

Jeffersonian Republican.

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

VOL. 9.

STROUDSBURG, MONROE COUNTY, PA., THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1848.

No. 16.

Published by Theodore Schoch.

TERMS—Two dollars per annum in advance—Two dollars and 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 proprietor, will be charged 37 1/2 cents, per year, extra. No papers discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the Editor. Advertisements not exceeding one square (sixteen lines) will be inserted three weeks for one dollar, and twenty-five cents for every subsequent insertion. The charge for one and a half squares is the same. A liberal discount made to yearly advertisers. All letters addressed to the Editor must be post-paid.

JOB PRINTING.

Having a general assortment of large, elegant, plain and ornamental Types, 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 dispatch, on reasonable terms. AT THE OFFICE OF THE

Jeffersonian Republican.

The following appeal to the Laborers of Pennsylvania, by HORACE GREELY, editor of the New-York Tribune, we commend to the consideration of every voter in this County.

To the Laborers of Pennsylvania. MEN AND BRETHREN!

For the familiarity of this address, I make no apology and ask no pardon. Your State is the chosen home of my kindred. I have worked on her soil and as a mechanic among her sons. She embosoms all I own of this earth's surface but a grave. But more than this—she has been my teacher in the noble science of National Policy. When but a child I listened to the words of wisdom that fell from the lips of her SYDNEY, her TAD, her BALDWIN, her FORWARD, as from her chair of State and from the halls of Congress they appealed to Intelligence and Patriotism in behalf of the policy of PROTECTION TO LABOR. In those early days, Pennsylvania spoke with no divided, no double voice. She was the citadel of Democracy, and Protection was then Democratic; but on this subject Pennsylvania knew no party. Her Ingersolls and Dallases then were not the Charles J. Ingersolls and Mifflin Dallases of this day.— They stood together for the interests of their State and of Labor everywhere. New-York may have been distracted by glittering dreams of commercial magnificence, and Boston was entirely under the sway of the Free Traders, when Pennsylvania taught me that the prosperity and true glory of a young Nation like ours were to be sought, not through War and extended dominion, not through vast Commerce with its gigantic fortunes for the few and hopeless bankruptcies of the many, but through a devotion of its intellect and its energies to the steady encouragement of Useful Labor by calling into existence new branches of Productive Industry, by fostering to vigorous maturity those yet infant and feeble, and by so adjusting its Duties on Imports that the fluctuations of Foreign Markets, the oscillations of Foreign Policy, shall not deprive any portion of our own People of Employment and Bread. Years have passed since your State taught me these truths, during which experience and study have combined to convince me more and more firmly of their soundness and importance. They tell me that my teacher has apostatized; but I know better. She cannot so suddenly and immolately herself. Deceived and confused she has temporarily been by men whose path to personal aggrandizement lay across that dictated by her principles and her interests, but she is still unchanged in conviction as uncorrupted in heart. I speak to her as she was and is; her betrayers shall answer for what she has seemed to be.

I do not propose to argue to you the policy of Protection; that were needless; but I will forestall cavillers by stating concisely what it is:

We who stand for Protection maintain that a Nation large and prolific as ours ought to draw upon its own internal resources for all such desirable staples as may be produced on its own soil with substantially as little labor as elsewhere.— We do not, we never did, contend for buying only of each other and thence attempting to grow Cotton in Labrador or Oranges in Wisconsin. But we do insist that a nation so large as ours and so widely separated from other civilized countries commits an enormous and calamitous mistake when it permits from year to year importing its Fabrics from beyond the ocean and sending its Food thither in payment, and leaving its Ores undisturbed in their beds while it ships off its harvests in exchange for foreign Metals. We insist that to send our Cotton, Flax and Wool across the ocean to be made into Cloth for our use, even if the manufacturers shall be fed with our Grain and Pork, involves an enormous waste of Human Labor, in the expensive transportations, transshipments, &c. which would inevitably be saved by wooing the manufacturer to put up his mills and factories beside and among our farmers, thereby inducing a more thorough and diversified culture, annually fertilizing instead of exhausting (by the removal of its products) the soil, and at the same time securing to our laborers, a far greater choice of employments and higher average wages than any one vocation could possibly furnish. In short, we believe this country is now annually impoverishing itself to the extent of many millions of dollars by buying largely of the Metals, Wares and Fabrics of Europe and sending thither its Grain, Meat, &c. in return, instead of making its own Metals, Wares and Fabrics almost exclusively, and thus withdrawing its husbandmen largely from the growing of Grain and rearing of Animals to the culture of Fruits, Vegetables, &c. and the fabrication of the thousand necessities to warmth, comfort and elegance we now buy from abroad when they might easily be made at home. — O! I thought you were hostile to Commerce! says a Free Trader.— Well, Sir, you

thought wrong, as usual. A thoroughly Protective Tariff would scarcely, after a few years, reduce our importations, though it would essentially change their character. We should still buy largely from abroad, but not of articles that come in direct competition with our own products. We should buy far more of such as we continued to buy because of our greatly increased ability to buy. Thus Massachusetts, with her immensely diversified industry, now consumes more of Imports than either Carolina, because her laboring classes are better educated, better employed, better paid—have a larger circle of wants and the means of gratifying them. If every person in this country were steadily employed and fairly remunerated, the demand for every description of goods would be increased beyond all calculation.— This is the end contemplated by Protection.

—But what is the need of Protective Duties, asks a doubter, "if it be our interest to buy at home?"—Whose interest? It is "our interest" as a People that no iniquities shall be committed in the land, yet they are committed daily because individuals fancy their several interests may be promoted by that which they know to be hostile to the general interest. The fine lady does not step into a fashionable store in quest of such a dress as the public interest may dictate, but such a one as will increase her personal attractions. The lawyer who has just received \$50 for pleading the cause of an American citizen turns into a tailor's shop to expend his fee in a suit of clothes; and, though he is quite aware that if everybody would wear American cloth the general prosperity of the country would be promoted, and he, having more suits to plead, might have more to wear also, he yet says—My one suit can make no material difference—the British cloth is more fashionable and is said to be more serviceable, so I will take it—not considering that the very fact of such general preference tends to keep American goods inferior in quality and cheapness. So we go on, keeping our own fabrics in the background so far as possible by constantly insisting or conceding that they belong there.

But if England will sell us Railroad Iron for \$40 or \$50, while good American Bars cost \$60, why should we not buy of her?—For several good reasons, and among them these: Because buying mainly of our own makers would stimulate them to continued improvement in their machinery, processes, &c. and would thus unless all analogy is deceptive) soon bring down the price of American Iron, as the prices of American Pins, Cotton fabrics, Cut Nails, Wood Screws, and hundreds of like articles have been reduced. Because the money price at which the two articles are respectively sold in New-York affords no reliable criterion of their relative cost, and our Iron made at home for \$60 has really cost us less than that imported and sold for \$45. For the \$60 cost of a ton of American Iron is made up of the prices of Ore, of Wood, &c. which would have borne no value otherwise, and of Labor, Vegetables, Fruits, Butter, &c. &c. of which the money value has often been created and always largely increased by putting Iron Works in operation in the vicinity. It is my deliberate conviction that the Iron used in this country would cost the consumers far less if made here at \$60 per ton than if imported at \$45; while I am equally certain that steady and efficient Protection for twenty years would reduce the cost of American Iron at least twenty and probably forty per cent. It is not, therefore, for the sake of Iron-makers especially, but for the sake of every class of producers of wealth, that we insist on the comprehensive and efficient Protection of American Industry at every point at which foreign competition is encountered or could be effectually attempted.

Take another familiar example: The People of Illinois and Wisconsin have an excellent soil for Grain and Cattle, and are abundantly proffered Wares and Fabrics in exchange for their great staples, at prices lower, it is said, than the cost of producing the Wares and Fabrics within their own borders. But is there one rational being who imagines that their wants would not be better supplied if their State were thickly dotted with Factories, Forges, Foundries, &c. and the importation of Wares and Fabrics were forbidden? Suppose the Broadcloth now imported for \$2 should thus be made at a nominal cost even of \$3, and other Manufactures at proportional rates—what of it? Who believes that the farmers of these States would then sell their Wheat and Pork as low as they now must in order to undersell in distant markets the producers on farms adjacent to those markets? or that they would not find better use for their arable acres than growing Grain and making Pork even at double the present prices? The farm on the Western Prairies which yields barely ten dollars' worth of Wheat to the acre would, if surrounded by a thrifty manufacturing and mechanical population, readily produce fifty to one hundred dollars' worth of Fruits and Vegetables, whose bulk and perishable qualities forbid their transportation and consequently their culture at a distance from extensive markets of consumption. The Wisconsin farmer who toils early and late to raise five hundred dollars worth of Grain and Meat from his quarter-section could realize one thousand dollars from it with lighter labor if there were a Lowell or Patterson at hand, when Milk, Chickens, Apples, Cherries, Potatoes, Turnips, Wood, &c. &c. could at all times be sold for cash. And, so far from Protection being adverse to the dictates of diffusive Benevolence and Philanthropy, as is sometimes contended, I maintain that if we looked to this point alone—if we considered solely our duty as brethren of the hard-tilling, ill-fed artisans and laborers of Europe, we ought to adopt the Protective Policy, in order not so much to woo them to our shores, for they are coming rapidly enough, as to secure them steady employment and fair wages when they do come, and neither doom them to perpetual degradation and famine in the land of their birth nor to the inadequate and precarious recompense always accorded to Agricultural labor in a country where no other is pursued. If the policy which tends to place the producers of Food by the side of the producers of Clothing, enabled each to supply his

wants at first cost without paying tribute to a long line of forwarders, shippers, factors, wholesale and retail merchants, &c. be not that which true Philanthropy would dictate, then I am indeed grossly in error.

—But why, it may be asked, do I recall all this in addressing you, when I know that you understand it already, and that many of you are perfectly competent to teach Political Economy to the College Professors and theory-spinning Doctors of that perverted Science?—I do it to call your attention to the deliberate conspiracy of your would-be leaders and rulers to betray you into the power of the bitter adversaries of the time-honored convictions of your once unanimous State—to sacrifice your principles and your interests on the altar of South Carolina policy and Presidential aspirations. I ask you to look once more at the Resolution relating to this subject of the last Baltimore Conventions, viz:

"That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of Industry to the detriment of another, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country; that every citizen and every section of the country has a right to demand and insist upon an equality of rights and privileges, and to complete and ample protection of person and property from domestic violence of foreign aggression."

[RESOLUTIONS OF THE BALTIMORE POLK CONVENTION, 1844; REPEATED BY THE CASS DITTO, 1848.

He who willfully mis-states his adversary's positions evinces a guilty consciousness of the unsoundness of his own. He resorts to a dishonest stratagem because he is aware that he cannot stand in the open field of argument.— Compare the doctrine of Protection, as above stated, with the counterfeit which the concocters of the Baltimore Resolutions seek to palm upon the country. Who ever contended that one branch of Industry should be fostered to the detriment of another?—Who ever asked them to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country? Who has advocated an inequality of rights and privileges? The manufacturers of these resolutions seek by a fraudulent statement of the question to libel the friends of Protection, and to win the confidence of its enemies without provoking the hostility of the thousands who would not recognize the principle they cherished in the disguise so knavishly upon it.

To the discerning it became obvious, early in 1844, that Pennsylvania was to be swindled. Her laboring masses were devotedly favorable to the principle of Protection and to its embodiment, the Tariff of 1842; the problem proposed was to cajole her into voting for the deadly enemies of both. This was no easy task; for that Tariff not only accorded with her convictions but manifestly and signally promoted her interests. This resolution was intended to satisfy the ultra Caution interest, while it only mystified her. Before it appeared, one of your Representatives, Mr. Bidlack, representing a District at once strongly Iron and strongly Democratic, procured copies of *The Globe Prospectus* to circulate in his District, first striking out of it all that portion avowing deadly hostility to Protection and the Tariff of '42! Comment were needless.

James K. Polk was nominated at Baltimore. He was known to the intelligent as a uniform, embittered, inveterate enemy of Protection. But this was strongly denied by the journals and speakers of the party supporting him in Pennsylvania. They insisted that he was as favorable to the Protective Policy as Henry Clay! There were some among them brazen enough to maintain this in public controversies on the stump. *Schuylkill County* was the theater of one of these debates—it gave a large majority that Fall for the sham Protectionists; it has just detected the fraud and given a like majority for the other sort. Judge Christian Myers of Clarion was a Polk Elector and iron-master; he christened his new works "Polk Furnace" to testify his faith in the Protective orthodoxy of his candidate; he is now opposing Cass and the party which deceived him. Wilson McCandless of Pittsburg was another Polk Elector, and wrote a letter certifying that Mr. Polk was quite as good a Protectionist as Mr. Clay. I have not yet heard of his repentance, but, though a lawyer, I think he cannot much longer withhold it. He ought to lament in dust and ashes the deception he practiced, the mischief he has wrought.

—But there were those among you whom these assurances did not satisfy—they feared their cherished policy was to be sacrificed—they would not rest on anything short of the word of Mr. Polk himself, the value of whose word was not so well known then as it now is. Accordingly, a letter was dispatched to Mr. Polk by John K. Kane, (whom Polk has since appointed a Judge,) and who obtained the following answer:

COLUMBIA, Tenn. June 19, 1844. DEAR SIR: I have received, recently, several letters in reference to my opinions on the subject of the Tariff, and among others, yours of the 10th ultimo. My opinions on this subject have been often given to the public. They are to be found in my public acts, and in the

public discussions in which I have participated.

I am in favor of a Tariff for Revenue, such a one as will yield a sufficient amount to the Treasurer to defray the expenses of Government economically administered. In adjusting the details of a Revenue Tariff, I have heretofore 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. I am opposed to a Tariff for Protection merely, and not for Revenue.

Acting upon these principles, it is well-known that I gave my support to the policy of General Jackson's Administration on the subject. I voted against the Tariff act of 1828. I voted for the act of 1832, which contained modifications of some of the objectionable provisions of the act of 1828. As a member of the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, I gave my assent to a bill reported by that Committee in December, 1832, making further modifications of the act of 1828, and making also discriminations in the imposition of the duties which it proposed. That bill did not pass, but was superseded by the bill commonly called the Compromise bill, for which I voted.

In my judgement, it is the duty of the Government to extend, as far as it may be practicable to do so, by its revenue laws and all other means within its power, fair and just Protection to all the great interests of the whole Union, embracing Agriculture, Manufactures, and the Mechanic Arts, Commerce and Navigation. I heartily approve the resolutions upon this subject passed by the Democratic National Convention, lately assembled at Baltimore.— I am, with great respect, dear sir, your obedient servant, JAMES K. POLK.

JOHN K. KANE, Esq. Philadelphia. There is no need of dwelling on the terms of this letter. Though artfully drawn, the intent to deceive is obvious throughout. Mr. Polk has made dozens of Speeches, in Congress and on the stump in Tennessee, against the policy of Protection,—not against this or that mode or measure, but broadly against the idea of Protection at all. He knew as well as you do that the question had but two sides, of which he was on one and Pennsylvania on the other.— Yet, knowing this full well, he wrote that letter to confuse and beguile the subject so that partisans less critically circumstanced might proclaim him as good a Protectionist as Henry Clay!

I cannot doubt that a deliberate intent to deceive was the impulse to this letter. After Mr. Polk's election, and just before his inauguration, I was in Washington watching the consummation of the Texas Iniquity, and was there introduced to Mr. John K. Kane. After some unimportant conversation, I said to him, "Mr. Kane, the letter on the subject of the Tariff which you received from Mr. Polk and published, has been the theme of much comment, and has received contradictory interpretations. I think its true meaning might be settled by reading in connection your letter to Mr. Polk to which his was the answer. Will you be good enough to let me see that letter?" Mr. Kane said he had no copy of it—at least none in Washington. "Nay, but Mr. Polk is here, boarding at the same house with us, and he surely can produce your letter, if you both think proper." All was vain—the letter of Kane to Polk, which drew out the famous Kane letter, was never made public, and I presume never will be. But the practical commentary came soon enough in the appointment of Walker as Secretary of the Treasury, the bitter attacks on the Protective Policy of both master and man in their various Messages and Reports, and the passage of the anti-Protective Tariff of '46 by the influence of Polk and Walker, the thick-and-thin support of Cass, and the casting vote of Dallas. That last vote filled up the measure of treachery. The ticket had been warmly commended on the plea that, even if Mr. Polk was not entirely right, Pennsylvania had in her own Dallas a champion of her interests whose votes and speeches in favor of Protection were abundantly on record, and that his influence would suffice to arrest any measure of hostility to the policy of '42. The hour of trial came, and George M. Dallas voted with Calhoun and McDuffie in opposition to twenty-five of the twenty-six Members of Congress from your State. By his vote the Tariff of '43 was subverted and that of '46 enacted. The fruits of '46 enacted. The fruits of that change you now witness; some of them you feel. Will you now help your betrayers to triumph again?

Yours, H. G.

The Way to Get Rich.—The only way by which capital can increase is by saving. If you spend as much as you get, you will never be richer than you are. 'Tis not what a man gets, but what he saves, that constitutes his wealth.

"What is the meaning of Syntax, mother?" inquired a little girl.

"It is a tax on sin, and this is the only thing that is not taxed in Pennsylvania, was the reply

The Michtgander's Death Song.

Come Locos, come and listen,
A story I'll relate;
It happened in a valley
Of the Indiana State.
'Twas there I left the Fiddies—
The Democrats had sway—
And electioneered the harder,
When I thought of Extra Pay.
Oh Extra Pay,
You've cheered me many a day,
But now Old Zack is on our track,
And our strength is gone away.

For office under Adams
I worked it very neat,
Congratulating Henry Clay
On Hickory's defeat;
But soon as I discovered,
That he would win the day,
I surely was his firmest friend—
I wanted Extra Pay.— Chorus

From one thing to another,
And over the whole range
Of political opinion
I've "undergone a change;"
And when our party differ'd
In measures, then I would
Say, "there's so much confusion
I can't be understood."

When we kill'd little Matty,
About four years ago,
Who would have thought this party
Would fall to pieces so?
The love of public plunder
Is a great adhesive power;
Yet we are rent assunder—
We are weakening every hour.

We sent old "Rough and Ready"
With a small but gallant band,
To wage a war with Mexico,
Down on the Rio Grande;
It brought on us vexation—
Disgrace upon our name,
While it was winning for Old Zack,
Imperishable fame.

We sent our fees a leader,
We pass'd him through our fleet;
We sought for to disgrace Old Zack
By making him retreat;
We cut off his resources;—
After all it wouldn't do—
Old Zack has nobly flax'd them out,
And now he'll flax us too.

Our party gave me offices—
They cannot any more—
I'll ne'er obtain the salaries,
That I enjoyed before,
The people will not trust me;
My credit's getting low;
Our party is dishearten'd—
Our Chapman cannot crow.

The Indian sings his death-song;
He thinks with dog and gun
To enjoy a pleasant hunting ground
Beyond the setting sun.
We too must sing our death-song,
Unhappier far than they:
Salt River has no offices
To yield us Extra Pay.
Oh, Extra Pay, &c.

Loco Foco Relics.

In order to preserve some evidence of the existence of the Loco loco party from the ravages of the political earthquake, threatening to engulf it in November, we have consigned to a fat gourd the following articles of their faith as a legacy for admiring posterity:

A small quantity of the "noise and confusion" which surrounded Cass at Cleveland.

The "circumstances which prevented" him from attending.

The "change" which his mind is "at present undergoing."

The threshold, the porch, and the altar for which he expected to fight.

A spoonful of the gravy in which he rolled Mexico previous to swallowing her.

The rifle the Indian snapped at him.

The earth upon which he "first landed" in Canada.

The "whole or none."

The Life and Eulogy of Louis Philippe, beautifully bound in calf, tanned from the hide of a defunct Democrat.

The reason why he "would have voted for it," if it had come up last year.

The black cockade he wore in 1812.

The sword he broke.

The door that "closed his political professions."

The "corrupt system of general internal improvements" for which he voted.—Raymond (Miss) Gaz.

An Editor in Indiana says that "salt is an excellent thing for hogs." He adds that he has "tried it." How much did he eat?