

THE SOMERSET HERALD.

AND FARMERS' AND MECHANICS' REGISTER.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY JONATHAN ROW, SOMERSET, SOMERSET COUNTY, PA.

New Series.]

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1845,

[Vol. 4.—No. 6.

[From the New York Recorder.

CHARITY.

In the hour of keenest sorrow—
In the hour of deepest woe,—
Wait not for the coming morrow,
To the sad and suffering go;—
Make it thy sincerest pleasure
To administer relief—
Freely opening thy treasure
To assuage a brother's grief.

Go, and seek the orphan sighing—
Seek the widow in her tears;
As on mercy's pinions flying,
Go, dispel their darkest fears;
Seek the stranger, sad and weary,
Pass not on the other side,
Though the task be sad and dreary,
Heeding not the scorn of pride.

Go, with manners unassuming,
In a meek and quiet way,—
O'er the father, ne'er presuming,
Though thy brother sadly stray;
'Tis a Saviour's kind compassion—
'Tis his righteousness alone,
All unmerited salvation
That around thy path hath shone.

When thy heart is warmly glowing,
With the sacred love of prayer,
Be thy works of kindness flowing
Not as with a miser's care;—
Duty e'er should be thy watchword—
Pity drop the balmy tear,
Always towards the fallen cherish
Sympathy and love sincere.

REMARKS

of the
Hon. Andrew Stewart,
In the House of Representatives,
December 9, 1845.

Mr. Douglass, offered amongst others, the following resolution, in reference to the President's Message:—
"That so much of said message as relates to the condition of the Treasury; to the reduction and modification of the tariff with reference to revenue; to the extension of our revenue laws over the Territory of Texas; to the payment of the public debt; and the establishment of a constitutional Treasury, and the separation of the affairs of Government from all banking institutions, be referred to the Committee of Ways and Means."
The resolution having been read,—
Mr. STEWART moved to amend the resolution by inserting thereafter instructions to the committee to report "as the sense of this House that no alteration ought to be made in the tariff of 1842." In supporting this motion, Mr. S. said that he thought the House ought to meet this question at once. It seemed to him to be the duty of this committee to give an expression of its views on the general subject. The people had heard with alarm the language of the Executive Message on the subject of the tariff. Mr. S. was in possession of letters just received from individuals who had commenced manufacturing establishments, and who wished to know whether it would be safe for them to proceed. Their inquiry of him was, what was going to be done. Whether the entire system of protective policy was to be overturned, as had been recommended by the Executive? That inquiry was coming up from all parts of the country, and he thought it the duty of that House to reply to these inquiries, and to let the people know at once whether the policy of protecting American industry was to be subverted or established. Surely it was their obvious duty to come up to the question fairly and openly, and at once to give a distinct expression of their views.
"It had been intimated by a gentleman from Alabama, over the way, (Mr Payne) that the report from the Secretary of the Treasury was a most extraordinary document. Extraordinary it certainly was, and many new and very extraordinary doctrines did it contain. Mr. S. concurred very heartily with the gentleman in this much of what he had said. The report was a document setting forth doctrines in political economy such as never before had been promulgated by any authorized officer of Government, and the positions there assumed were such as had startled the country. It was therefore manifestly proper and highly obligatory on this body that it should give as prompt an expression as possible of its views and intention in the premises. Mr. S. proposed to draw forth to view, and to public examination, in as brief a manner as he could, some of these opinions.
The first doctrine which he should notice, and which was most distinctly avowed in the Secretary's report, was that the protective policy was UNCONSTITUTIONAL, and if so, there must be an end to it.—The Secretary said expressly that the tariff of 1842 was "too unequal and unjust, too exorbitant and oppressive, and too clearly in conflict with the fundamental principles of the Constitution."
These were the express words, that the tariff of 1842 was clearly in conflict with

the fundamental principles of the Constitution; and he had made an argument to prove this. He quoted the Constitution, and then argued, by way of inference, that the power to lay a duty for protection was not in this government. His report says:

"A PARTIAL and a TOTAL PROHIBITION are ALIKE in VIOLATION of the TRUE OBJECT of the TAKING POWER. They only differ in degree and not in principle. If the revenue limit may be exceeded ONE PER CENT. it may be exceeded one hundred. If it may be exceeded on any one article, it may be exceeded on all; and there is no escape from this conclusion but in contending that Congress may lay duties on all articles so high as to collect no revenue, and operate as a total prohibition.

"The Constitution declares that 'all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.' A tariff bill, it is conceded, can only originate in the House, because it is a bill for raising revenue. This is the only proper object of such a bill. A TARIFF IS A BILL to 'lay and collect taxes.' It is a bill for raising revenue; and whenever it departs from that object, in whole or in part, either by TOTAL or PARTIAL prohibition, it VIOLATES the PURPOSE of the GRANTED POWER."

Thus he held explicitly that a duty which went but one per cent. beyond the revenue standard was unconstitutional, and that if Congress might add but one per cent. to the amount of duty necessary for revenue, it might add a hundred per cent.; and that if it might impose such duty on one article, it might with equal right impose it upon all other articles whatever. The whole proceeding, whether in a smaller or a greater degree, the Secretary maintained to be directly against the Constitution, and an act which transcended the power of Congress to perform. That was the doctrine of the report. Was it a doctrine which this House meant to sustain? Would the House express its concurrence in such sentiments? He trusted not. The doctrine was extraordinary, indeed. What, the protective policy unconstitutional!—Then all those statesmen who had gone before us had been open violators of the Constitution of their country. Had not this very policy of a protective tariff been recommended to Congress by every successive Executive, from George Washington down to and including Andrew Jackson? If gentlemen would refer to the first and to the last communications of President Washington, they could perceive that he had distinctly recommended the adoption of such a policy as among the duties of Congress. Here are his words:

"The advancement of agriculture, commerce, and MANUFACTURES, by ALL PROPER MEANS, will not, I trust, need recommendation; but I cannot forbear intimating to you the expediency of giving effectual encouragement, as well as the introduction of new and useful inventions from abroad as to the exertions of skill and genius in producing them at home."—Washington's Annual Address.

"Congress has REPEATEDLY, and not without success, directed their attention to the ENCOURAGEMENT of MANUFACTURES. The object is of too much consequence not to ensure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible."—Washington's last Annual Address.

He was President of the Convention which had formed the Constitution, and must be presumed to have known something about its meaning and intention.—So, if they would examine the Executive Messages of President Jefferson—and Mr. S. presumed that gentleman, especially those of the Jefferson school, would admit that he, too, knew something of the Constitution—they would find there three successive recommendations of this same policy as among the highest duties of Government. Here are the opinions of Jefferson. He went to the extent of absolute prohibition:

"To cultivate peace, and maintain commerce and navigation, in all their lawful enterprises; to foster our fisheries, as nurseries of navigation and for the nurture of man; and to protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances; these, fellow-citizens, are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings."—Jefferson's second Annual Message.

"The situation into which we have been forced has impelled us to apply a portion of our industry and capital to national manufactures and improvements. The extent of conversion is daily increasing, and little doubt remains that the establishment formed and forming will, under the auspices of cheaper materials and subsistence, the freedom of labor from taxation with us, and of protecting duties and prohibitions, become permanent."—Jefferson's eighth Annual Message.

"He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures, must be for reducing us either to a dependence upon that nation, or be clothed in skins, and live like beasts in dens and caverns. I am proud to say that I am not one of these. Ex-

perience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort."—Jefferson's Letter to Benj. Austin, Esq., Boston, 1816.

Would gentlemen say that George Washington and Thomas Jefferson had united in recommending a violation of that sacred instrument which their own hands had formed? And how was it with President Madison—that pure unsullied patriot and most sagacious and incorruptible statesman—what did he think about the matter? In no less than four executive communications, two of them annual messages and two of them special, he had united his voice to recommend the encouragement and protection by legislation of our domestic manufactures:

"The revision of our commercial laws, proper to adapt them to the arrangement which has taken place with Great Britain, will doubtless engage the early attention of Congress. It will be worthy at the same time of their just and provident care, to make such further alterations in the laws as will more especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture which have been recently instituted or extended by the laudable exertions of our citizens."—Madison's Special Message, May 23, 1809.

"I recommend also, as a more effectual safeguard, and as an encouragement to our growing manufactures, that the additional duties on imports which are to expire at the end of one year after a peace with Great Britain, be prolonged to the end of two years after that event."—Madison's Special Message, May 31, 1814.

"But there is no subject which can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations of Congress, than a consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence, and attained unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars.—This source of national independence and wealth I anxiously recommend to the prompt and constant guardianship of Congress."—Madison's Special Message, February 29, 1815.

In Madison's seventh message he still more strongly recommends this policy.

Mr. S. did not like to take up the time of the committee by reading from these documents to any extent; but gentlemen would hardly maintain that James Madison did not understand the Constitution at least as well as Robert J. Walker. He might himself be called the father of the Constitution, and yet he publicly and officially recommended on four different occasions that very policy which the present Secretary of the Treasury pronounced to be in open conflict with the Constitution.

[An Executive message was here received from the President, through the hands of Mr. Walker, his private Secretary.]

Mr. S. next referred to the messages of President Monroe, who had over and over again, in the strongest and most emphatic language, urged upon Congress the propriety of protecting domestic manufactures. He then came to the messages of General Jackson—a name which, he should suppose, would still have some small measure of authority; at least with those who once professed themselves prominently his friends. Mr. S. would place in distinct and open contradiction the opinions held by the present executive and his Secretary of the Treasury, as contained in the message of the one and the report of the other, and the opinions of Andrew Jackson as contained in his Executive messages to Congress. He had already presented the doctrines of the existing Administration, as they were embodied in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee, here interposed, and desired to present to Mr. Stewart this question: Whether, when the duties levied were sufficient for the purposes of revenue, Mr. S. was in favor of adding other duties for the purpose of protection?

Mr. Stewart was understood to say in reply that he would attend to that question directly, but did not wish to be interrupted. He would now proceed to read a paragraph from the message of President Jackson, by way of refreshing gentlemen's recollection as to what had been the opinions on this subject avowed by that distinguished man. Mr. S. considered the passage he was about to quote as containing one of the clearest and strongest vindications of the constitutional power to lay duties, for the purpose of protection, that had ever been put forth to the world. Here it is:

"The power to impose duties upon imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust these duties, with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry, is so completely identical with that power, that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to the inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of pro-

tection does not exist in them; and, consequently, if it be not possessed by the General Government, it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely cannot be the case; this indispensable power, thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress. In this conclusion I am confirmed, as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people."—Jackson's second Annual Message.

Yet now Congress was to learn for the first time by Executive instruction that they possessed no CONSTITUTIONAL power to protect our own home industry—no power to counteract the injurious regulations of other countries—no power to protect the labor of our own citizens from the destruction which must be brought upon it by an unrestricted competition with the pauper labor of Europe; but our own hardy sons of toil must be impoverished and ground down as long as the wretched beggars under a foreign Government were compelled by their necessities to labor at lower rates than freeborn Americans. Such was the doctrine distinctly promulgated by the President in his Message, and especially by his Secretary of the Treasury. Well might they be called extraordinary, for such they certainly were. Were the American people prepared to sustain opinions like these?—Would they subscribe to the dogma that their own Government had no power to protect them? That was the doctrine—there was no evading it; and Mr. S. desired to know whether this committee were prepared to give it the impress of their sanction?

This, however, was but one of the extraordinary doctrines in this most extraordinary production. It contained others equally strange, equally new, equally pernicious in tendency, equally destructive in practical operation. Would the people believe it? This document from the Secretary recommended the imposition of an excise on American manufactures—to take the duties off British goods, and put on the American.

Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee, here again interposed, and as the gentleman was speaking a great deal about the protection of our home industry and domestic manufactures, Mr. J. desired to ask him another question. When the Government protected these manufactures, who paid? And if all were protected alike, what benefit was there in the protection?

Mr. Stewart resumed. The gentleman asked him who paid? The gentleman and his friends held the doctrine that the consumer always paid the duty, and the Secretary told the nation that the poor man was taxed eighty-two per cent. on cotton goods over the rich man. Yes, this poor man seemed a special favorite of the honorable Secretary: He had introduced him ten times in the course of two paragraphs of the report. His sympathy was greatly excited that this unhappy "poor man" was taxed one hundred and fifty per cent. on his cotton shirt because there was a specific duty on "imported cotton goods of nine cents a yard. Now, if this specific duty of nine cents amounted to a hundred and fifty per cent. *ad valorem* that fixed the price of the cotton to the "poor man" at six cents a yard, for nine cents was just a hundred and fifty per cent. on six cents. So the practical effect of the horrid tax was, that this "poor man" got a good shirt at sixpence a yard. And Mr. S. would tell the gentleman another thing. When those most abominable minimums, which so excited the wrath of the Secretary, had first been introduced in 1816 by William Lowndes—one of the purest patriots and most intelligent statesmen that had ever graced these legislative halls, and sustained too, by John C. Calhoun, scarcely less distinguished—India cotton goods, of the very coarsest quality, known to every lady at the time by the name of hum-hums cost thirty-three cents a yard; so that the "poor man" would then have had to pay four dollars for twelve yards of it, and the effect of the infamous minimums had been that every poor man in the country could now get a better article for six and a quarter cents. That was the way the people were taxed and oppressed by the protective system; and this was the manner in which the "poor man" was ground down to the dust to benefit his rich monopolist! The Secretary persuaded this poor man that he was taxed eighty-two per cent. more than the rich man, and this was quite insufferable, yet he paid only six cents for what formerly cost him thirty-six cents, and of an inferior quality at that. On that thirty-six cents protection laid a duty of nine cents, which was but twenty-five per cent. *ad valorem*.

These dreadful minimums had, in their practical consequences, given the farmers a market, given their children employment, made their cattle profitable, filled

the country with the hum of contented industry, and had brought down the price of the poor man's clothing from thirty-six cents a yard, down—down—down, as the system proceeded, till at last it gave it to him at six cents a yard. Now the Secretary cried out that the duty on these cottons was a hundred and fifty per cent. *ad valorem*! Enormous! Horrid! And why? The duty had not changed, but the price had. As the price went down the duty went up. At thirty-six cents per yard, nine cents duty would be twenty-five per cent. at six cents a yard, the duty would be one hundred and fifty per cent.; and if the price descended to one cent a yard, then the duty would be nine hundred per cent.! The poor man robbed, plundered, and oppressed by a duty of nine hundred per cent., simply because he gets a yard of cotton goods for one cent a yard! Let the manufacturer run up the price to thirty-six cents again, and the oppression is all over; the duty of nine cents a yard falls instantly to twenty-five per cent., a moderate revenue duty. No more complaint; these friends of the "poor man" are perfectly satisfied.

Such was the practical operation of these odious minimums which had reduced the poor man's cotton goods from twenty-five and thirty cents per yard to six and eight cents. Yet this was the system which must be given up; this was the operation that was so oppressive and so unconstitutional that it must be suffered to exist no longer upon our statute book! The duty was to be taken off the foreign goods and put upon American manufactures; such was the doctrine of this report.

Mr. Johnson, of Tennessee, here again asked Mr. Stewart, if the tariff brought down the prices of articles taxed, what was it that brought down the price of other goods in the same proportion.

Mr. Stewart replied that such was not the fact. Other goods not manufactured here, silks, velvets, &c., had not declined in the same ratio, nor had wages or agricultural produce; because the protective tariff had increased the supply of domestic goods by increasing competition, and had sustained wages and agricultural produce by creating an increased demand for both. If the gentleman could comprehend that demand and supply regulate price, it would be all plain.

When interrupted, he had been contending the doctrines put forth by the Secretary in his report. He had referred to a table which had been reported to the House last session by the Committee of Ways and Means, for the purpose of showing the enormous tax which was imposed by the system of minimums, but when the Secretary, by the assistance of the honorable chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, was preparing with great labor and pains this document, he seemed to forget that he was at the same moment furnishing mathematical proof of the exact extent to which protection had reduced prices. By converting specific into *ad valorem* duties, the duty runs up precisely as the price runs down, so, by showing an increased rate of duty, the gentlemen have only shown reduced prices.

The duty is fixed, and cannot vary.—The *ad valorem* duties are always the same. None were imposed by the tariff of 1842 above 50 per cent. How, then, does the President, in his message, get duties of 200 per cent. This can only be done by converting the specific duties into *ad valorem* duties; and, when this is done, a high duty only shows a low price. If the duty is 200 per cent., the price must be one-fourth only of the duty. Thus we are told that glass pays the enormous duty of 200 per cent., and why? Because the duty is \$4 per box, and the price \$2 per box; but if the glass went down to \$1 per box, the duty would be 400 per cent. Thus we are told by the Secretary of the Treasury and the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means that the people paid in all a tax of eighty-four millions, of which but twenty-seven went to the Government, and fifty-seven to the manufacturers; and he gave a list of sixty or seventy articles on which the duty amounted to more than a hundred per cent. Very well, and what did this prove? Why, simply that the prices of those articles had been greatly diminished, as in the case of cottons. The same duty which, when levied, had been but 25 per cent., had now become 150 per cent., simply because the price had gone down to one-fourth part of what it was. So the main result of all the labor and ephering of the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means had been to furnish to the whole country official demonstration that prices had been reduced by a protective tariff to one-fourth or one-fifth of what they had been in 1816. Take a plain illustration: the tariff imposed a duty of four cents per pound on nails which in 1816 had been 16 cents per pound; so that the duty then 25 per cent. on the price; but the same duty, we are told in this report, is 100 per cent., and how so? Because the price had fallen from sixteen cents to four cents per pound. Very oppressive on the "poor man," who has thus now to pay 100 per cent. on nails! The explanation of all this was perfectly plain and easy. The effects of competition

and of American industry had increased the supply, and by an increased supply, in this as in all other cases had reduced the price of glass, cotton, &c. whilst it had rendered the whole neighborhood prosperous by the increased demand for all the productions of the farmers.

Mr. S. thanked the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means for his document; it had furnished to him and to the country undeniable proof, from the highest authority, to what an extent prices had been reduced, inasmuch that the duty on one article, though reasonable at first, had now risen to three hundred and eighty-nine per cent. *ad valorem* brought about solely by the reduction of price.—Mr. S. defied escape from this position. Let any gentleman take the report and examine it, and the more they examined, the more they would be convinced that this was a true explanation of the whole matter. Yet this was held forth for the purpose of exciting alarm; it furnished a topic for popular declamation; it might persuade the "poor man" that he was greatly oppressed, because he paid a tax of two hundred per cent. on his window glass fell to a dollar per box, he would be taxed four hundred per cent., or if by any improvement in the manufacture he should be enabled to get his glass at fifty cents a box, why then he would be paying the enormous unheard of tax of eight hundred per cent. This same "poor man" of the Secretary sometimes wanted to buy a few nails, and the Secretary alarmed him by the intelligence that nails were taxed a hundred per cent. on their value. So they were, but what did he pay for them? He used to pay sixteen cents a pound, but this wicked oppressive tariff had brought them down to four cents. Now, who did not see that if a specific duty of four cents a pound on nails amounted now to a hundred per cent., should nails be brought down to a cent a pound, the duty would be four hundred per cent.? What an oppression to get nails at a penny a pound! Surely the "poor man" was likely to be utterly crushed and ruined.

Mr. S. said he had wished to point out some other of the extraordinary doctrines contained in this paper of the Secretary, and there was one which startled the country; it was covered up in cautious language, but when the veil was drawn aside, and the truth exposed, he again warned gentlemen that it would stir the country. The free trade Secretary had recommended an excise on American manufactures. Yes, that was the protection he had provided for American industry. It was to take off the duty from foreign manufactures, and put it on our own. Hear him:

"In accordance with these principles, it is believed that the largest practicable portion of the aggregate revenue should be raised by maximum revenue duties upon luxuries, whether grown, produced, or manufactured at home or abroad."

Let mechanics and manufacturers hear that. Every American artisan should hear it. The duty was to be on a tariff, &c., whether grown, produced, or manufactured at home or abroad." Here was an American Secretary distinctly recommending to levy the highest rate of revenue duties on goods manufactured at home. What else was an excise than a tax on the manufactured goods of this country! Yet this was the Secretary's recommendation. How would American manufacturers like it!

Both in the message and in the report the Administration had given its own definition of what, according to its understanding, was a revenue standard of duty; and this was the language of the President's message:

"The precise point in the ascending scale of duties at which it is ascertained from experience that the revenue is greatest, is the maximum rate of duty which can be laid for the bona fide purpose of collecting money for the support of Government. To raise the duties higher than that point, and thereby diminish the amount collected, is to levy them for protection merely, and not for revenue. As long, then, as Congress may gradually increase the rate of duty on a given article, and the revenue is increased by such increase of duty, they are within the revenue standard. When they go beyond that point, and, as they increase the duties, the revenue is diminished or obstructed, the act ceases to have for its object the raising of money to support Government, but for protection merely."

Here was the rule by which duties were to be laid. The moment an American manufacturer had succeeded in supplying our own market, and began to thrive in his business, that would be a proof that the duty was too high for revenue; it was no longer a revenue duty but a protective duty, and it must forthwith be reduced. As the American furnished more goods to the country, less foreign goods would be imported, revenue would be diminished, and the duty must come down: that was the rule. And now Mr. S. would ask, under such a rule as this, what man in his senses would invest a dollar in manufactures? What was the prospect before him? The moment when, by industry and enterprise, he should succeed in getting the better of his foreign