living at the expense of the rest of the country, and is a burden for the rest to carry. If that is all true, then the taunt of the South is true, and New England was eager in the war for the Union because she wanted to hold together the whole Union as a wider field over which she could exercise this system of plunder. For my part I deny and resent any such doctrine, and I regard that sort of an appeal to the New England people as an atrocious insult.

3. Free trade is asserted to be a wicked device of Southerners to injure free labor. This is an appeal to prejudice which is antiquated and false. The demand for free trade now comes from the West more loudly and aggressively than from the South. What is the malicious intent of the West? Is the West opposed to "free labor?"

4. From what I said in my former letter it appeared that a protectionist must affirm that although Americans won in the separate exchanges made by them with foreigners, yet the sum total of exchanges used in loss to the country. From what is said in this letter it is plain that a protectionist must argue that, if Americans plunder Americans, by the sum of such transactions the country becomes rich. Yours, respectfully, W. G. SUMNER.

New Haven, October 9, 1880.

Speech of Hon. Henry D. Fernandis.

Hon. Henry D. Fernandis addressed the Hancock and English Club at Belair, Harford county, Md., on Saturday night last, in which he gave the political record of Col. Edwin H. Webster, now a candidate for Congress by an opposition to Hon. J. F. C. Talbott, in this district. Mr. Fernandis said:

If I were to tell you that sunshine, pure water and fresh air were blessings, you would feel that you knew they were just as well as I. But shut up in a noisome dungeon you would realize the blessings of sunshine and air. Thirsting, you would know the value of fresh water. That, said he, brings me to a matter more pertinent to our meeting. We had heard of the writ of habeas corpus and of personal liberty, but never knew the meaning of the words until the war broke out. Then amidst the clash of arms, imprisoned without a cause, we realized the value of the writ of habeas corpus. Some people honestly believed that the safety of the Union was at stake and thought these things right. Others who did not believe this, submitted. The war ended, and we hoped the white robes of peace would be spread over the land, but we found instead a bloody shirt. When it was seen how the Republican party had usurped power, some of them came out and joined the Democratic party. Among them were J. Morrison Harris and Col. Edwin H. Webster. I had the pleasure of introducing them to a Democratic meeting, and they declared that wrongs were being perpetrated and they came out of the Republican party to secure our rights.

The speaker in referring to Col. Edwin H. Webster, said he would do so with no want of respect. He recognized him as a friend. But every vote for Col. Webster is a vote for Garfield and Arthur, and a vote for the Republican party. Col. Webster tells you in his letter of acceptance that he is in thorough affiliation with the Republican party—and that means that he approves its practices and principles—and he endorses the noble standard bearers of the Republican party, Garfield and Arthur."

Mr. Fernandis then gave a rapid sketch of Garfield's inconsistency on nearly every question; his course at New Orleans, where he helped to manufacture testimony which enabled corrupt supervisors to cheat the honest voter out of the President and of the people. In the matter of the Credit Mobilier, Garfield acknowledged to Judge Black that he had innocently taken the stock from Oakes Ames, yet he denied before a Committee of Congress that he had taken it—and swore to it.

Now, says Mr. Webster, I am in thorough affiliation with the Republican party and I endorse those noble men, Garfield and Arthur. He has a right to say so. Mr. Garfield and Mr. Webster are friends, and friendship may blind a man to the faults of his friends. I take it for granted that Mr. Webster has convinced himself that Garfield is an honest man. But if you vote for Mr. Webster you vote for Republican principles. Approving Mr. Webster you approve the nobility of Garfield. Approving him you put an opponent of reform in place of a Democratic reformer. Mr. Webster will carry out and keep in force the iniquitous laws which it is the great object of the Democratic party to repeal. Mr. Webster is perfectly frank. He does not tell you that he wants you to vote for him upon his own merits, but on account of his affiliation with Republican principles. Looking only to his merits he would have a strong claim on us.

When the war was over, Mr. Webster, opposed to the Republican policy of Centralization, came out from among them. When Mr. Hayes, who was never known to vote for a reform measure, was nominated, Mr. Webster, I am informed, voted for Mr. Tilden, the Democratic reformer. But what has been done to show that the Republican party is any better now than when he voted for Tilden and not for Hayes? He may have satisfied himself. I can understand that if the Democratic party had put up a man unworthy of support he might refuse to support him. Is that the case with Mr. Talbott. He has worked his way up from an humble position to one which any man might feel proud to occupy. He has rendered great services to the State. Among other things he secured a large appropriation for our city of Haver de Grace. This man who in the face of prejudice, achieved the success Mr. Talbott has, is a man of enterprise, and ought to be encouraged. It is idle to use bad terms in reference to him when you cannot justify them. But I would make large allowance for a Democrat than for a man who is proud of his affiliation with the Republican party and thinks Garfield a noble man. I have no bitter kind feelings for Mr. Webster and scarcely know Mr. Talbott. But Mr. Webster asks the people to put him in a place where he would show his approval of acts that would pierce to the heart every Democrat.

You are going to take care of Hancock, but we want in Congress from the second district a man who will uphold his arm in restoring purity to the government.

That Tariff Record.

"Free trade has many advocates, and much can be said in its favor. * * * Against the abstract doctrine of free-trade as such very little can be said; but it can never be applied to values save in time of peace."—*Garfield in reply to Judge Kelley, in tariff debate in the House.*

"Garfield, the Free-Trader."—*Pittsburg Gazette, October 16, 1877.*

"I have never found General Garfield stand squarely for Protection. I do not see how to acquit him of holding the opinions of his British co-laborers of the British Free-Trade leagues."—*Congressman Killinger, October 17, 1877.*

Garfield voted for free trade in coal.

Garfield voted for free-trade in salt.

Garfield voted twice to impose a heavy tax on tea and coffee, and also for a tax on knowledge, in supporting prohibitory duties on paper and printing material.

Garfield thus voted to tax the miser's cup of tea or coffee, and his school books but voted to let in British mined coal free of duty.

Garfield voted to reduce the duty on pig iron in 1870, from $9 to $7 per ton, and in 1872 for a further reduction of seventy cents per ton.

Garfield voted to reduce the duty on railroad iron from eighty to sixty cents per one hundred pounds.

Garfield voted to reduce the duty on bar iron $3.36 per ton.

Garfield voted to reduce the duty on sheet iron from No. 20 to No. 25, $3.37 per ton.

Garfield voted to reduce the duty on steel valued at eleven cents per pound, $10.30 per ton.

Garfield voted to reduce the duty on window glass twenty cents per 100 pounds.

Garfield voted to reduce the duty on all manufactures of wool.

Garfield voted to reduce the duty on all cotton manufactures.

Garfield voted against the interest of every wool grower in Maryland, by advocating and voting for the reduction of the duty on all wools.

Garfield voted for every reduction of duty on iron, steel, wool, coal, glass and cotton and woolen manufactures made the last sixteen years. Every statement here made can be verified by a reference to the *Congressional Record.*

Two Original Statements by Grant.

On the day Hancock was nominated, Gen. Grant, Col. Rowley and Mr. Hunkins were seated in Col. Rowley's office in Galena, awaiting the expected news. A telegram was received announcing the result. Col. Rowley, turning to Gen. Grant, asked him how he liked the nomination. Gen. Grant answered:—"He will run like wildfire! He is a man without a blemish!"

And in connection with Gen. Hancock's nomination, Gen. Grant said to Mr. Hunkins that "if Gen. Hancock had been a Republican, he would have been the commander of the army of the Potomac instead of myself."—*Dubuque Herald.*

SPEECH OF SENATOR BAYARD.

Views of the Recent Elections—The Tariff, &c.

Senator Thomas F. Bayard addressed the Democrats of Wilmington, Delaware, on Friday night of last week. He opened by saying that he came with no appeal to prejudice, folly and hate. After deprecating attempts to force a man to vote by threats of non-employment and otherwise, he proceeded to discuss the Indiana victory. The Republicans, he said, cackled more over it than a thousand hens over their eggs. His declaration that if Delaware were ever put up at auction for gold, as Indiana was said to have been, one party at least would not bid, was receive with enthusiastic applause. Landers, he said, was scarcely a true Democrat, and conceding all the Republican claims in Indiana, he inquired, "What has this to do with Hancock?" The nineteen votes of South Carolina, Louisiana and Florida, which had been falsely counted for Hayes in 1876, are as sure for Hancock as the votes of Delaware. He referred to the change of base of the republican party. How the bloody shirt was tried until the Maine defeat showed that the American people were tired of bitterness. The Southern claims string was played upon until Hancock scraped his bow across it and it snappped.

Finally, from all the organs, from the shrilliest squeaks to the grummest bass, came the cry of tariff, tariff. Tariff he defined to be the tax levied on imports and a tax as a sum raised from persons or property of the people of the government for the use of the State. During the years of Democratic administrations previous to 1861 six-sevenths of the revenues of the government were derived from imports. In 1879 $300,000,000 were raised by taxation upon the people, half of this being derived from the duties on foreign imports, the rest by excise upon three or four articles.

It is absurd to say that the democratic party wishes to abandon this system. The story is stupid, absurd and ridiculous. They would not if they could, and they could not if they would. The power to tax is a very important one, and many a business has been taxed to death. Laws framed so as to tax one business to support another are wrong, communistic and indefensible. A tax for revenue, so as to form incidental protection, is a good thing.

He illustrated the subject with the supposed case of a father who, after starting his five sons in business, is compelled by their needs to give them $500 each. It is all right for the sons, but what becomes of the old man? Any business honorably followed cannot fail to be useful, but who shall say one trade shall draw money from the treasury and another not? Protection for protection's sake means subsidizing certain trades. It cannot be justified, and there never was a more dangerous system.

If political parties are to be arrayed on this issue they will be turned into storming parties upon the treasury. Another case is of John Roach, of Chester, and his application to Congress for a subsidy of $150,000 per year for ten years for his proposed steamship line between New York and Rio Janeiro. Had this been carried out private lines from other American ports to Rio Janeiro would have been driven from the seas and the ship owners would have been ruined by competition with our own government.

Is it right that capitalists or mechanics should be brought into competition with the treasury of the United States standing back of a private individual? The present system of protection, as it has grown up within twenty years, Mr. Bayard declared to be a system of war tax, and he censured the republican party for keeping up such a system in time of peace. The democratic party would lay a tariff so as to bring a revenue. There are now hundreds of articles on the tariff list that do not bring in a cent.

The best informed manufacturers want certain articles placed on the free list, and there have been many petitions from manufacturers in this city asking that certain articles needed in manufacturing here be added to that list. We now, with a population of 50,000,000, manufacture enough for 100,000,000 of people. The democratic party proposes by adjusting the tariff to give manufacturers such free materials as will enable them to carry this surplus into the markets of the world.

The democratic party would not build a Chinese wall about the capitalist and the laborer, but would give them the civilized world for a market. It is absurd to say that the democratic majority party wishes to adopt a system that will be suicide for itself and slaughter for its opponents. The party has too much regard for the law of selfpreservation to do anything of the kind.

He declared that the election of Garfield meant paving the way for a third or fourth term; that Garfield, in order to be nominated had given himself to that party of which Grant was the dangerous head. He concluded by a brilliant eulogy on Hancock, which was received with the wildest enthusiasm.

An Iron Man's Views.

There appeared in the Harrisburg *Patriot* on Tuesday, a letter from Col. Henry McCormick, one of the largest iron manufacturers in the State, in favor of the election of Gen. Hancock. Colonel McCormick is connected with the Paxton rolling mill, the two Paxton furnaces, Lochiel rolling mill and the Harrisburg nail works, located at Fairview, a few miles from Harrisburg. He is noted for his political independence. The following letter will explain itself:

"HARRISBURG, October, 18, 1880.

"*B. F. Myers, Esq.:*

Dear Sir: Yours of the 16th is received. You are right in your inference that I do not think business interests will be in any way imperiled by the election of General Hancock. The efforts to create a panic in business circles are mainly based upon alleged danger to industrial interests dependent more or less upon the tariff. Now, if the Presidential election has any bearing at all upon the question, I infinitely prefer Hancock, born and bred in the valley of the Schuylkill, amid mines and furnaces, in a community where all parties are a unit on the tariff question, and whose only published utterances on the subject should be entirely satisfactory to Pennsylvanians, to Garfield, a member of that famous free trade club, "The Cobden," whose tariff record was so odious to Pennsylvania Republican members of Congress that they bolted his nomination in caucus for Speaker of the House, and who is supported as champion of revenue reform by the great free trade organs of New York and Chicago. But we are referred to party platforms. They are only traps set to catch gudgeons. They are only framed to be misunderstood. When has the dominant party regarded them in legislation? For example, I may here refer to a highly-polished plank that has served in more than one Republican platform. I mean that of 'civil service reform,' so much preached and so little practiced by the party.

"But the real power of regulating the tariff devolves upon Congress. The present Congress is Democratic in both branches, and why has not the threatened ruin already paralyzed our industries? If the country can survive and thrive under a Democratic Congress two years, why not longer? A Presidential veto has no power to prevent the passage of any measure through Congress, and we have a right to suppose that if the Democratic party as such united upon any modification of the tariff, they would have adopted one.

"But the fact is, it is generally conceded, except for campaign purposes, that the tariff is no longer a party question, and it is almost sure during the present Congress to be submitted to the hands of a commission of experts for the preparation of a measure that will be just to all interests. This will be done by common consent of men of all parties, after election. For the above reasons I have no fear that Democratic success in November need disturb the equanimity of the most ardent protectionist.

"Again the Republican party pretend to claim credit for the present general prosperity of the country. Is not the legislative branch of the government Democratic? Surely it is more powerful for good or ill to the public credit and welfare than the executive department, and is in a great measure responsible for improved credit and enforced economy. The Republican administration deserve no credit for resumption of specie payments. It was merely done in obedience to law passed years before and against the protest of the most powerful wing of the party. A happy conjunction of accidents (over which party would scarcely claim control) rendered resumption a success and has thus far enabled us to continue it. Foreign war, wasting the grain fields of Europe, our bountiful crops and improvements in transportation have brought gold here in abundance and make it easy for us to pay in specie. Knowing well the conservative character and tendencies of General Hancock, I feel confident that the interests of labor, capital and the whole reunited States would be subserved by his election to the Presidency. Yours Respectfully,

HENRY MCCORMICK.

THE BALTIMORE AMERICAN ON HANCOCK.—The Baltimore *American* of June 26th, 1880, said:—We believe that the interests of the nation will be much better in Republican hands than Democratic, and will have a good deal to say upon the subject during the campaign; but we congratulate the nation that the Democratic party has presented so good and true a man as General Hancock as its candidate, and that the character of both tickets is such that discussion will be compelled to address itself to reason, and not to prejudice.

Business Locals.

Don't fail to see my Hand Jade Boot at $3.00, also a full assortment of first class Boots and Shoes for men, women and children, at H. L. Norris'.

For a good set of Harness and Winter Lap Robe, go to Ike Miller, at Bowers' Hall, opposite Catholic Church, Westminster, Md., where small profits are thankfully received.

Blankets, Comforts and Coverlets, cheap, at H. L. Norris'.

Updegraff's Dog