Posted

American Sentinel.

WESTMINSTER, MARYLAND.

W. L. W. Seabrook, - Editor.

Entered at the Postoffice at Westminster, Md., as Second-class matter.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1888.

REPUBLICAN TICKET.

For President of the United States,
BENJAMIN HARRISON,
OF INDIANA.

For Vice-President of the United States,
LEVI P. MORTON,
OF NEW YORK.

Electors at Large,
F. SNOWDEN HILL,
JOHN R. BOND.

District Electors,
1st District—JOSEPH W. WADDELL,
2d " —SAMUEL ROOP,
3d " —WILLIAM COATH,
4th " —JOSEPH M. CUSHING,
5th " —THOS. B. PARRAN, JR.
6th " —DANIEL CHISHOLM.

For Congress,
THEODORE F. LANG,
OF BALTIMORE COUNTY.

Election Tuesday, November 6th, 1888.

Protection is Constitutional.

Many of the Democratic statesmen of the present time are denouncing the protection of American industries by the imposition of tariff duties as unconstitutional. In the discussion of the Mills bill the advocates of the measure frequently presented this theory employing it as an argument to discredit protection, notwithstanding many of them now assert that the schedule of the bill affords ample protection to numerous American products. It is not, however, to the inconsistency of this attitude, but to their arguments against the constitutional power of the government to impose protective duties, as such, that this article is directed. The arguments are based upon the assumption that neither by the use of specific language nor by implication does the constitution empower Congress to pass laws for the development, fostering and protection of manufactures or other industries; hence, as the authority of the general government is limited within the powers distinctly delegated, there is no constitutional warrant for the imposition of tariff duties for the purpose of protection.

It is not the purpose of the writer to discuss the question upon a theoretical construction of the constitution. It is a subject for the exercise of the best legal talent and the profoundest jurisprudence, considered in the abstract, and it would be presumption in a layman to engage in such a discussion. But in this case the practice of a century leaves very little to legal construction, and it is very clear that that practice has been such as to confirm the doctrine of the constitutionality of a protective tariff. On another subject, one of Maryland's ablest lawyers said to the writer, more than thirty years ago, that half a dozen sound precedents were worth more than any amount of abstract theories. That eminent lawyer yielded his legal opinion to the force of precedent presented by a layman. Now, the precedents are substantially in favor of the protective principle. George Washington, the first President of the United States, in his first message to Congress recommended the promotion of such manufactures as would tend to render the country independent of foreign producers, and the first act of Congress, after the passage of a law prescribing a form of oath for federal officials, was a tariff act, of which the following was the preamble:

"Whereas it is necessary for the support of the government, for the discharge of the debt of the United States, and the *encouragement and protection of manufacturers*, that duties be levied on goods, wares, and merchandise imported."

There was no question in the minds of the law-makers of that day, and they comprised some of the best legal talent the country has ever produced, about the authority of Congress to pass tariff laws for the protection of home manufactures. It is very clear that the fathers of the government not only held that Congress possessed this authority; but they were in favor of its exercise.

In his last annual message Washington commended Congress for what had then already been accomplished by the encouragement given to manufactures and declared that the object was of "too much consequence not to *insure a continuance* of their efforts in every way" that should appear eligible.

President Adams in his very first message endorsed the principle of protection and urged its extension to commerce.

President Jefferson, the apostle of Democracy, in his second annual message, recommended the protection of the "manufactures adapted to our circumstances," and Congress persistently and consistently enacted protective tariff laws in 1824, 1828, 1842 and at other periods.

It would extend this article to unreasonable lengths to pursue the precedents in favor of the constitutional authority of Congress to legislate for the protection of American industries. Let another single reference suffice. It is from the statesman who gained the appellation of "Father of the Constitution," and whose judgment and opinion are worth as much as the combined wisdom of the gentlemen of to-day who believe that the fathers framed a government incapable of protecting its own citizens against the fatal consequences of foreign competition. James Madison, in the greatness of his legal lore and the maturity of a long experience said, as late as 1828, that

"A further evidence in support of the constitutional power to protect and foster manufactures by regulations of trade —an evidence that ought in itself to settle the question—is the uniform and practical sanction given in that power, for nearly forty years, with a concurrence or acquiescence of every State government throughout the same period, and, it may be added, through all the vicissitudes of party which marked that period."

Such an opinion, from such a man, practically leaves nothing more to be said. It is further emphasized by the recognition of the principle for sixty years longer. A century of evidence, in the way of precedent, ought to leave the power unquestioned, and free-traders should find some other argument upon which to found an attack on the great doctrine that, in practical effect, has made the country great, prosperous and powerful.

The Democratic a Free-Trade Party.

The Democratic party has not always distinctly, by its quadrennial platforms, annunciated the doctrine of free-trade as one of its cardinal principles, but it has done so with sufficient frequency to leave no reasonable doubt in the minds of thoughtful men as to its attitude on that subject. In 1840 it declared that "justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another." This barely concealed the underlying free-trade sentiment of the convention that adopted it. It was reaffirmed in 1844. Success in that campaign emboldened the leaders, and in 1848 a more distinct deliverance was made. The convention then declared that "the fruits of the great political triumph of 1844, which elected James K. Polk, * * * have fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union in the noble impulse given to the cause of free-trade by the repeal of the tariff of 1842," &c. The free-trade platform of 1848 did not meet the approval of the country and Gen. Cass, the Democratic candidate for President, was defeated by Gen. Taylor. In 1852 the platforms of 1840 and 1844 were substantially repeated. In fact the same language was employed in regard to the tariff question. It should not be overlooked that the platform of 1848 was practically an interpretation of those of 1840 and 1844, and their repetition in 1852 was simply a reiteration of the doctrine of free-trade. This was reaffirmed in 1856 with the additional declaration that the time had "come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free-trade throughout the world." In 1860 this was reaffirmed. The platform of 1868 was ambiguous, but declared for a "tariff for revenue upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under the internal revenue laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures." The platform of 1872 was under the "new departure," with Horace Greely, a life-long protectionist, as the candidate. In 1876 the platform demanded that "all custom-house taxation shall be for revenue only." The platform of 1880 declared for a "tariff for revenue only." That of 1884 was ambiguous and was generally regarded as a "straddle." It was repeated in 1888, with the additional endorsement of the President's annual message and the Mills bill, both in the line of free-trade. In the light of these facts who can doubt the determination of the Democratic leaders to force upon the country, if successful in the present campaign, the principle of anti-protection? It is very clear that only the antagonism of the people as manifested in the elections of 1840, 1848, 1860 and 1880 have restrained the Democratic leaders from the full annunciation of the doctrine. It is the principle of political economy recognized and embodied in the Confederate constitution, which declares that no "duty or tax on importations from foreign nations shall be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry." When it is remembered that more than one-half of all the Democrats in the House of Representatives were citizens of the Confederacy, it is not straining a point to conclude that there is general sympathy among the Democrats on this subject, and every voter who believes in the doctrine of protection should vote, at the approaching election, against the representatives of free-trade, Cleveland, Thurman and Stump.

Experience Should Teach Wisdom.

The Democrats who are so anxious to return to the system of tariff for revenue only, should learn wisdom by the experiences of our fathers. Under the low tariff prevalent from 1816 to 1824, Mr. Clay estimated that the average depreciation of property was fifty per cent., and there are numbers of the old citizens of this community who can yet remember the fearful depression of those days, when sheriff's sales were of daily occurrence. The tariffs of 1824 and 1828 came to the rescue and restored comparative prosperity, but the enactment of 1833 brought a revulsion in 1837, during which the distress and depression was far greater than under the tariff of 1816. And this depression continued without abatement until the adoption, by a Whig Congress, of the Protective tariff of 1842. For five long years the land was prostrate under a tariff system similar to that now proposed by Democratic statesmen. Something of the condition of things then prevalent is told by Colton in his life of Henry Clay. Mr. Colton confined his illustrations to a few States, but these illustrations were examples of the general distress. There are yet living many persons who can recall the extremity to which the people were reduced during that crisis. The promoters of free-trade at this day are fond of holding up the enticing picture of low prices as an incentive to the voters. Well, prices were low from 1837 to 1842, but there was little money with which to purchase. Mr. Colton tells how, in some parts of Pennsylvania, the people used bank notes divided into halves, quarters and eighths, as currency. Shin-plasters flourished, and property of every description was sold at an amazing sacrifice. In Ohio it was as bad, or worse. In Muskingum county, hogs were bought for 6¼ cents; horses, worth in ordinary times, $50 to $75, were sold for $2; cows at $1; a good four-horse wagon for $5.50. These were auction prices. In Hannibal county, Missouri, the sheriff sold three horses at $1.50; a large ox for 12½ cents; 5 cows, 2 steers and a calf, at $3.25 for the lot, &c.

To hear Democratic orators on the subject of low prices it might be supposed that those were halcyon days, when every man might buy a farm and stock it for an inconsiderable sum. Unfortunately very few possessed means at all, and to this fact, the result of a free-trade tariff, the low prices that prevailed were directly attributable.

No man is so foolish as to desire a recurrence of these events. They were but the evidences of the dire distress and adversity forced upon the people by the system of political economy now so dear to the Democratic heart, but the statesmen of that ilk receive not the witness. In the face of the unanswerable logic of these cruel facts on the one hand, and of the unparalleled prosperity prevalent under a protective tariff on the other, they would have the land renew the lamentable experiment of free-trade. Has experience taught the people wisdom? or, beguiled by the sophistries of favorite partisans, will they return to the paths that lead to inevitable disaster? The answer must be given at the ballot box. May it be an emphatic verdict for the protection of home and country against ruinous and fatal foreign competition.

Free Raw Material.

Under the above caption the SENTINEL of September 8th called attention to the inconsistency of the Mills bill in placing wool on the free list and imposing a duty on iron ore, both being raw materials which the Democrats claim should not be subject to import taxation. Mr. Blaine, in his speech at Buffalo, N. Y., on Monday evening, explained the cause of this inconsistency in the treatment of wool, iron ore and several other articles. The speech is so well worth reading, in this connection, that its full text is subjoined. That which seemed a riddle, without explanation, becomes very clear in the light of the lucid presentation of the facts underlying it. Professing to be governed by a principle in placing wool on the free list as raw material, it is found that the Democrats have utterly ignored it when the interests of party friends were involved. This is what Mr. Blaine says on the subject:

One of the most frequently repeated arguments of the Democrats in favor of what they term "Tariff Reform" is the necessity for the admission of all raw materials free of duty. They leave it to be inferred that the Mills bill attains this end, and their failure to explain all of the provisions of that bill amounts to a suppression of the truth. Let me ask some Democratic speaker or some Democratic journal to tell the public how far and for what reasons raw materials are admitted free by the Mills bill, and in the meantime I will contribute a few facts to the discussion.

If I mistake not the Mills bill combines the most discreditable features of legislation ever attempted in a tariff measure—discreditable alike by acts of commission and by acts of omission. Let us take the raw materials in detail. Coal is a raw material of immeasurable value. The original design was to admit coal free of duty, but the Democratic Ways and Means Committee were plainly told that if they took that step they would endanger the supremacy of their party in Old Virginia, in West Virginia and in Maryland, and, therefore, their project of making coal free was abandoned. Iron ore is one of the raw materials about which we heard much at the beginning of the recent session of Congress. It was proclaimed on all hands by Democrats that iron ore must be free, for iron ore lay at the basis of all forms of iron and steel fabrics and its price must be lowered. But it was found that Mr. Barnum, of Connecticut, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, was the owner of one of the largest mines of iron ore in the Lake Superior region, and that the chairman of the Executive Committee, Mr. Brice, with his political associates, owned and controlled a road which derived large sums from the transportation of this ore. It was further known that Mr. Smith Weed, one of the most prominent Democrats, was largely interested in iron ore and in the manufacture of iron. Upon the statement of those facts, the Democratic Ways and Means Committee at once abandoned the idea of putting iron ore on the free list —abandoned it, not because they thought the step unjust, but because they found it would injure the business interests of prominent Democrats.

Now for another article. Lime, which is one of the essentials in all building operations, was upon the free list in the first publication of the Mills bill. The largest supply of fine lime comes from the county of Knox, in the state of Maine. Knox happens to be the only county in the state that ordinarily gives a Democratic majority. The Democrats of Knox memorialized the Ways and Means Committee, remonstrating against their proposed action and giving the committee to understand that if they wanted to wipe out a majority in the last Democratic county in Maine they should put lime on the free list. The old duty was restored on lime, but the Democrats of Knox were naturally so justly enraged at the manner in which the Ways and Means Committee had trifled with so large and, to them, so vital an interest, that they turned around in the September election and gave a good-sized majority to the Republican ticket, by way of rebuking an attempt to reform the tariff on the line of a partisan division. They will vote still more heavily against Mr. Cleveland in November.

PROTECTING DON DICKINSON.

Wood pulp is treated as a raw material, and was put on the free list in the Mills bill as originally framed. But it was soon discovered that Mr. Don M. Dickinson, postmaster-general, and Mr. I. M. Weston, chairman of the Democratic State Committee of Michigan, owned a valuable patent for an improvement of the manufacture of wood pulp, and that the patent would be rendered worthless if wood pulp was put on the free list; and so back went the former duty. The value of Mr. Dickinson's patent was preserved to him by his Democratic friends of the House of Representatives. Mark you, the duty was not restored because in the belief of the Democratic Committee of Ways and Means sound policy required it, but it was restored because they did not wish to do harm to leading Democrats who were expected to deliver the electoral vote of Michigan to President Cleveland.

Here is another case: "Marble of all kinds in block, rough or squared" was on the free list in the Mills bill, as reported to the House, but was afterwards removed from it, probably because it gave offense to some conspicuous members of the "unconquerable Democracy" of Vermont. I do not actually know the real reason in this case, but doubtless Mr. Bradley B. Smalley, the keeper of the Democratic conscience in Vermont can state it. But it added one more instance of a proposed abolition of duty on raw material being promptly reconsidered and the duty being restored by the Ways and Means Committee.

Another case comes very near to you in Buffalo. "Cement, Roman, Portland and all others," was put on the free list in the original draft of the Mills bill. It was taken off and restored to its old duty at the instance and by the influence of your fellow citizen, Hon. Daniel Lockwood, United States district attorney. Mr. Lockwood appeared either as a stockholder in a cement company or attorney for stockholders, I know not which. But he succeeded in removing cement from the free list, not simply because it was right to do so, but because Mr. Lockwood is an influential Democrat.

Glue was treated as a raw material in the first draft of the Mills bill because it is prepared as an essential feature for so many handicrafts. Glue, therefore, was reported on the free list, but it was soon found that a Democratic syndicate in the West made pretty much all the glue for that section and that the Democratic heirs of the late venerable Peter Cooper, of New York, made nearly all the glue for the rest of the country. It was not in the hearts of the Democratic Ways and Means Committee to strike down an interest that could afford large Democratic contributions in the West and that had so prominent and influential a Democrat interested in its manufacture as Mr. Edward Cooper, late mayor of New York City, and consequently glue went off the free list and back to its old duty.

Another case in point, though not connected with the free list, presents the same extraordinary course on the part of the Ways and Means Committee. Everyone who has paid attention to the tariff discussions for the last fifteen years knows that the one subject on which the Free-traders unceasingly harped was that of the monopoly of wood screws held by some manufacturers in Connecticut. They denounced it through all the moods and tenses of denunciation. It was to be expected, therefore, that the duty on wood screws would be seriously reduced, if indeed the Democratic Ways and Means Committee in their wrath did not put the article on the free list. But the interest was found to be so large in Connecticut and to be in such large part in Democratic hands that the Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee were advised that if they hoped to carry Connecticut for Mr. Cleveland wood screws must be let alone. So this "great odious monopoly," as they had for so many years described it and denounced it, was left undisturbed by the tariff reformers and with all the naked and time-honored abuses which they had imputed to it.

PECUNIARY CONSIDERATIONS PREVAILED.

I am not at all expressing dissatisfaction with the Democratic Ways and Means Committee reached in these several cases, but I am proving from the changes in their own bill, in its different stages, that they shifted around, turned and dickered on the various provisions in it just as the personal and pecuniary interests of leading Democrats outside of Congress demanded and that in several important departments of manufacturing they shaped their action and reached their conclusions without the slightest regard to considerations other than those affecting the pockets of distinguished Democrats, the prospects of political influence and the results of forth-coming elections. The Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee had been crying aloud that Protection was robbery, but they apparently changed their creed before they got through with their bill, and concluded that it was robbery only when Republicans secured the profits on a protected article. But, when leading Democrats like Mr Barnum, or Don M. Dickinson, or Smith Weed, or of the most prominent Democrats, was largely interested in iron ore and in the manufacture of iron. Upon the statement of those facts, the Democratic Ways and Means Committee at once abandoned the idea of putting iron ore on the free list —abandoned it, not because they thought the step unjust, but because they found it would injure the business interests of prominent Democrats.

Now for another article. Lime, which is one of the essentials in all building operations, was upon the free list in the first publication of the Mills bill. The largest supply of fine lime comes from the county of Knox, in the state of Maine. Knox happens to be the only county in the state that ordinarily gives a Democratic majority. The Democrats of Knox memorialized the Ways and Means Committee, remonstrating against their proposed action and giving the committee to understand that if they wanted to wipe out a majority in the last Democratic county in Maine they should put lime on the free list. The old duty was restored on lime, but the Democrats of Knox were naturally so justly enraged at the manner in which the Ways and Means Committee had trifled with so large and, to them, so vital an interest, that they turned around in the September election and gave a good-sized majority to the Republican ticket, by way of rebuking an attempt to reform the tariff on the line of a partisan division. They will vote still more heavily against Mr. Cleveland in November.

PROTECTING DON DICKINSON.

Wood pulp is treated as a raw material, and was put on the free list in the Mills bill as originally framed. But it was soon discovered that Mr. Don M. Dickinson, postmaster-general, and Mr. I. M. Weston, chairman of the Democratic State Committee of Michigan, owned a valuable patent for an improvement of the manufacture of wood pulp, and that the patent would be rendered worthless if wood pulp was put on the free list; and so back went the former duty. The value of Mr. Dickinson's patent was preserved to him by his Democratic friends of the House of Representatives. Mark you, the duty was not restored because in the belief of the Democratic Committee of Ways and Means sound policy required it, but it was restored because they did not wish to do harm to leading Democrats who were expected to deliver the electoral vote of Michigan to President Cleveland.

Here is another case: "Marble of all kinds in block, rough or squared" was on the free list in the Mills bill, as reported to the House, but was afterwards removed from it, probably because it gave offense to some conspicuous members of the "unconquerable Democracy" of Vermont. I do not actually know the real reason in this case, but doubtless Mr. Bradley B. Smalley, the keeper of the Democratic conscience in Vermont can state it. But it added one more instance of a proposed abolition of duty on raw material being promptly reconsidered and the duty being restored by the Ways and Means Committee.

Another case comes very near to you in Buffalo. "Cement, Roman, Portland and all others," was put on the free list in the original draft of the Mills bill. It was taken off and restored to its old duty at the instance and by the influence of your fellow citizen, Hon. Daniel Lockwood, United States district attorney. Mr. Lockwood appeared either as a stockholder in a cement company or attorney for stockholders, I know not which. But he succeeded in removing cement from the free list, not simply because it was right to do so, but because Mr. Lockwood is an influential Democrat.

Glue was treated as a raw material in the first draft of the Mills bill because it is prepared as an essential feature for so many handicrafts. Glue, therefore, was

Lord Sackville, the British Minister at Washington, has written a letter to a naturalized Englishman, advising him in substance to vote for Cleveland. That tells the whole story of England's interest in the pending election. Do free born Americans propose to surrender their natural rights and advantages for the benefit of a foreign country? If so, vote for Cleveland; if not, vote for Harrison. By the way, will the administration demand the recall of this foreign intermeddler in the politics of the country? He has certainly trangressed all rules of diplomatic courtesy and should be taught a lasting lesson. But then it was in the interest of Cleveland you know.

It will be a perfectly safe rule to discredit all Democratic sensational stories from now until the election. The work of circulating them has already commenced. Frederick Douglass was quoted, on Thursday, as taking a very gloomy view of the situation and giving currency to the dollar-a-day story. He denies it absolutely. What next?

Ex-Governor Hamilton, of this State, died yesterday at noon, in Hagerstown.

Judge Yellott's Letter.

Hon. George Yellott, of Baltimore county, Judge of the Court of Appeals, in response to a request from Messrs. James E. Hooper, James W. Tyson, Jr., Whitelock, Enoch Pratt, and many other leading citizens of his county, to give the people the benefit of his "observations, experience and reflections upon the system of protection to our producing and laboring classes, as compared with the effects of efforts which have been made and are being made to destroy or injure that beneficent system," has written a letter that deals very candidly and forcibly with the subject. It must be borne in mind that Judge Yellott is a Democrat and has been twice elected to the bench of the Court of Appeals by that party. We commend his views to the thoughtful consideration of all who desire to be enlightened on the supreme issue of the hour.

TOWSON, MD., October 22nd, 1888.

Gentlemen:—In your communication just received, you request me to give public expression to my views in relation to the vitally important question involved in the present political contest. You very properly suggest that the paramount issue of the day—the protection of American industry—"rises far above the plane of partisan politics, so that no impropriety would attach to one occupying a judicial station, in defining his position thereon; such a course being rather a patriotic duty, which will contribute to avert a public disaster."

I feel the full force of this suggestion, and could I, at this time, withdraw myself from the sphere of the duties appertaining to my official position, nothing would afford me greater pleasure than to be present at the proposed meeting and give expression to my opinions on a subject which, next to the preservation of the organic law of the land, is the most important which has ever occupied the attention of the American people.

The pleasure afforded by an attendance on the meeting would be the greater as, among the numerous signers to the communication addressed to me, I perceive the names of gentlemen who have hitherto differed in regard to their political affiliations, and, therefore, fully recognize the fact that I am invited to address an assemblage of patriots, and not of partisans. Although I cannot be present, for the reason already assigned, I beg you to accept a written expression of some of my views on the subject of protection to American industry.

Let us recur to the past and learn wisdom from the lessons of experience. "The American colonies ought not to be permitted to manufacture a hobnail. Let them occupy themselves in cultivating the soil and buy the manufactured products of Great Britain;" this was the policy proclaimed by the British ministry anterior to the outbreak of the American Revolution. That revolution emancipated us from the political control of England, but left us still in a condition of comamercial vassalage.

The sagacious mind of Washington soon perceived the dependent condition of this country, and directed the attention of Congress to the encouragement of domestic manufactures. His recommendation was repeated by Jefferson in his first annual message, and Madison, while president, strongly urged the importance of encouraging home industry by a protective tariff, which would effectually relieve the country from its dependence on foreign nations. But, during the administration of these three great statesmen, the peculiar condition of transatlantic affairs saved the farmers of America from the calamities which would have resulted from the want of a home market. From the commencement of the French Revolution, soon after the organization of our Federal government, until the final overthrow of Napoleon's colossal power on the field of Waterloo, during a period of twenty-five years, all Europe was engaged in wars conducted on a gigantic scale; the whole of that continent became an immense military camp; the enormous armies employed had to be fed; supplies of food were obtained from America, and our farmers—few in number, and in a sparsely populated country—had an ample market for their products and prospered and grew rich. But the disbandment of these vast armies brought about a disastrous change in the prospects of the American producer. Europe produced her own food, and no longer purchased our agricultural products. European goods came into our markets, and our farmers had no markets abroad. There was also no adequate home market for the American farmer, because domestic manufactures could not be established, the ruinous foreign competition rendering such industrial enterprises almost wholly impracticable. The farmers obtaining small prices for their products, were involved in debt. Many were ruined, and their land had to be sold. It is well known that in 1824 some of the finest farms in Baltimore county were sold for about one-fourth the price paid for them ten years antecedent to this calamitous period.

In view of this disastrous condition of things, President Madison, in his inaugural address, earnestly advised the creation of a home market by means of a protective tariff. That great statesman, Henry Clay, strongly supported this policy, and by his influence and eloquence obtained the passage of the tariff act of 1824. The beneficial effect of this legislation soon became apparent. Prosperity was restored to the country, and in his annual message President Andrew Jackson clearly indicated the salutary effects of the protective system, and strongly urged its continuance. His argument on the constitutionality of the measure is as clear and satisfactory as any that has ever been presented.

The troubles resulting from the nullifying ordinance of South Carolina ultimately led to the destruction of the protective system. Henry Clay to avert the danger of civil war and the probable dissolution of the Union, consented to a gradual reduction of the duties on imports, and the result was that in 1840 American industry had ceased to be protected. Many now living, myself among the number, can recollect the condition of things at that period. Manufactories were closed, thousands of workmen were without employment, farmers were paid for produce in shinplasters—for there was no other money—and grass was growing on many of the wharves of Baltimore. This state of affairs continued until the passage of the tariff act of 1842, when business revived and the country began to prosper. During Polk's administration the tariff was tampered, with but not to such an extent as to reproduce the disasters of 1840. The civil war produced the present tariff, and since the restoration of peace and the resumption of specie payment, no country in the world, in this age or in any other age, has been so prosperous as the United States of America, now containing a population of sixty-five millions of people, and having the best home market on the face of the terrestrial globe.

Why do politicians desire to jeopardize or destroy the market? Are men who take even a step in that direction worthy of the confidence of the American people? Can the American people trust them? The solution of these questions is dependent on the result of the coming election.

The farmers of this country surely do not desire to have their home market destroyed. They are told that, if certain foreign goods are let in, they can buy cheaper. Well, a man cannot buy unless he has money. A farmer cannot have much money unless he can sell his produce for a good price. An Englishman comes to him and says: "I can sell you a coat cheaper than the American manufacturer." "Well," says the farmer, "if you will buy my grain for a good price, I can buy the coat." Says the Englishman: "I don't want your grain. I get my supply of grain from India. The Hindoo works for a few cents a day. My grain obtained from India costs me not more than half as much as you ask for yours. Lower your price and I may buy your wheat, though the Indian supply is abundant." "What!" says the American farmer. "Am I, in order to get the English coat, to sell my wheat at ruinous prices? My farm laborers will not work, like the Hindoo, for a few cents a day. We cannot compete with the pauper labor of India. We are American citizens, and I and the men who work on my farm had better vote for a protective tariff, and have a home market. Mr. John Bull, I can't buy your coat, unless you will consent to pay me a good price for my wheat."

And so with all the workingmen of the country. It would be bitter mockery. It would be adding insult to injury, for a free trader to tell a factory operative about cheap English goods, when he has been thrown out of employment and has no money in his pocket, and sees no prospect of obtaining any. When the Englishman comes in and undersells the American manufacturer, the factory is closed and the operative is out of employ. The Englishman's cheap goods have been the ruin of the American workman.

A few days ago I was standing at the window of a house in Hampden. I had passed over this very spot of ground some thirty years ago, when, with the exception of a few straggling houses, there was no Hampden, no Woodberry. Now there is a population of many thousands. All this is the outgrowth of the protective system. As I was thinking of these things a wagon was driven up loaded with the finest potatoes I ever beheld. It was soon surrounded, the potatoes sold, and the farmer—the son of one of my old friends—started back to the Sixth district of Baltimore county to bring another load. Here was a home market for the farmer created by the protective tariff. Could the Englishman have bought the farmer's potatoes? Oh, no; but he would have offered him a cheap coat. But the farmer must sell before he can buy, and unless he can find a home market he cannot dispose of his produce. There are a vast number of Hampdens and Woodberrys created by the protective tariff. Let anyone travel over this great country, and he will discover hundreds of manufacturing places created by the wise policy of protection, and affording a home market for the farmer's products.

The evil of the surplus in the Treasury can easily be obviated. Let them remove duty on sugar and many other articles which ought to come in free, and there will be no surplus. But it is apparent that men who will keep the duty on sugar and let foreign wool in free, so that our farmers will have to compete with the wool-growers of Australia and Europe, are not the safest depositaries of political power. The State of Maryland has endeavored to protect our wool-growers by a tax on dogs in many of the counties, but the present dominant party in the House of Representatives proposes to render such legislation useless by letting in foreign wool free and thus injuring our farmers more than would be done by a thousand sheep-killing dogs turned loose in every county.

In conclusion, I would say that any farmer or any workingman who votes for a party that is moving in the direction of free-trade, will be voting to impoverish himself, beggar his family, and bring on the country the calamities which afflicted us in 1840. In that year I cast my first vote for General William Henry Harrison, and in this year it is my intention to vote for his worthy grandson, General Benjamin Harrison, who, I believe, will make as good a president as any man now living in America. With much respect, I am, gentlemen,

Very Truly Yours,
GEORGE YELLOTT.

The Mills Bill Reduction.

From the U. S. Senate Majority Tariff Report.

"After months spent in violent attacks upon the Protective system, and when, fortunately, the people of the country have become thoroughly aroused to the impending danger, the friends of the House bill suddenly discover that it is not a Free-trade measure.

"To ascertain the effect of the Mills bill upon protected industries we should eliminate from computation the amount collected from the revenue duty imposed upon sugar. We should then have the value of all imported articles referred to in the bill as $175,571,927, upon which the duties collected in 1887 amounted to $78,074,855. The duties which would have been collected upon these articles under the Mills bill would have amounted to $39,535,789, showing a percentage of reduction of duties and rates upon all articles named in the bill, exclusive of sugar, of 49.37 per cent."

The Democrats have been taking credit for hunting down and convicting a tramp named Gordon for false registration in New York, with the intention of voting the Republican ticket. The facts are, however, that Gordon was hunted down and his conviction and sentence to two years and six months in Sing Sing prison procured by the Republicans. He isn't a Republican and didn't intend to vote the Republican ticket.

Maryland Monuments at Gettysburg.

The Maryland monuments on the battle-field of Gettysburg were formally dedicated on Thursday and transferred to the keeping of the Gettysburg Battle-Field Association. Col. Theo. F. Lang, as chairman of the commission, made the speech of presentation, and Governor Jackson responded. J. M. Krauth, secretary of the Association, accepted the monuments and promised that they shall be guarded and protected. There were 3,000 men in the procession, including the Fifth Maryland Regiment, Governor Jackson and Staff, 5th Baltimore Light Infantry, Hagerstown Light Infantry, Linganore Guards, Bond Guards, Company A Third Battalion, Monumental City Guards, Baltimore Rifles, and the following G. A. R. Posts under command of Col. Lang: Wilson, Dushane, Reno, Gen. J. F. Reynolds, Denison, Burns, Antietam, Guy, Burnside, Hicks, A. C. Spicer, Bushman, Thaddeus Stevens, Lincoln, W. H. Emory, all of Maryland; and Lincoln, of Martinsburg, W. Va; also Ellsworth Camp Sons of Veterans, survivors First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, First Regiment of Eastern Shore, Third Maryland, First Regiment of Maryland Cavalry, of Rigby's Battery A of Purnell's Legion, and 75 veteran firemen of Baltimore, with Fire Inspector Holloway as chief marshal. Col. Wm. P. Maulsby, and other members of the First Regiment Potomac Home Brigade, from this county, who were in the battle, participated in the ceremonies on Thursday. The excursion over the Western Maryland Railroad from Westminster carried 315 passengers to the scene, including 86 from this point.

The ceremonies were of a highly interesting character and greatly enjoyed by all.

A Democrat Nails a Democratic Lie.

FROM ANSONIA (CONN.) SENTINEL (Rep.).

Dickerman M. Bassett, of Birmingham Conn., wrote a letter to his friend in Indianapolis, William Henderson, and the reply is printed below. Mr. Henderson is a Democrat of prominence in Indiana, a leading member of the Indianapolis bar, and a relative of the late Vice-President Hendricks:

"D. M. Bassett, Esq., Birmingham, Conn.

"Dear Sir: I am in receipt of your letter of the 2nd inst., stating in substance that Mr. Pendleton, of this city, addressed a Democratic meeting in your town last Saturday, in which he said he never believed General Harrison had said that a dollar a day was enough for a workingman until he obtained an affidavit signed by twelve prominent citizens of Indianapolis, who swore that they heard him utter the words. I have to reply to this that I am not a supporter of General Harrison or a defender or apologist for what he has said or done, but having lived in the same town with him for thirty-five years and during that time never heard him accused of a mean act or an unkind word of anyone, rich or poor, and being called on by you for the fact of this utterance, I would be doing him great injustice if I were to decline to answer your respectful letter. That he ever uttered such a word is not believed by a single respectable Democrat in the state of Indiana. I have been engaged in active business in this city for about thirty-eight years, and have known and now know, all the prominent men of the city, and do not know a single one of the so-called prominent men referred to by Mr. Pendleton. This thing is a silly falsehood gotten up for influencing voters abroad, and not at home. The thing is so basely false that the Democratic State Committee and the County Committee of this county refuse to give it countenance.

"WILLIAM HENDERSON.

"*Indianapolis, Oct. 6, 1888.*"

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

Republican Meeting!

IN WESTMINSTER.

The Republicans and friends of Protection will hold a meeting in the

COURT HOUSE,

On Saturday Evening, November 3rd, at 7.30 o'clock.

R. C. THACKERY,
OF ELKTON, MD.,

and other speakers will address the meeting.

PROTECTION
—TO—
Home Trade.

THE fall business campaign is now open, and we are offering the largest assortment of

Suitings and Overcoatings,

both foreign and domestic, ever offered outside of the city, and can compete with many of the city houses for quality and variety of styles. We have some of the finest imported Suitings ever brought to this county and can get up Suits to compete with any city work, and at prices far below. We guarantee a fit. Now what inducements have you to go to the city and pay more? Does home protection say go? Our line of

GENTS' FURNISHING GOODS

cannot be surpassed in the county. Special attention given to UNDERWEAR. It will pay you to call on us as we have it at all prices. In the Glove line we challenge any house outside of the city. Fine Gloves a specialty. We have Gloves from 25 cents up to $10.00. We are headquarters for Collars and Cuffs, always looking for the latest. New specialty in

FUR COLLARS AND CUFFS.

Something that has never been offered in this market before and certainly is a handsome thing for an Overcoat and for comfort. We always lead in Neckwear and have the largest line ever offered in the town. Our SHIRT department is full and complete, both white and colored. Beautiful line of Wool Overshirts, latest styles. The best Overall and Norfolk Jacket ever shown in this town.

Our Line of Gents' Jewelry

cannot be surpassed. If you want a Suit, Overcoat, Suit of Underwear, or Shirts, Collars, Cuffs, Neckties, Gloves, Suspenders, Hose, Handkerchiefs, Scarf Pins, Sleeve Buttons, or anything in our line, we will be pleased to have you call.

J. T. ANDERS.

oc-27

Trustees' Sale
OF A
DESIRABLE FARM
AND
PERSONAL PROPERTY,
Near Hampstead, Carroll County, Maryland.

BY virtue of a deed of trust from David Burns and wife to the undersigned, duly executed and recorded, we will sell at public sale, on the premises, on

Saturday, 24th of November, 1888,

at 10 o'clock, A. M., the following property: First, that desirable farm containing

101 ACRES, 1 ROOD AND 20 PERCHES

of land, more or less. The improvements thereon consist of a large and conveniently arranged two-story log and frame Dwelling House, with backbuilding; large bank barn, with wagon shed attached; dairy, smoke house, carriage house, hog house, blacksmith shop, frame tenant house, large grain barrack and other necessary outbuildings; nearly all the buildings have been recently erected and are all in good repair. The buildings are supplied with superior water and the fields are conveniently watered; fences are all in condition; about 10 acres is good meadow land, and about 15 acres is heavily covered with good timber. There is an orchard of apple and other fruit trees on the farm which is not surpassed in the vicinity, besides, also, an extensive variety of choice grapes. The land is in a high state of cultivation. This farm is now in the occupancy of Mr. Burns, is situate on the county road leading from Brilhart's mill to the Baltimore and Hanover turnpike road, is about one-quarter of a mile from Greenmount Station, on the Baltimore and Hanover Railroad, is about one mile from Hampstead, and adjoins the land of Daniel Yingling, Benjamin Bosley and others. The location of this farm to the railroad, market, schools, churches, &c., renders it worthy the attention of purchasers.

Also, at the same time and place, the following Personal Property: Rockaway buggy, horse, 2 cows, set of harness, halter chains, &c.; lot of carpenter tools, half interest in about 26 acres of growing wheat, lot of hay, lot of wheat and corn by the barrel, household and kitchen furniture, and a variety of articles too numerous to mention.

Terms of Sale of the Real Estate.—One-third cash on the day of sale or on the ratification thereof, one-third in one year and the other one-third in two years from the day of sale; the credit payments to be secured by the notes of the purchaser or purchasers, with approved security, bearing interest from the day of sale.

Terms of Sale of the Personal Property.—All sums of $10 and under, cash; on all sums above $10 a credit of six months will be given on notes with approved security, bearing interest from the day of sale.

JESSE LONG,
MICHAEL S. BRILHART, } Trustees.
Reifsnider & Reifsnider, Solicitors.
oct-27-ts

For Sale.

A FURNACE, in good order; also a "Cutter," but little used, almost new. Inquire at SENTINEL Office, or Box 71, Uniontown, Md.
oc-6-4t

Auctioneering.

THE undersigned offers his services as Auctioneer or Sale Clerk. Charges moderate. Satisfaction guaranteed.

J. G. SHUNK,
69 E. Main St., Westminster, Md.
oct-20-3m

Commissioners' Notice.

THE County Commissioners of Carroll county, will meet at their Office, in Westminster, on the FIRST MONDAY OF NOVEMBER, 1888, for the transaction of business.

By order, CHARLES BRILHART, Clerk.
oct-6-1m

Notice to Tax-Payers.

NOTICE is hereby given that the Mayor and Common Council of Westminster, Maryland, have made their annual levy for the year 1888, due and payable on and after November 10, 1888. Interest will be charged on all accounts not settled by December 10, 1888.

oc-13-3t
</