

THE SOMERSET HERALD.

AND FARMERS' AND MECHANICS' REGISTER.

TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,
HALF-YEARLY IN ADVANCE.

IF NOT PAID WITHIN THE YEAR,
\$2.50 WILL BE CHARGED.

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

New Series.]

TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1846,

Vol. 4.—No. 40.

[From the Harrisburgh Telegraph.]

A World of Love at Home.

The Earth has treasures fair and bright,
Deep buried in her caves,
And Ocean hideth many a gem,
With its blue curling waves;
Yet not within her bosom dark,
Or 'neath her dashing foam,
Live's there a treasure equalling
A world of love at home.

True sterling happiness and joy
Are not with gold allied—
Nor can it yield a pleasure like
A merry fireside.

I envy not the man who dwells
In stately home or dome,
If, with his splendor, he hath not
A world of Love at home.

The friends whose time has proved sincere
'Tis they alone can bring
A sure relief to hearts that droop
'Neath sorrow's heavy wing.
Though care and trouble may be mine,
As down life's path I roam,
I'll heed them not while still I have
A world of Love at home.

EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECH OF HON. A. STEWART.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, May 27, 1846.

A CHAPTER FOR WORKING MEN TO READ.

Mr. Stewart's system was this: Select the articles you can manufacture to the full extent of our own wants, then, in the language of Thomas Jefferson, "impose on them duties lighter at first, and afterwards heavier and heavier as the channels of supply were opened." This was Jefferson's plan; the reverse of democratic-free trade. Next Mr. S. went for levying the highest rates of duty on the luxuries of the rich, and not on the necessities of the poor. Encourage American manufactures, and while on the one hand the poor man found plenty of employment, on the other he got his goods cheap. He could clothe himself decently for a mere trifle. He wanted no foreign commodities but his tea and his coffee, and they were free, and should remain free. The poor man could now buy cloth for a full suit from head to foot for less than one dollar of substantial American manufacture. He had himself worn in this hall a garment of this same goods, at 10 cents a yard, and it was so much admired that more than a dozen members had applied for similar garments, and they had been supplied to Senators and others; yet we are told the tariff taxes and oppresses the poor. Put high revenue duties on wines, on brandies, on silks, on laces, on jewelry, on all that which the rich alone consumed and which the poor man did not want. Take off the duties from the poor man's necessities and, give him high wages for his work. That was the way to diffuse happiness and prosperity among the great body of the people: That was good sound democratic policy. He was for lifting up the poor. He was for "levelling upward;" for increasing the domestic comfort of our own laboring population—the true democracy of the country.—The rich could pay, and ought to be made to pay, and they should pay: the poor man could not, and should not, with his consent. Mr. S. went for the system which elevated the poor man in the scale of society; that promoted equality, that essential element in all free Governments, not by pulling down the higher, but by lifting up the lower classes to their level. The gentleman from Alabama and his friends advocated a policy which would have precisely the opposite effect. Their system would truly make the "rich richer and the poor poorer." The gentleman advocated a system whose direct and undeniable tendency was to destroy competition, and thereby give a monopoly to the heavy capitalists. He would benefit those very "millionaires" of whose presence here he complained to loudly. Free trade would inevitably degrade the wages of labor in every department of industry, whether employed in the fields or in the workshops, to the level of wages in Europe; this was as certain as the ebbing and flowing of the tides. What could be plainer? Take two coterminal States—Kentucky and Ohio. Suppose in Kentucky, as in Europe, wages was 12½ cts. per day, and in Ohio, as in the U. S., 75 cents per day. Now was it not perfectly clear that, unless Ohio protected her prosperous labor, the productions of the low price labor of Kentucky, boots, shoes, hoes, every thing would come in, and compel the mechanics and laborers of Ohio to come down to 12½ cents a day, or give up their markets, quit work, buy every thing, sell nothing and get rich!—And he submitted, would not this be the effect of "free trade" with Europe? The only difference was the cost of transportation across the Ohio and across the Atlantic; and with the modern facilities of steam, a ton of iron could be brought from

Europe to this country for less than \$4; less than it would cost to cart it 20 miles on common roads. Such would be the manifest and ruinous effects of "free trade," on the wages of labor in every department of the national industry; and any reduction of protection would be a reduction of the same extent to the wages of labor.

It would degrade the free labor of this country to the miserable condition of the serf labor of foreign lands, where men were slaves—without the means of educating their children—working from the cradle to the grave, and never aspiring to any thing beyond a scanty and miserable subsistence; and such was the condition to which "free trade" must inevitably bring the now protected and prosperous labor of this great country. Pull down the walls built up by the tariff of '42 to protect and defend American labor—let the cheap productions of the low priced labor of Europe flow freely into your markets, and you must sooner or later come down to their degraded condition—moral and political. He, therefore, earnestly appealed to the laboring people of this country—the sovereigns of the land—who "made all and paid all," to come quickly to the rescue, to save themselves from the degrading and disastrous effects of "free trade." The power was in their own hands—they could protect themselves at the ballot-box, and, if they did not, they would deserve the degradation to which they would be doomed. To every candidate for office propound this question: "are you in favor of protecting American against foreign labor by a Protective Tariff?" And let his answer be conclusive. This is the remedy—the only remedy. Let it be adopted, and all will be well. He stood there the firm friend and humble advocate of the laboring man. He had been a laboring man himself; he knew their privations and had participated in their toils; and to deserve and receive the approbation of the laboring poor, of the mechanics and log cabin men of this country, would be more grateful to his heart than all the praises of all the presses of the land. It would be the crowning and cherished reward of all his efforts—the only reward to which he aspired.

Labor, productive labor, was the great source of national wealth. Its importance was incalculable. Compared with this all other interests dwindled into perfect insignificance. What is all other capital combined compared to the capital of labor—hard-handed, honest labor—the toiling millions—the great fountain of our national prosperity—look at it. Suppose we have but two millions of working men in the United States, whose wages average \$180 per year—this is equal to the interest of \$3,000 at six per cent. Each laborer's capital, then, is equal to \$3,000 at interest. Multiply this by two millions, the number of laborers, and it gives you a capital amounting to the enormous sum of six thousand millions of dollars, producing, at six per cent., three hundred and sixty millions of dollars a year.—This was the "labor capital" he wished to sustain and uphold. This was the great national industry he wished to protect and defend against the ruinous and degrading effects of a free and unrestricted competition with the pauper labor of foreign lands. He went to secure the American market for American labor. In the great struggle for the American market he took the American side. On the other hand, the gentleman from Alabama and his friends went for the British, for foreigners; for "free trade;" for opening our ports to the manufacturers of all the world; for bringing in freely the pauper productions of Great Britain, to overwhelm the rising prosperity of our own poor but industrious citizens. They went for crushing American enterprise; grinding down American labor, and putting their countrymen on a footing with the very sweepings of the poor houses of Europe; and would, in the end, bring them down to their political, as well as their pecuniary moral condition. Mr. S. was for cherishing American labor; for giving it high wages; for surrounding it with all the substantial comforts of life. Which was the true friend of the People? And yet these "free trade" advocates, from the Secretary down, professed to be the exclusive friends of the "poor man," and we are denounced as the friends of "millionaires and monopolists." We now imported fifty millions worth of British goods annually, and therein we imported twenty-five millions worth of British agricultural products—of English wool, English grain, English beef and mutton, English flax, English agricultural productions of every kind. And yet gentlemen would rise here and talk of a British market for our breadstuffs. Why, how much of this did England take? Not a quarter of a million, in all its forms!

Here was a beautiful reciprocity. Here were the beauties of free trade. Here was our equality of benefits. We took fifty millions in British goods, one-half of it agricultural produce, while she took one-quarter of a million of our breadstuffs. This was our boasted British market.—What was this British market to us?—The American market consumed annually nearly a thousand millions of American

grain; the British market one quarter of one million. Great Britain took of our flour not a twentieth part as much as Massachusetts, not a tenth part of the amount taken by the East and West Indies; not a third part as much as Brazil; not as much as the little Island of Cuba; and not much more than half as much as Hayti. Poor, miserable, negro Hayti, took last year 53,144 barrels of our flour, while England, Scotland, and Ireland together, took but 35,355 barrels of flour and one barrel of corn meal. Yet we are told, in the face of these official facts, by the Secretary of the Treasury, that we must take more British goods, otherwise she will have to pay us "cash for our breadstuffs, and, not having it to spare she will not buy as much of our cotton." What an insult to American farmers is this! As an honorable man, must he not blush for his reputation when he looks upon these facts? But what better could we expect from this American Secretary, who, over and over, in his report, denounces the substitution of American manufactures for foreign goods, and declares that direct taxation is more equitable and just than duties on foreign goods, especially in its operations on the poor! Better levy taxes on our productions than on those of foreigners! Such are the doctrines openly avowed by this Secretary to favor his miserable system of "free trade." Away with such British doctrines as these! They could never find favor with the American people while a spark of patriotism animates their hearts, or a drop of Revolutionary blood runs in their veins.

The gentleman from Alabama will no doubt discover another terrible absurdity when Mr. S. stated that Great Britain exported and sold more agricultural produce than any other country in the world. Yet it is strictly and undeniably true. Exported, not in its original form, but worked up and converted into goods, iron, cloths, &c., consisting of raw materials and breadstuffs. Great Britain exported, on an average, more than two hundred and fifty millions of dollars worth of manufactures, one-half of the whole value of which consisted of the produce of the soil. The United States took about one-fifth part of all the exports of Great Britain—being more than all Europe put together. In a report of a committee in the British Parliament, and some years ago, it appeared that the British goods consumed by the people of the different countries of Europe, France, Russia, Prussia, Austria, Spain, Belgium, &c., amounted to FOURTEEN CENTS' worth per head, while the people of the United States at the same time consumed three hundred and fifty-four cents' worth per head! This showed the immense importance of the American market to Great Britain, and accounted for her great solicitude to retain it.—It also showed the superior wisdom of the European Governments in excluding British goods by high and prohibitory tariffs; thus developing and relying upon their own resources, encouraging and sustaining their own national industry, promoting their own prosperity, and thus establishing (as we should do) their own national independence on the most solid and lasting foundations.

Mr. S. invited scrutiny into the facts he had stated; he challenged contradiction. He put them before gentlemen, and begged them to examine and disprove them if they could. He invited them to reflect upon them in a spirit of candor. To dismiss from their minds all party bias; to rise for once superior to the low grovelling prejudices of party to wake up to the great interest, and feel for the real strength and true glory and independence of their native land.

BENEFITS OF THE TARIFF TO FARMERS.

Gentlemen dwell entirely on the benefits of foreign trade. They went together in favor of importing foreign goods, and creating a market for the benefit of foreigners. Would our own agriculture be benefited by a process like this? Nothing could more effectually divert the benefit from our own people and pour it in a constant stream upon foreign labor. No American interest was so much benefited by a protective system as that of agriculture. The foreign market was nothing, the home market was every thing to them; it was as one hundred to one. The Tariff gave us the great home market, while the gentleman's scheme was to secure us, at best, but the chance of a market abroad, while it effectually destroyed our secure and invaluable market at home. Gentlemen were very anxious to compete with the pauper labor of Europe. I will tell them one fact: With all the protection we now enjoy, Great Britain sends into this country eight dollars' worth of her agricultural productions to one dollar's worth of all our agricultural productions (save cotton and tobacco) that she takes from us.

This I will prove by the returns furnished by Mr. Walker himself in support of the bill which he has laid before the Committee of Ways and Means. Now, I assert, and can prove, that more than half the value of all the British merchandise imported into this country consist of agricultural products, changed in form, converted and manufactured in goods.—And I invite a thorough analysis of the

facts. I challenge gentlemen to the scrutiny. Take down all the articles in a store, one after another—estimate the value of the raw material, the bread and meat, and other agricultural products, which have entered into their fabrication, and it will be found that one-half and more of their value consists of the productions of the soil—agricultural produce in its strictest sense.

Now, by reference to Mr. Walker's report, it will be seen that, for twelve years back, we have imported from Great Britain and her dependencies annually 52½ millions of dollars worth of goods, but call it 50 millions, while she took of all our agricultural products, save cotton and tobacco, less than two and a half millions of dollars worth. Thus, then, assuming one-half the value of her goods to be agricultural, it gives us 25 millions of her agricultural produce to 2½ millions of ours taken by her, which is just ten to one; to avoid cavil, I put it eight to one. To test the truth of his position, he was prepared, if time permitted, to refer to numerous facts. But for information of gentlemen who are such great friends to the poor and oppressed farmers, I will tell them that we have imported yearly, for twenty-six years, (so says Mr. Walker's report,) more than ten millions of dollars worth of woollen goods. Last year we imported \$10,666,176 worth.—Now, one-half and more of the value of this cloth was made up of wool, the subsistence of labor and other agricultural productions. The general estimate is, that the wool alone is half. The universal custom among farmers, when they had their wool manufactured on the shares was to give the manufacturer half the cloth. Thus we import, and our farmers have to pay, for FIVE millions of dollars worth of foreign wool every year in the form of cloth, mostly the production of sheep feeding on the grass and grain of Great Britain, while our own wool is worthless for want of a market; and this is the policy gentlemen recommend to American farmers. Yes, sir, and not satisfied with five millions, they wish to increase it to TEN millions a year for foreign wool. Will gentlemen deny this? They dare not. They supported Mr. Walker's bill, reducing the duties on woollens nearly one-half, with a view to increase the revenue; of course, the imports must be doubled, making the import of cloth twenty millions instead of ten, and of wool ten instead of five millions of dollars per annum.

This was the plan to favor the farmers British farmers, by giving them American market. Their plan was to buy everything, sell nothing, and get rich.—(A laugh.) What was true as to cloth was equally true as to everything else.—Take a hat, a pair of shoes, a yard of silk or lace, analyze it, resolve it into its constituent elements, and you will find that the raw material, and the substance of labor, and other agricultural products, constituted more than one-half its entire value. The pauper labor of Europe employed in manufacturing silk and lace got what it eat, no more; and this is what you pay for when you purchase their goods. Break up your home manufactures and home markets, import everything you eat and drink and wear, for the benefit of the farmers. Oh, what friends these gentlemen are to the farmers and mechanics and laborers of this country—no, sir, I am wrong, of Great Britain.

As a still stronger illustration of his argument, Mr. S. referred to the article of iron. Last year, according to Mr. Walker's Report, we imported \$9,043,396 worth of foreign iron, and its manufactures, mostly from Great Britain, four-fifths of the value of which, as every practical man knew, consisted of agricultural produce—nothing else. Iron is made of ore and coal; and what are the ore and coal buried in your mountains worth? Nothing—nothing at all, unused. What gives its value? The labor of horses, oxen, mules and men. And what sustained this labor but corn and oats, hay and straw for the one, and bread and meat and vegetables of every kind for the other.—These agricultural products were purchased and consumed, and this made up nearly the whole price of the iron which the manufacturer received and paid over to the farmers again and again, as often as the process was repeated. Well, is not iron made in England of the same materials that it is made here? Certainly; then is not four-fifths of the value of British iron made up of British agricultural produce? And if we purchase nine millions of dollars worth of British iron a year, do we not pay six or seven millions of this sum for the produce of British farmers—grain, hay, grass, bread, meat, and other provisions for man and beast—sent here for sale in the form of iron?—He put it to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BAYLY) to say if this was not true to the letter. He challenged him to deny it, or disprove it if he could. The gentleman's plan was to break down these great and growing markets for our own farmers, and give our markets to the British; and yet he professed to be a friend to American farmers! "From such friends good Lord deliver them!" One remark more on this topic. Secretary Walker informs us that the present duty

on iron is 75 per cent., which he proposes to reduce to 30 per cent., to increase the revenue. To do this, must he not then double the imports of iron? Clearly he must. Then we must add ten or twelve millions per year to our present imports of iron, and of course destroy that amount of our domestic supply to make room for it. Thus, at a blow, in the single article of iron, this bill is intended to destroy the American markets for at least eight millions of dollars worth of domestic agricultural produce to be supplied from abroad; and this is the American—no! the British—system of policy which is now attempted to be imposed upon this country by this British-hating Administration! Let them do it, and in less than two years there will not be a specie-paying bank in the country. The people & the Treasury will be again bankrupt, and the scenes and suffering of 1840 will return; and with it, as a necessary consequence, the political revolutions of that period.

The Consequence of Annexation.

Pennsylvania gave her vote in favor of the Annexation of Texas, which added two Free Trade Senators to the U. States Senate, by whose votes the Tariff of 1842 has been repealed, and this Free Trade system been introduced, prostrating her energy, destroying her manufactures, and her iron and coal interests. She built the gallows to hang herself, and her neck is now in the noose. The consequence of her own folly and her own wilful course.

The annexation of Texas has not only involved the Nation in a war that may cost hundred of Millions and require a direct tax upon the people to sustain, but has taken from us the means of paying it, and placed us unshorn into the hands of the Philistines. We are hereafter to become the servants and subjects of Queen Victoria. Not only our manufactures but our banking institutions will all be destroyed or rendered useless, so far as regards their aid in developing the resources and spurring the enterprise of the country is concerned. James K. Polk, the Grand Son of a British Tory, in the Revolution, George M. Dallas, and their coadjutors have sold and delivered us over to Great Britain. But whether the people will ratify the sale, or tamely submit to be bartered like oxen in the shambles, remains to be seen. We opine not.—We think that hereafter in Pennsylvania and in the north, there will be but two parties—the knaves and traitors will form one; the honest and patriotic the other; and we shall expect to see every honest man and every friend of Pennsylvania, united firmly and cordially with the determination of rectifying the wrong that has been committed, and of placing our State and her interests where she ought to be, in the lead of all others.—Pa. Tel.

The Sub-Treasury Bill.

This measure, an innovation and novelty in our administration system—once already tried and deliberately and signally condemned and renounced by the people—this offering of abstractionism has passed the Senate, and is again to vex and annoy the country. If ever a measure was demonstrated to be unnecessary and unwise, this sub-treasury scheme was shown to be so by the debate which has taken place on it. In the Senate, as well as previously in the House, the arguments against it were so unanswerable that in the former body, the able gentlemen who favored the bill did not attempt to answer them. But the "Baltimore Convention" had willed it, and reason and experience and the public convenience must yield. So the Government must set about building vaults and iron safes in which to keep secure, and free from bank contamination and risk, the treasure of the Government, its Treasury Notes.—It is about as wise a step as if a man having a peck of corn to grind, should set about building a mill for his own use.—Pitts. Gazette.

Western Produce.

The St. Louis New Era of the 14th ult., says:

"Several boats have left here recently for the Ohio river with heavy cargoes of produce. The steamers Schuykill, Tonnalouks and John J. Crittenden were the three last, all of which carried around fine freights and a goodly number of passengers. The steamer Roscoe left yesterday. She had on board 2000 yegs lead and about 800 dry hides for Pittsburg to be shipped from there to the Eastern cities; 5,000 bushels of corn for New Richmond, a short distance above Cincinnati; 360 hales of hemp, and 27 hds. of tobacco for Covington, besides various and sundry smaller lots for different points along the river. This seems like confirming the prediction long since made that Missouri would furnish tobacco enough for all the chewers and snufflers, and hemp sufficient for the use of all the rogues in the world."

The Tariff—Our Duty—Home Leagues.

To the Editor of the Daily Chronicle.—The glorious Tariff of 1842 is no more! The bill of abominations, the black Tariff of 1846, is now the law of the land—and poor Pennsylvania will soon mourn in dust and ashes the practical working of a bill concocted by one of her own sons! No less humiliating will be the recollection, that others—men of mark—betrayed her into the hands of the Philistines in 1844—and that in the hour of trial, another, upon whom she had lavished her highest honors, struck the parricidal blow! Myriads of those who shouted "Polk, Dallas and the Tariff of '42," will soon be deprived of bread under the suicidal misrule of these "betrayed friends of the Tariff," while the Plaquemine President will lavish untold millions upon his war with Mexico, subjugate the freemen of the North to the dictation of the South, and reduce them at her nod, to that level which Mr. Sevier assigns to all who labor. Thus, by the treason of Pennsylvania politicians, and at the behest of the Baltimore Convention—a power unknown to the Constitution or laws of our outraged country—our forge and furnace fires are to be extinguished—our coal mines deserted—our looms stand idle—and our commerce, flourishing under the benign provisions of the tariff of 1842, ruthlessly sacrificed in exchange for a barren and worthless moiety of Oregon. Nor is this all—our artisans are coolly told that an additional fifty millions of foreign merchandise must be annually imported to supplement these in the home market. As we now find it needful to export all the staples we can raise, to pay for our present imports, (to say nothing of a foreign debt of nearly two hundred millions,) the stock of specie accumulated under Whig legislation, must soon be exhausted, and scenes of destitution in a land of plenty, and private ruin and State repudiation be again enacted!

With such consequences of Democratic policy staring us in the face, what is the course of duty? Happily, the patriots of the Revolution have left us the legacy of their bright example. When Britain passed her stamp act in 1765, upwards of 400 of the first citizens of Philadelphia signed a solemn pledge not to import or consume British goods until the obnoxious bill was repealed. In 1773 they threw her tea into the ocean, and during the fearful struggle, our noble matrons clothed themselves and their families in the fabrics manufactured by their own native skill and industry. Let their example be hallowed in the eyes of every good friend of the Tariff of '42; and while we cheer our ingenious artisans by the assurance that we will exclusively patronize home industry, we shall at least check the drain of precious metals, and aid in preventing the derangement of our currency. Let us lose no time in forming Home Leagues, pledged to abstain, as far as possible, from all foreign articles, and to clothe ourselves entirely in American fabrics, until our corrupt rulers cease to make war upon the dearest right of the poor man—the right to labor and to live. He permitted himself to be deluded and betrayed in 1844 by the most stupendous frauds, and by the most unblushing falsehoods. Let him now be able to recognize his true friends by their American uniform, and he will be less likely to be cheated again. This policy I strongly recommended a few years since. Had it then been generally adopted, our beloved country would probably have escaped the ruin and disgrace brought upon us by the spoils party.

In such a holy struggle for our altars and firesides, we shall find a warm response in the most influential quarter. In such a patriotic effort to save the Union from a recurrence of the sad spectacles yet fresh in the remembrance of us all, we may fearlessly appeal to the women of America. They will not dishonor the noble matrons of the Revolution. Thousands will cheerfully forego the use of foreign fabrics; and by rendering those of our own native industry dear in the eyes of their sons and brothers, foil the base compact by which the honor and happiness of a now prosperous country are to be bartered away for the spoils of office, and the Union deluged with the pauper labor of Europe—sent hither to enrich the millionaire Peels, Cobdens and Crawshays of Britain—beggars America and to bring into disgrace that republicanism which the crowned heads of Europe have so long sought to destroy or dishonor. E. C.

LAMB vs SHEEP.

A lady, whose maiden name was Lamb, but who recently got married, met an acquaintance the other day, and thus addressed her:

"Ah, Sarah, so you have got married and changed your name I find."

"Yes, indeed," replied she, "and in getting married, instead of being a Lamb, I find that I have made a Sheep of myself."

"Tommy, my son, what is longitude?"

"A clothes line, daddy."

"Prove it, my son."

"Because it stretches from pole to pole."