

Jeffersonian Republican.

THE WHOLE ART OF GOVERNMENT CONSISTS IN THE ART OF BEING HONEST.—Jefferson.

STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA., THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1844.

No. 24

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
SCHOCH & SPERING.

TERMS.—Two dollars per annum in advance—Two dollars a quarter, half yearly—and if not paid before the end of the year, two dollars and a half. Those who receive their papers by a carrier or stage drivers employed by the proprietors, will be charged 37 1/2 cts. per year, extra. No papers discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except the option of the Editors. Advertisements not exceeding one square (sixteen lines) will be inserted three weeks for one dollar; twenty-five cents for every subsequent insertion; larger ones in proportion. A general discount will be made to yearly advertisers. All letters addressed to the Editors must be post paid.

JOB PRINTING.

Having a general assortment of large elegant plain and ornamental Type, we are prepared to execute every description of

FANCY PRINTING.

Cards, Circulars, Bill Heads, Notes, Blank Receipts,

JUSTICES, LEGAL AND OTHER

BLANKS,

PAMPHLETS, &c.

Printed with neatness and despatch, on reasonable terms AT THE OFFICE OF THE

Jeffersonian Republican.

From the Carlisle Pennsylvania Statesman—Sept. 19, 1844.

DICKINSON.

Proceedings of the Democratic Tariff Meeting.

At a large and respectable meeting of the Democrats of Dickinson township, friendly to the Tariff of 1842, held pursuant to notice, at TRENKLE'S tavern, on Saturday the 31st of Aug., JOHN MOORE, President—Capt. JACOB CHESNELL, HENRY LYNCH, JACOB BLYLER, PETER UTZ, PHILIP PARLET, JOHN MCKINNEY, and HENRY SMITH, Vice Presidents—Martin Snyder, Secretary—the following proceedings were had: The committee appointed at the former meeting to address a letter to the Hon. JAMES K. POLK, make report that they had addressed the following communication to him, that five weeks have elapsed, and that no reply has been received:—

CARLISLE, July 22, 1844.

HON. JAMES K. POLK.

DEAR SIR:—At a meeting of the Democrats of Dickinson township, of this (Cumberland county, Pa.) the undersigned persons were appointed a committee, to address you on the subject of the tariff, and enquire

1st. Are you in favor of the tariff of 1842. 2d. Would you, if elected support that act as it is, without modification, or would you be in favor of modifying it.

With every desire to support and uphold the democratic nominees, we most respectfully request a distinct and positive answer to the above interrogatories.

Very sincerely, Your most obdt

Humble servts.,

THOMAS C. MILLER, HENRY T. WILSON, HENRY LYNCH, FRANCIS HUTCHINSON, JACOB BLYLER, JOHN MOORE, MARTIN SNYDER, JOHN MYERS, JOSHUA SELLERS, BENJAMIN PEPPER, MONTY DONALDSON.

Whereupon the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously agreed to, as the declared sentiments of the meeting.

We profess to belong to the democratic party, and we cherish the principles of that party, as taught to us in the lessons of our youth and the reflections and practices of our more mature years:—we cherish them as sure safe-guards of our republican institutions and a certain guarantee of political freedom:—we cherish them, more especially because they are the true and only system by which practical effect is given to the opinions, wishes and interests of the people. Our intimate connection and long habits of association with the members of that party, cause us to look with most unfeigned regret upon the false position in which it is placed. To maintain a tariff for the protection of American industry, is, at this moment, the most interesting and desirable principle which occupies the minds of the people of Pennsylvania, and it is the almost universal desire and wish of the democratic party to support and maintain it: and yet accident, or perhaps design, has thrown us into the false position of being obliged to abandon our principles, or vote for a man for the highest office in the government who is directly opposed to the hopes, wishes and interests of the democratic party. We are determined that we will do neither. In taking the important step which we are about to do, it is respectful to our democratic friends, with whom we have heretofore acted, that we should declare the reasons which impel us to this course.

We look upon a permanent and protective tariff, one which will give security to free American labor against the influence of British cheaper labor, and the ingenuity with which it is used by the English Government to break down our agricultural and manufacturing capital, as the most important political interest which the people of Pennsylvania now have, and one which is advocated by nine tenths of the democratic journal of the State. The Hon. JAMES K. POLK, the candidate of the party, has declined to answer our respectful inquiry upon this subject, from which our worst fears with regard to his opinions have been realized. The declarations from his own mouth are stronger proof to us of the opinions of Mr. Polk, than the declarations of designing men who would

gain our votes, secure their offices, and sacrifice us.

Can we as Pennsylvanians, can we as democrats, support the man who is thus hostile to all our views, all our principles? What can we hope from an administration such as his would be? The hand of destruction would be laid upon us, and we would again be brought to the footstool of British influence and power, and live by the labor of British hands. We cannot, we will not sacrifice all we hold dear on earth, to maintain the pride of a party name.

Therefore, Resolved, That we cannot support the election of James K. Polk to the Presidency of the United States, because he is opposed to a Tariff for protection.

Resolved, That we feel the most earnest desire and anxious wish to preserve the purity of the democratic party; and that we are most firmly convinced that designing men have now placed the party in the false position of giving support to a man who is hostile to their principles and their interests.

Resolved, That we call earnestly and anxiously upon the Democratic Party of Pennsylvania, individually and collectively, to look seriously at the attitude in which they are placed, and view the elements of destruction which now threaten to prostrate them as a prey, and to sacrifice the interests of the country.

On motion, Gen. T. C. MILLER, MONTGOMERY DONALDSON, Esq. and Dr. JOHN W. SHRIVER, were appointed a Committee to prepare an Address to the Democrats of Cumberland county, expressive of the sentiments of the Meeting, and containing the reasons for not supporting the nominee of the Party for President, at the coming election.

The Committee reported the following Address, which was unanimously adopted:

To the Democrats of Cumberland County.

Fellow Citizens:

You allege that you are Democrats, and in favor of a Tariff. Do you also consider, that on this measure is based your most important Agricultural and Manufacturing interests? or do you merely handle the name as an instrument of political warfare, and to gain political popularity? Have you studied well into its effects; considered the impulse that such a measure will give to domestic industry; the markets it will create for domestic products; the sources opened for the profitable employment of our capital labor; the occupations it will afford to all classes of the community; and the reverse of all this that the want of such an act would create? Or do you merely hold it up as a beautiful object to dazzle and bewilder the multitude, and entice the unwary to vote for a political individual, and the empty name of an important measure? Have you held out to the people for years past that your motto was "Measures, not Men," and do you now support a MAN and a MEASURE hostile to each other, and the MAN in preference to the MEASURE? Has there been no sincerity in your motto; or have you found it a bad one? If so, why speak of measures? Why not vote for the Man, for the honest reason that he is the nominee of the Party? If we support our candidate for the Presidency, let us do it on honest grounds. If we support him for his principles, let us do it for the principles that he himself says are his, and not for those that others attribute to him contrary to his own expressions and acts. Let us not support him as a friend of the Tariff, for this is now a bold, palpable insult to the intelligence and understanding of the People. But if he must be supported—and supported on principles—let his principles be defended, and the Tariff proved to be a bad policy. It is gross hypocrisy to palm him off longer as a friend of the Tariff, when his acts, his votes, and his own words prove that he is not.

Review candidly with us his acts, votes, and speeches, and, divested of party prejudice, determine whether Mr. Polk is in favor of the present Tariff, or any one that is protective in its general features, and then we leave it to you, as upright men, to act as honestly your judgments and your feelings towards this great measure shall dictate.

Why has not Mr. POLK answered the letter addressed to him from this county? The interrogatories were few and simple, and the letter respectful in its terms; ample time has elapsed, and if he was desirous of being known as a friend of the Tariff, why has he neglected this opportunity of spreading it abroad? and particularly so as the letter was from Pennsylvanians, who, as Pennsylvanians, he must have known were in favor of the measure.

But why should we be so much afraid of the truth, as not to take his previous acts and expressions as the criterion of his present opinions on this subject? Are a man's acts not significant of his opinions? How else are we to judge? We have had no intimation that he has ever repudiated them, and his late letter to John K. Kane does not require the arts of a magician to give it an interpretation perfectly consistent with the whole course of his previous political life. But setting this aside, we find that in answer to certain interrogatories, propounded to Mr. Polk and also to Mr. Jones,

during the canvass for Governor of Tennessee, so late as the summer of 1843, Mr. Polk, after giving as many arguments as he could gather together in favor of Free Trade, replies:

"I am opposed to the tariff act of the late Congress, considering it to be in many respects of this protective character, and, indeed, so highly protective upon articles as to prohibit their importation into the country altogether. I am in favor of repealing that act, and restoring the compromise tariff act of March 2d, 1833, believing as I do that it would produce more revenue than the present law, and that the incidental protection afforded by the twenty per cent. duty, especially when this would be paid in cash, and on the home valuation will afford sufficient protection to the manufacturers, and all they ought to desire, or to which they are entitled."

We find that this is the "sufficient" and "reasonable" protection that Mr. Polk alludes to in his letter to Mr. Kane.

In his speech of April 3d, 1843,—in Madison county, he remarked that "He was opposed to prohibitory and protective duties, and in favor of such moderate duties, as would not cut off importations" or that "he was in favor of reducing the duties to the rates of the compromise act, where the whig congress found them, on the 30th of June 1842." In the same speech, he says, that "the south, and he with them, had voted for the act of 1833, because it was a reduction of the rates of the act of 1828, though by no means so low, as he would have desired it to be; still it was the greatest reduction" he says "which could be attained at the time of its passage."

This bill reduced the duties so low, that it swept our manufactories away, like a wide spreading tornado; but Mr. Polk says they were still not low enough. In the same speech he further remarks: "The difference between the whig party and myself is, whilst they are the advocates of distribution and a protective tariff—measures which I consider ruinous to the interests of the country, and especially to the interest of the planting states, I have steadily and at all times opposed both."

In his address to the people of Tennessee, dated May 9th, 1843, Mr. Polk says, "I have steadily, during the period I was a representative in Congress, been opposed to a protective policy, as my recorded votes and public speeches prove. Since I retired from Congress, I had held the same opinions. In the present canvass for Governor I had avowed my opposition to the tariff act of the late Whig Congress, as being highly protective in its character, and not designed by its authors as a revenue measure. I had avowed my opinion in my public speeches that the interests of the country and especially of the producing and exporting states, required its repeal, and the restoration of the principles of the compromise tariff act of 1833. In his speech of April 3, 1839, Mr. Polk remarks: "In repeated instances, he (Gen. Jackson) recommended modifications and reductions of the tariff, with a view to a final abandonment of the odious and unjust system," which policy Mr. Polk in his letter to Mr. Kane, says he supported. So effectual he continues, "were these recommendations, and so rapid the change of public opinion, that the friends of the tariff, and even Mr. Clay, its imputed father, seized on a favorable moment to save the whole from destruction, by a timely compromise. It was the defence of Mr. Clay with his friends at the north, that by yielding a part he prevented the destruction of the whole, and in their continued and devoted support of him, the Northern capitalists have shown, that they are grateful for the fortunate rescue."

If we examine his votes in Congress we find that in 1827 he voted against the bill, and joined Mr. Crambling, (who avowed free trade doctrines,) in opposition to the bill, for the better protection of wool and woolens.

In 1828, he opposed and voted against the famous tariff bill reported by Mallory.

In 1830, he voted against the bill to prevent frauds in the importation of foreign products, and to enforce the tariff of 1823, reported by Mr. Mallory.

In 1830, Mr. Barringer introduced a resolution, to reduce the duty on coarse wool, woolsens, &c.—Mr. Polk voted for it.

In December 1832, he was a member of the Committee of Ways and Means, and reported and gave his earnest support to a bill, to repeal the existing tariff of 1828, and in lieu thereof to collect a revenue of but \$12,500,000, all by impost on foreign merchandise, at an average duty of 15 per cent., and that too to be assessed on the foreign valuation, which would probably have brought it down to 12 per cent. and lower.

On the 23d of June 1833, he voted for the motion of Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, to reduce the duty on cotton goods, costing not exceeding 15 cents the square yard, to 12 1/2 per cent. ad valorem. On the same day he voted for Mr. McDuffie's motion to abolish the duty on rolled iron.

But if additional evidence, is wanted of his hostility to a protective tariff, and his entire devotion to the principles of free trade, or what is worse, a fluctuating and constantly changing revenue tariff, examine the circumstances under which he has been presented to the democracy of the nation, as their candidate, and who were the active participants in this unexpected nomination. They were southern men advocating free trade doctrines. In addition to this we find that not only the tariff of 1842, but also every principle of protection under any form whatever, is openly and avowedly repudiated by the leading political papers,—first, and strongest, in the support of James K. Polk for the Presidency.

Has there been any thing to show a change, in the sentiments of Mr. Polk. Do you say that his letter to Mr. Kane, proves him a friend of the tariff? What is it? He says in that letter "In adjusting the details of a revenue tariff I have heretofore" (does this word show any change) "sanctioned such moderate discriminating duties, as would produce the amount of revenue needed, and at the same time afford reasonable incidental protection, to our home industry." Does any thing in this show that he has changed from what he has "heretofore" said and done. He says in the same letter "I gave my support to the policy of Gen. Jackson's administration on this subject." In order therefore to know what Mr. Polk means we must understand what Gen. Jackson's policy was,—and that he himself tells us was to reduce the tariff, "with a view to the final abandonment of the odious and unjust system." Is this the language that expresses friendship for the tariff;—and this the man that is the advocate of our interests. If he ever is in favor of such "moderate discriminating duties as would afford reasonable incidental protection," such as he has heretofore sanctioned, we have every evidence from his past acts, that they would be so moderate as to amount virtually to the free trade doctrine. But laying this aside, we have now a tariff, beneficial to our interests. Shall we run the risk of losing it, and of having another forced on us that might bring ruin as its consequence. We know not on what articles Gov. Polk would wish those "discriminating duties" should go. They might be on such things as would be no protection to Northern interests; or on a few articles of minor importance. And this would in all probability be the case, for his own words bear evidence, that his feelings and interests are both enlisted in favor of the "Planting States."

As democrats we put the question to you, which is the most democratic in principle, to remain firm to important measures long held as democratic, or to abandon the measures to vote for a man opposed to these measures, but nominated by the party. To express our honest sentiments, we find ourselves in this dilemma, either to vote for a democrat opposed to measures the most vital and important, alleged by some of our papers to be democratic; or vote for one, who is not by name a democrat, but who ever has been, and incontrovertibly is now, friendly and committed in favor, of what the party alleges to be a democratic measure,—the tariff. If we vote to support the measure, does it matter who the man or candidate is, so that he is friendly to the measure.

But can we be still a tariff party, and vote for a man deadly opposed to the measure, who if elected would have it in his power, and undoubtedly would destroy the protection of our greatest interests, on which our very support and subsistence depends. Shall we be called by the name of Democrats and relinquish our principles, or hold fast to these principles, as the very foundation of our prosperity, and enshrine them as American measures, and relinquish if required, our old and endeared party name. Which is the nobler? Which shall we do? Shall we rush blindly on to the support of a policy, insuring our own destruction? Shall we give every thing to the south and like willing slaves always succumb and yield to their dictation? Shall we for the sake of a party name, forget ourselves, our families, our country,—and madly support men, who have no sympathy with us, but who are in feeling and sentiment, united and bound to southern interests? The question comes plainly to us, shall we desert our name or our measures? Shall we support men in favor of our interests, or men opposed to them? Shall we go blindly yoked, the dupes of party, afraid to act for ourselves, led as sheep to the slaughter; and bigoted enough to take all for truth, that designing party leaders, and office seekers, who to secure their own ends, make their business to conform to any windings, however crooked, tell us or would have us believe,—or shall we act as men, who have intelligence enough to know what their interests are, and who have courage to stand openly in their defence. We have long held it as a maxim of the democratic party, that we support "measures and not men." Shall we now lose the name of democrats, if we hold firmly to our maxim, and support measures and forget men? It is for you to determine.

T. C. MILLER, MONT. DONALDSON, JOHN W. SHRIVER.

The proceedings were then offered to the meeting, and adopted by acclamation, without one dissenting vote.

Resolved, That these proceedings be published in the County papers.

(SIGNED BY THE OFFICERS.)

The Committee that addressed Col. Polk, subsequently addressed the following letter to the Hon. Henry Clay. The reply of Mr. Clay, which was promptly given, is also subjoined:

CARLISLE, Sept. 2d, 1844.

HON. HENRY CLAY.

Dear Sir:—The undersigned, members of a Committee appointed by a Democratic meeting of citizens of Dickinson township, Cumberland county, Pennsylvania, held at Cumberland Hall on the 20th day of July last, in accordance with a resolution of said meeting, addressed the following letter to the Hon. James K. Polk, viz:—

CARLISLE, July 24, 1844.

HON. JAMES K. POLK.

Dear Sir:—At a meeting of the Democrats of Dickinson township, of this (Cumberland county), the undersigned persons were appointed a Committee to address you on the subject of the Tariff, and inquire:

1st. Are you in favor of the Tariff Act of 1842. 2d. Would you, if elected, support that Act as it is, without modification, or would you be in favor of modifying it?

With every desire to support and uphold the democratic nominees, we most respectfully request a distinct and positive answer to the above interrogatories. Very respectfully, your most obedient servants, T. C. MILLER, & others.

As more than sufficient time has elapsed, and no answer received from Col. Polk, we now beg leave to propound the same interrogatories to you, respectfully requesting your answer to the same with the least possible delay. In the meantime we remain, very respectfully, your obedient servants. T. C. MILLER, HENRY LYNCH, MONT. DONALDSON, JOHN MOORE, MARTIN SNYDER, JOSHUA SELLERS, BENJAMIN PEPPER, JOHN MYERS.

Mr. Clay's Answer.

ASHLAND, 9th Sept., 1844.

Gentlemen:—I this day received your letter, addressing two enquiries to me. "1st. Are you in favor of the Tariff Act of 1842?" and "2dly. Would you, if elected, support that Act as it is, without modification, or would you be in favor of modifying it?"

I have so often, gentlemen, expressed my opinion in favor of the Tariff of 1842, that the only regret I feel is that you should deem it at all necessary to request any renewed expression of it. Nevertheless, I take pleasure in complying with your request, in saying that I am of opinion that the operation of the Tariff of 1842 has been eminently salutary; that I am decidedly opposed to its repeal; that I should regard its repeal as a great National calamity; and that I am unaware of the necessity of any modification of it. I am, therefore, opposed alike to its repeal or modification. A fixed and stable policy is what the country now most needs; and I sincerely hope that the Tariff of 1842 may be maintained, and thus afford a security for that desideratum.

I am, respectfully,

Your obdt servant,

H. CLAY.

Messrs. Miller, Lynch, Donaldson, Moore, Sellers, Blyler, Snyder, Peffer and Myers.

Strong Wish.

Mr. J. B. Battle, of the Caddo Gazette, thus prays:

"The Lord deliver us from wallops and trollops, four-footed beasts, that crawl over the mountains and long-legged blue things that fly up and down the creek and holler 'yooouk'."

Washington on Protection.

Extract from an answer to the address of the Delaware Society for protecting Domestic Manufactures, on his accession to the Presidency of the United States, April, 1789:

"The Promotion of Domestic Manufactures will, in my conception, be among the first consequences which may naturally be expected to flow from an energetic government. For myself, having an equal regard for the farming and manufacturing interests, I will only observe that I cannot conceive that the extension of the latter (so far as it may afford employment to a great number of hands which would be otherwise in a manner idle,) can be detrimental to the former."

Punch asks the following impertinent questions:—"Does a gentleman who associates with blackguards continue to be a gentleman, or degrade himself to be a blackguard? or does a blackguard become a gentleman by consorting with such?"