

THE SOMERSET HERALD.

AND FARMERS' AND MECHANICS' REGISTER.

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

New Series.]

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 1846,

[Vol. 4.—No. 9.

The Heart.

The human heart—that restless thing!
The tempter and the tried;
The joyous, yet the suffering—
The source of pain and pride;
The gorgeous throng—the desolate,
The seat of love, the lair of hate—
Self-strong and self defined!
Yet do we bless thee as thou art,
Thou restless thing, the human heart.

THE TARIFF.

The following queries, in the shape of a circular, we find appended to Mr. Stewart's recent speech on the Tariff, and would invite to them the attention of our readers:—

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, Dec. 9, 1845.

DEAR SIR: Will you have the goodness to answer some, or the whole, of the following questions at your earliest convenience. The facts you communicate may be important in the discussion of the tariff question now pending before Congress. The Secretary of the Treasury has sent out several circulars to obtain facts on one side of the question, and it is deemed but right to take measures to obtain some on the other.

The whole opposition to the PROTECTIVE policy is based upon the ASSUMPTION of the fact (without proof), that PROTECTIVE duties INCREASE the prices of both domestic and foreign goods, and are therefore oppressive and burdensome to the people. Now, if this is proved to be untrue in point of fact, then the whole ground of opposition to the protective policy falls to the ground.

It is admitted that REVENUE duties, levied on articles NOT PRODUCED OR MANUFACTURED in this country, may, and generally do, increase prices; but PROTECTIVE duties, levied on articles we can furnish at home, it is contended, ultimately REDUCE the prices by introducing competition, skill, machinery, and increased supply, and that such is the universal experience on the subject.

You perceive, therefore, that the whole matter resolves itself into a question of FACTS; and it is to ascertain those FACTS that I have taken the liberty to address you. Will you then be so good as to refer to your books and bills, and FURNISH ANSWERS TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS: TO MERCHANTS, MANUFACTURERS, AND OTHERS.

1. What was the price of cotton goods, sheetings, shirtings, &c., in 1816, when the minimum duties were first imposed for their protection? What the price when the tariff of 1828 was passed, and what is the price now?

2. What the prices, at the date indicated, of calicoes, twist, yarn, &c., and are they not reduced to about one-fourth of what they were before they were protected by the tariff of 1816?

3. What was the price of woollen goods, flannels, satinetts, &c., at the periods above mentioned? and are they not now furnished of domestic manufacture for less than half the price paid when exclusively imported from abroad?

4. It is estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his report, that we manufacture 84 millions of dollars' worth of cotton goods in the United States, and I assume half that amount of woollens, what would be the effect on PRICES at home and abroad, were this immense supply destroyed or withdrawn from the markets of the world?

5. What were the prices of window and other glass in 1816, and at the dates of the tariffs of 1824, 1828, and what now? Is glass not now supplied at home for less than one-fourth of the price paid in 1816; and for less than the amount of the duty imposed for its protection?

6. What were the prices of iron, nails, and other manufactures of iron and steel in 1816? What at the other periods referred to, and what are the prices now? Are not many of these articles now made at home for one-half and one-fourth of their former price?

7. What were the prices, at the above dates, of salt, paper, and of such other articles as may seem to you calculated to show the effect of PROTECTIVE duties upon prices generally?

8. On the other hand, please state whether the articles not produced or manufactured in this country, on which duties for REVENUE merely and not for PROTECTION are levied, such as silks, velvets, laces, &c., have been reduced in price since 1816, or have they been reduced in anything like the ratio of reduction that has occurred in the prices of the protected articles? What is the reason of the difference? and is it not true that PROTECTIVE duties, in the end, REDUCE prices, while REVENUE duties INCREASE them?

9. While PROTECTIVE duties have reduced the prices of manufactured goods, has not the increased demand, resulting from the increase of manufacturing establishments throughout the country, sustained and kept up the wages of labor, and the produce of the farmer, flour, grain, provisions, &c., at as high, and in some cases even higher, rates than they were in 1816? And do not PROTECTIVE duties,

therefore, by increasing the SUPPLY of manufactured goods, while they increase the DEMAND for the raw material and bread-stuffs, enable the farmers to SELL FOR MORE AND BUY FOR LESS?

QUESTIONS TO FARMERS, MECHANICS, &c.
10. What part of the value of a yard of cloth consists of wool, bread, meat, and other agricultural products? And is not a piece of flannel, manufactured by a farmer in his own family, as much a production of his farm, and as strictly agricultural, as a barrel of flour?

11. What portion of the price of foreign hats, shoes, axes, hoes, glass, salt, &c., consists of foreign agricultural produce, raw material, and the subsistence of labor? and when we send our money abroad, to purchase these articles, do we not send it to support and enrich foreign farmers and mechanics to the injury of our own?

12. What portion of the value of a ton of pig-iron consists of agricultural produce, estimating the subsistence of men, horses, oxen, &c., employed in supplying the ore and coal, and converting it into iron? Is not seven-eighths of its value agricultural? Does not Great Britain make iron, cloth, glass, &c., out of the same materials that we do; and when we import these articles, do we not import the British agricultural produce worked up in them? And is the policy of reducing duties to increase imports, such a policy as ought to be sustained by your representatives? Your answer will inform them.

13. What proportion of the value of the whole of our foreign imports consists of foreign agricultural produce, estimating the raw material and the subsistence of the labor employed in their production? Is it not greatly more than one-half?

14. Estimating, then, one-half of the value of our imports to be agricultural produce, and our imports of British manufacture (as appears by official documents) having exceeded for ten years past FORTY MILLIONS a year, while she has taken, for the same time, of all the agricultural products of the grain-growing States, flour, grain, meat, and provisions of every kind, less than two millions of dollars' worth per year from us; does it not follow that we consume annually twenty millions of dollars' worth of British agricultural produce to two millions of the same that she consumes of ours? and ought the extension of this system of policy, by which we are made to consume TEN DOLLARS' worth of British wool, grain, and provisions in the form of British goods, to one dollar's worth she takes from us, to be advocated by the American people or their representatives?

QUESTIONS TO LABORERS AND OTHERS.
15. With our present facilities of intercourse with Europe by steam, would not "free trade" reduce the wages of labor here in every department of industry to the level of the wages of labor there? just as certainly as the removal of a wall separating two unequal bodies of water would reduce the one to the level of the other?

16. If the productions of European labor working at 25 cts. per day in making shoes, hats, cloth, and every thing else, were admitted into our ports free of duty, must not our mechanics and laborers come down and work as low as they do, or give up the market? just as certainly as that labor on one side of a street or river working at 25 cts., would reduce 75 cent. labor on the other side to its own level?

17. The message says the tariff "imposes heavy and unjust burdens on the farmer." General Jackson says, "the tariff by taking 600,000 men, women and children from agriculture, and employing them in manufactures, would create a home market for more bread-stuffs than all Europe now furnishes."

18. The message also says, duties ought to be imposed for revenue only, and whenever they are so high as to diminish imports and revenue, they ought to be reduced to the revenue standard. THOMAS JEFFERSON in his report to Congress says, the true system is just the reverse of this; he says Congress should select such articles as we can manufacture for ourselves, "imposing on them duties lighter at first, but HEAVIER and HEAVIER afterwards as other CHANNELS OF SUPPLY OPEN." The one says, as the American supply increases, REDUCE the duties so as to INCREASE IMPORTS—the other says, as the American supply increases, INCREASE the duties so as to diminish imports. Here JACKSON and JEFFERSON both stand directly opposed to Polk. Which is right?

The information sought by this letter may be addressed to any friend of the tariff in Congress, stating whether the name of the writer may be used publicly or not.

Letters are received from all parts of the country, anxiously enquiring whether the tariff will be put down or not.

From present indications, I think the PROTECTIVE policy is in great danger of being entirely overthrown. The enemies of the tariff are endeavoring to make it a PARTY question, and to rally the ADMINISTRATION PARTY against it on PARTY grounds; if they succeed, the protective policy and the present tariff must go down. Supposing it to have every Whig vote, it will require 35 administration votes to

save it. Where are they to come from? Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio, could give them—but will they do it? Not in my judgment, unless the people themselves come speedily to the rescue. Unless they promptly send in remonstrances, signed without distinction of party, against making the tariff a party question, and against the modification or repeal of the tariff of 1842, I fear all will be lost; but a prompt and patriotic appeal to Congress by the people, without distinction of party, may save the country from impending danger, and nothing else in my opinion can do it.

Yours, respectfully,
A. STEWART.

Congressional.

29th Congress—1st Session.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 2, 1846.

THE ARMY AND OREGON.

Mr. Haralson, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill to provide for the organization of two regiments of riflemen, and for other purposes; which was read twice, when—

Mr. Haralson moved that it be committed to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and that it be made the special order for Tuesday next, the 6th instant.

Mr. Houston objected to making the bill a special order. These orders were becoming so numerous already as to be embarrassing to the House in the regular order of business.

Mr. J. Q. Adams rose to address the House. He said that he ought perhaps to commence with an apology to the House for addressing it at all on this question. The state of his health was such as to render it impossible for him to enter at all on the many important questions connected with this subject, and, whatever observations he might feel it his duty to make upon it, must necessarily be brief. His physical power would not enable him to go at any length into the question.

The question now immediately before the bill making provision for raising two regiments of riflemen should be made the special order for the first Tuesday in January.

The Speaker said that that constituted one part of the question, but was not debatable. The other part of the question was on referring this bill to a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and that question was open to debate.

Mr. Adams said that he asked, that the question might be divided, and might first be put on the reference, because he presumed that there was no diversity of opinion on that point; if there was it would change the whole state of the debate.

Mr. Houston of Alabama, said, in explanation, that it was not the reference of the bill he had objected to, but its being made a special order.

The speaker further declared that the first branch of the question, viz: the reference of the bill could be decided by a majority but that to make it a special order would require a vote of two thirds.

Mr. Adams said that, if the House should refuse the reference, then he should have nothing further to say.

The Speaker said that the first question would be on the reference of the bill, and that question was debatable.

Mr. Adams then asked if he was at liberty to debate the question whether this bill should be made the special order for Tuesday next.

The Speaker replied that he could not, but that the question of reference might be debated.

Well, then, (said Mr. Adams,) I will, at the risk of being arrested for irrelevancy (which seems of late a favorite mode of preventing discussion,) speak in reality and in substance to the question of making the bill a special order—while, in form my remarks will be on the question of reference.

This measure now proposed to be referred is one, which, for a variety of reasons, is as important as any question which has hitherto come, or will hereafter come, before this House for discussion. It is difficult to speak on one of the bills relating to this subject without reference to all the others. For example: this is a bill to raise two regiments of riflemen. Now I find there has been reported in another part of this building a bill providing for one regiment of mounted riflemen. The question then presents itself to me—how are these two bills to go together? and whether they ought not to be considered together? If but one regiment only of mounted riflemen is necessary to be maintained, then it does not follow that two regiments of unmounted riflemen are needed: the one bill depends in a measure upon the other. I refer to this merely as an illustration, to show the variety of measures which are at the same time in contemplation of the House. I find further, in the same bill to which I have just alluded, an appropriation of

dollars, for the expense of any military defence which the President may deem necessary on the line of our communication with Oregon. Now the importance of that provision depends on the sum which shall be put into the hands of the President. All I infer from this is, that it is contemplated that other expenses (and in my opinion very heavy ones) must be considered as concurrent measures with the raising of these regiments of riflemen. This is not the only measure that will be necessary, and therefore it may be doubtful if there is any necessity for wasting the time of this House in discussing the question whether these two regiments of riflemen shall be raised, unless the necessity is made apparent for their employment. Why, what reason is there that two regiments or one regiment shall be raised at this time? We have heretofore gone through some measures which presented a prospect of war: we have gone through them and there has been no war. We are at a profound peace with all the world. Why then increase our military establishment? It must be recollected that the spirit which prevailed in this House two, three, or four years ago, was very different as to this matter of increasing our military force. We who were then here voted not only to prevent the increase of our military establishment, but we reduced it by very nearly one-third. That was four years ago, when the prospect of war was quite as great as now, and I will take this opportunity to say that I DO NOT BELIEVE AT ALL IN ANY DANGER OF WAR AT THIS TIME.

I do not see any testimonials of the probability of a war at this time; but, if any danger is apprehended by any gentleman here, it appears to me that the very first measure to be taken—that which should precede all military measures of any kind—is to give notice to Great Britain that we mean to terminate the existing joint occupancy of Oregon. That is the first measure to be taken—How can gentlemen apprehend war otherwise? Does Great Britain tell us that she shall take offence at the continuance of the treaty of joint occupancy? She does not, though I have heard of some question being made in England whether the joint occupancy is not a joint occupancy. Yet it is not a joint occupancy, and I have been surprised at the language held by some gentlemen on the subject. The treaty acknowledges, no occupation of the territory by either party; it is a commercial convention for free navigation, but it does not admit by either party the occupation of one inch of territory by the other. It is no occupation. But whether it is, neither party can permanently occupy the country without notice to the other to terminate the convention of commerce and trade, which would not be permitted without such convention. It is not a treaty of joint occupancy; it is a treaty for the exercise of navigation rights, commercial rights, and trading rights with the Indians. It precludes the occupation of the country by either party. Exclusive occupation cannot be assumed by either without notice. Of all the measures for assuming jurisdiction over citizens of the United States who have gone into Oregon and are there in actual possession, notice is the first thing. Twelve months after that notice shall have been given the right will accrue to the United States to occupy any part of the territory they may think proper.

In the bill which passed at the last session I myself moved, as a first section to the bill, that such notice should be given. The House did not think proper to agree to it, and passed the bill without any notice.

Mr. C. J. Ingersoll. No: It was put into the bill at the last moment.

Mr. Adams. But the bill did not pass the Senate, and so the insertion was immaterial. But it is a material fact to me, because I proposed it as constituting the first section of the bill. I declared myself ready then, and I am ready now, to give such notice. [Great sensation.] I hope it will be given, and that we shall do it as the first measure to be taken—to be followed afterwards by a real occupation of the whole territory. [Great sensation in the House and an incipient clap, which, however, was promptly arrested by the Speaker who called loudly to order.] But it is indispensable that we shall first give notice.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Douglas) says that it appears to him there is a game playing here—a remark which is quite incomprehensible to me. I shall not inquire to what the gentlemen alluded, but I confess I was very much surprised to hear that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will not report to the House such notice.

Mr. C. J. Ingersoll. I know of no member of that committee who has said so.

Mr. Douglass. I said so, because I had heard that such was their determination.

Mr. Adams resumed. I have heard it from various quarters; and, if the report is delayed much longer, I shall believe it. [A laugh.] If it is so, I shall deplore it; I shall deeply regret if a majority of that

committee shall not be ready to give that notice. All the other measures must depend on that. While we sit talking here about regiments of riflemen, and regiments of infantry, and stockade forts, and sappers and miners, and pontoniers, Great Britain is arming her steam-vessels, equipping her frigates and line-of-battle ships, and sending troops over here to be ready. I would press a resolution giving the notice THIS DAY, if I hoped that a majority of the House could be obtained to effect the measure.

Mr. Wentworth here moved that the rules be suspended to afford an opportunity for such a motion; but the motion was pronounced to be out of order.

Mr. Adams resumed. I feel myself scarcely authorized to hope that I should be successful should I make the motion. But for this I would have moved it on the first day of the session. Because I have so profound a sense of the duty of adhering to treaties, I feel debarred from the least act of hostility, or even from meeting hostility manifested elsewhere, till notice shall have been given. While our convention remains, I will vote no increase of the army or navy, no fort or stockade, no rifleman, no sappers, or miners. All must depend on that. If this bill shall be made the special order for Tuesday day, I hope it will be arranged by the gentlemen who manage the business of this House, that the question of giving notice shall come up on the same day, and shall be taken up before any thing else. It is mere wasting of time, and whistling to the wind, to talk about raising a military force until our conscience is clear from the obligation of the convention.

And it does not follow that, if we give notice, there must of necessity be war; nor does it even follow that we shall then take possession. It will only be saying to Great Britain: After negotiation twenty years about this matter, we do not choose to negotiate any longer; we shall take possession of what is our own; and then, if to settle the question what is our own, you wish to negotiate, we will negotiate as long as you please. We may negotiate after we take possession. [Much laughter.] That is the military way of doing business. [Great sensation.] When the great Frederick came to the throne of Prussia; his father had prepared and equipped for him an army of an hundred thousand men. Meeting, shortly after, the Austrian Minister, the latter said to him: "Your father has given you a great army; but our troops have seen the wolf; yours have not." "Well, well," said Frederick, "I will give them an opportunity to see the wolf." Frederick then added in his memoir: "I had some excellent old pretensions to an Austrian province which some of my ancestors had owned one or two hundred years before, and I sent an ambassador to the Court of Vienna stating my claim, and presenting a full exposition of my right to the province. The same day my ambassador was received in Vienna I entered Silesia with my army." [A laugh.] So you see that, on the very day his army entered Silesia, he gave notice to the Court of Vienna that the convention for the joint occupancy of Silesia was ended. [Loud and prolonged laughter.]

I say therefore, that I hope the first measure adopted by Congress will be to give, in the most solemn manner, the notice to Great Britain which the treaty requires; then the coast will be clear for us to do what we please. It does not, I repeat, it does not follow as a necessary consequence that, because we give this notice, we must take possession, though it is my hope that we shall. It does not necessarily draw after it a war; and if Great Britain chooses to take such notice as an act of hostility on our part, and forthwith commence hostilities on hers, we have been told that we shall all be but one party, and God Almighty grant that it may be so! If it shall be so, the war will have less of those very extraordinary horrors which my friend from South Carolina (Mr. Holmes) has now just discovered notwithstanding the extreme military professions which he manifested on this floor last year.

The gentleman was a most valiant man when Texas was in question. But I shall draw no comparison as to what we witnessed then and what we see now; but this I will say, that I hope, if war shall come—which God forbid, and of which I entertain no fears at all: the whole country will have but one heart and one united hand. And of this I am very sure in that case Great Britain will not long occupy Oregon, or any thing else north of the Canada line. [Great sensation, and incipient indications of applause.] But if you will agree to give notice, strong as is my horror of war, and of all military establishments, if there should then be the breath of life in me, I hope I shall be willing to go as far as any in making any sacrifice to render that war successful and glorious. I can say no more. But, till notice is given, I am not prepared to vote any preliminary measure of a military kind. I suppose, however, that we may, without giving notice, extend our laws and our protection to our brethren who have settled at least in that part of Oregon which is not claimed by Great Britain;

but there can be no need of increasing our army and our navy in order to do that. I hope that such an act will not be offensive to Great Britain, and that she will not think of going to war about it.

But, if we are going to take actual occupation of the country, then some additional force will be needed to our army, and in that case, however unwilling I have ever been to increase our military establishment, I think I should get over my difficulties, especially if a disposition should be manifested by Great Britain to take offence at the measure I have just mentioned. All our military preparation must depend on notice to Great Britain; we must not have our hands and feet bound; the obligations of joint occupancy must be dissolved, and we left free to act according as the interests of our country may require.

I believe it will not be necessary for me to refer to any other part of this subject. There have been, as I understand two applications made to this House by fellow citizens of ours, settled beyond the Rocky Mountains, for the protection of this Government. The Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (Mr. C. J. Ingersoll) presented, as I think, one memorial, while another from a different quarter is also before the Territorial Committee—possibly it is a copy of the same.

Mr. C. J. Ingersoll. No: they are different memorials, from different persons.

Mr. Adams. I think it is time this House should consider what are their duties to our countrymen there. I confess that I know them very imperfectly. I have of course seen the reports of Lieutenants Wilkes and Fremont; they contain much valuable information; but that sort of information, which we now want it was not the object of those expeditions to obtain. I am in favor of protecting these persons as far as we can.

I believe I have now said all that is at present necessary. I have said perhaps more than I intended; I am not able to go further. The most important point I wish to state is, that to give notice should be our first measure. Then let us prosecute our military preparations, and our own territory, by stockade forts and such an increase of our military establishment as may be necessary; but I am against all other measures unless that is done first.

Mr. Farn, of Ohio, moved to suspend the rules for the purpose of offering a resolution which he held in his hand, but the House, without hearing it read, immediately adjourned.

IN SENATE.

December 30, 1845,
OREGON.

The following resolutions offered yesterday by Mr. Hannegan, coming up:

1. RESOLVED, That the country included within the parallels of forty-two degrees and fifty-four degrees forty minutes north latitude, and extending from the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean, known as the Territory of Oregon, is the property, and part and parcel of the territories of the United States.

2. RESOLVED, That there exists no power in this Government to transfer its soil and the allegiance of its citizens to the dominion, authority, control, or subjection of any foreign Power, Prince, or Sovereignty.

3. RESOLVED, That the abandonment or surrender of any portion of the Territory of Oregon would be an abandonment of the honor, character, and the best interests of the American people.

The resolutions having been read—Mr. Hannegan rose and said that, as the Senate was not at present full, he would ask that these resolutions be made the special order for some future day, and he would name next Monday week as the day.

Mr. Archer suggested to the Senator from Indiana that sufficient time ought to be allowed, before the resolutions were brought up for final action before the Senate, that they might be printed and reflected upon, not only by Senators, but by the community. He thought it would be better to prolong somewhat the time named by the Senator, and to order that the resolutions be printed.

Mr. Hannegan thereupon moved that the resolutions be printed, and made the special order for the third Monday in January.

Mr. Calhoun said he did not rise to oppose this motion, but to request that the Senate would permit him to make a few prefatory remarks before submitting the amendments he intended to move to the resolutions now before the Senate.

Mr. President, (said he,) though I cannot give my support to these resolutions, I am very much gratified that they have been moved by the Senator from Indiana. Whatever objections there may be to them, they have at least the merit of being direct, open, and manly. They deny, in direct terms, the authority of this Government to make a treaty in reference to the Oregon territory, and denounce, as I understand them, by implication, the propositions that have been already made by our Government to settle the boundary by a division along the forty-ninth parallel.