msa_sc2901_scm2353-0362 ©Maryland State Archives

THE KENT NEWS.

Prostra, laborat, qui omnibus, placere, studet.—"He labours vainly, who endeavors to please every one.

BY E. MANSFIELD. CHESTER TOWN, Md. $1 50 PER ANNUM, in advance.

VOL. 15 SATURDAY, AUGUST 12, 1854. NO. 15.

FARMER'S FOUNDRY!

HE subscribers respectfully announce to their friends and the public in general, that having taken the "FARMER'S FOUNDRY" in Chestertown, they now have on hand a large quantity of materials which they will manufacture to order in the best manner and at the shortest notice. They also keep constantly on hand a good supply of

PLOUGH CASTINGS,

which cannot be surpassed in neatness and durability by any manufactured in the State.

CARTS, WAGGONS, PLOUGHS &c., &c,

made to order at the shortest notice and low rates. Al kinds of

Machine Work

done in the neatest manner and at short notice, on accommodating terms for CASH.

Blacksmithing, &c.

will also be done in a workmanlike manner and of the best materials.

They would particularly call the attention of the Merchants and Farmers of Kent and the adjoining counties, to their castings—they will be sold as cheap as can be purchased elsewhere.

☞All descriptions of old IRON will be taken in exchange for work at the highest prices.

HENRY W. ERNEST,
MATHOS. BENJAMIN.
DAVID A. BENJAMIN.

Jan. 21, 1854.—tf.

"Farmer Notice."

THAT we are just receiving a few goods to keep up our assortment—Groceries, a fresh lot at old prices. Sugar at 6¼ cts., Coffee 12½ cts, N. O Molasses 31 cts.

WIRE MUZZLES,

for oxen and horses; an excellent article on hand:

GRAIN & GRASS SCYTHES,

Hay Rakes, and Forks, with a general assortment of farming implements, just received and for sale at

REES' CORNER

ja 10, 1854

Reading's Power Corn Sheller and Separator.

THE undersigned having been appointed agent, for the sale of READING'S POWER CORN SHELLER, would inform the Farmers of Kent and Queen Ann's counties, that he will fill orders, with despatch. These Shellers have been used by Judge Chambers, Dr. T. C. Kennard, John Greenwood, Esq., Sheriff, and others, to whom we refer all farmers

E. MANSFIELD,
Agent for E. J. Hyde & Co.
Kent News Office,
C. Town, April 8, '54

CRAVATS, COLLARS & HDK'FS

T W ELIASON has just opened a new assortment of Good Black Silk Cravats and Silk Hkfs. He has also Linen Collars, Umbrellas, Cotton and Linen Drawers, Merino Shirts, for sale cheap. Mar 11, '54

"NOTICE."

ONE Lever Horse Power, and three Threshers complete—now on hand and for sale low to close them off.

ABEL J. REES & Co.
Rees' Corner, July 8, '54

CLOTHING.

A LARGE assortment suitable for the Season just rec'd and for sale, by

A. J. REES & Co.
Rees' Cor. Ap. 29. '53

JUST received and for Sale, Liquors at 40 cts., warranted molasses, 25, 31½ and 40 cents per gallon, by

WM BACCHUS

May 13 1854.

JUST received and for sale, Liquors, Flour, Rice, Molasses, &c., also Hams.

WM. BACCHUS.
Chestertown, May 27, 1854. 1.

have on hand and for sale, Clothing, Flour, Grocery, Liquors, Fish Cheese, Lines, Laces, Bacon &c.

W. BACCHUS.

JUST received and for sale a lot of HAMS, weighing from 8 to 10 lb

W. BACCHUS.

July 1, 1854

JUST received at the CHEAP GROCERY and for sale, a hog-head of fine brown SUGAR, which is now going off at 6¼ cents. Call soon, for it soon be gone. A. M. RUSSELL

July 15, 1854.

THE KENT NEWS,

A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER,
Devoted to Agriculture, Politics & Gen'l News
IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY.

EDWARD MANSFIELD,
PROPRIETOR.

TERMS:

$1,50, payable in advance—$2 at the expiration of the first six months, or $2,50 at the end of the year—5 copies for $6—10 copies for $10. No subscription received for a shorter period than six months, and no paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid.

Terms of Advertising.

Advertisements not exceeding twelve lines will be inserted three times for $1, and 25 cents for each insertion thereafter. Larger ones in proportion. A liberal deduction will be made to yearly advertisers. Advertisements must have the number of times marked, or they will be published till forbid, and charged accordingly.

All communications must be post-paid.

Selected Poetry.

MY MOTHER'S BIBLE.

BY GEORGE P. MORRIS.

This book is all that's left me now!
Tears will unbidden start—
With faltering lip and throbbing brow,
I press it to my heart.
For many generations past,
Here is our family tree;
My mother's hand this bible clasped,
She dying gave it me.

Ah, well do I remember those
Whose name these records bear—
Who round the hearthstone used to close,
After the evening prayer,
And speak of what these pages said,
In tones my heart would thrill,
Though they are with the silent dead,
Here are they living still.

My father read this holy book
To sisters, brothers dear;
How calm was my poor mother's look,
Who loved God' word to hear.
Her angel face—I see it yet!
What thrilling memories come!
Again that little group is met
Within the halls of home!

Thou truest friend man ever knew,
Thy constancy I've proved;
Where all were false I found true,
My counsellor and guide.
The mines of earth no treasure give
That could this treasure buy;
In teaching me the way to live,
It taught me how to die.

SPEECH
OF HON JAMES A PEARCE
ON THE HOMESTEAD BILL.

DELIVERED JULY 17, 1854.

MR. PEARCE The proposition of the Senator from California, as I understand it, is to allow all persons described in the first section of the bill, that is, all citizens, native or naturalized, and also foreigners not naturalized, who come within the provisions of the sixth section, to enter public lands by paying twenty five cents per acre, instead of obtaining them free of cost, as the bill proposes. This modification he introduces for the reason that it is necessary to satisfy the consciences of some gentlemen who think that Congress has not the constitutional power to give away the great public domain. Sir, it is not for me to reflect upon the motives or the opinions of any member of this body; but it is difficult for me to conceive how their consciences can be satisfied by so small a provision as this.—The Senator has not assigned a solitary reason.—which would satisfy a statesman—for the project which he has just introduced; but, in this respect, he does not differ from any of the advocates of this bill; for, from the beginning to the end, I have not heard a single sentence in the nature of argument, or the semblance even of an excuse, for the introduction of this great principle, as they call it, of the homestead bill, which is to supercede the established policy of the Government under which this country has grown great and has prospered most remarkably from the very beginning. I repeat, I have not heard a solitary reason assigned for the adoption of this new principle, unless I must accept the general declaration that the public lands are to be improved by giving them away.

Sir, when the public lands were ceded by those States which had claims to them, they were supposed to be a great national estate, to be administered justly, prudently, and wisely by the Federal Government, with a view to the benefit of all the States of the Union; and in this view it was necessary that we should establish some system under which they should be sold. The resolution of October 10, 1780, adopted by the Congress of the Confederacy declared "that the unappropriated lands that may be ceded or relinquished to the United States, by any particular State, pursuant to the recommendation of Congress, &c. shall be disposed of for the common benefit of the United States." &c. Accordingly, in 1781, New York made her cession declaring that it "shall be and inure for the use and benefit of such of the United States as shall become members of the Federal Alliance of the said States"—In 1784, Virginia, by her cession, executed her deed of cession for the *common benefit* of the Union, and declared that the lands so ceded "shall be considered as a *common fund* for the use and benefit of such of the United States as have become or shall become members of the Confederation or Federal Alliance of the said States, &c., and shall *be faithfully and bona fide disposed of for that purpose*, and for no other use or purpose whatever." The cessions of the other States were similar in character and intent. The land acquired from foreign Powers being purchased by the common treasure, must also be held for the common use. In either case, the principle is clear that the lands must be disposed of *bona fide* for the common benefit.

Now, if there is any gentleman here who believe we cannot constitutionally give away the public lands, but must sell them, why, then, it must be perfectly clear to him that while it would be a gross violation of that principle to put the lands at so high a price as to prevent their sale, and to shut them up from public use, so it would be equally a violation of that principle to put them to a price so low as to be tantamount to a reasonable, fair and moderate valuation. If we are to administer these lands as a great national property, in the disposal of which all the States are to be benefitted, and the general prosperity of the country advanced, we must sell them neither at exorbitant nor at sham prices. I think twenty-five cents an acre is a sham price; we have no more right to squander the lands under the pretext of selling them, than we have to prohibit their settlement, and prevent the disposal of them for the common good of the Union, by fixing the price at an amount which practically produces this result.

The early policy of the Government in regard to the public lands was two fold in its object. The first object was to turn them into money for the use of the public Treasury. The second was to facilitate settlement, giving easy terms of purchase to persons residing in the west, and to emigrants who desired to reside there.

We began, it is true, by fixing two dollars an acre as the price of the public lands. Afterwards we reduced that price to one dollar and twenty-five cents. We went on as rapidly as our means would permit, and quite as fast as prudence would justify, in extinguishing Indian title, in doing which we have paid immense sums. Then we have provided for the survey of the lands upon a very beautiful and admirable system by which they were arranged into townships, into sections, into quarter sections, and even land off into parcels as small as forty acres. Then, after they had been offered at public sale and had not been bought at the minimum price, we allowed them to be entered at private sale by any individual who thought proper to do so, at the low rate of one dollar and twenty five cents an acre; and at a later period we adopted a general preemption system, long and much desired by the pioneer settlers on the public lands.

This was thought to be liberal policy. It was supposed to be eminently conducive to the growth and prosperity of the new States. Sir, it has been so. No one can deny it, and no one can say that their progress has been retarded in the smallest degree by our legislation on the subject of the public lands. Every one, on the contrary, must admit that our legislation has been so liberal, and generous, and paternal, that these States have advanced with a rapidity unknown in the history of nations, far surpassing the progress which the older States of this Union have made since the period of our independence, though they then possessed so much more capital, and so many more advantages.—Why, sir, how was it in 1810? In that year the State of Ohio had a population of about fifty five thousand. What is she now? Her population is over two millions; it was within a fraction of that in 1840. In forty years her population had multiplied more than forty-fold. Land her growth in every other respect was corresponding to her growth in population. She has increased in wealth; she has improved in knowledge; she has increased in everything that goes to make up the power and prosperity of a great people, or to advance individual comfort and improvement; and she stands at this day a proud result of a liberal, wise and prudent system of administering the public domain such as no other nation on the face of the earth ever exhibited. In fact, nothing is to be compared to it. But this increase great and magnificent as it has been, is no greater than that of other States of this Union which had no existence at the period to which I have referred.—Take the State of Indiana. In 1810 that state had a population of twenty-four thousand. In 1850 she had nine hundred and ninety-eight thousand. The increase of Illinois is equally marked. Her population of twelve thousand in 1810 had swollen, in 1850, to eight hundred and fifty one thousand. Wisconsin, only organized as a Territory in 1835 or 1836 and with a population of thirty thousand in 1840 is reported at the census of 1850 as having increased to three hundred and five thousand.

Sir, the forest and the wilderness have been subdued with a rapidity unknown before. All those beneficial institutions of which we boast, and all the internal improvements which characterize our country's progress, have grown up here equally, freely, and vastly more rapidly than they have in other parts of the country. What, then, is the ground of complaint? We have done nothing to retard the settlements of these new States. We have been bountiful to them in the way of gifts of lands. They have had ample donation for schools and universities. The sixteenth section in every township has been given for the use of schools. They have had five per cent on the gross sales for the benefit of roads. They have had enormous grants for internal improvements of every description. They have had some eight millions of acres within the last few years for making railroads; and to some of the owners of those railroads, I understand immense fortunes have been the result of this bounty on the part of Congress. We have given away the swamp lands to the new States in which they lay to the amount of about thirty five millions of acres. I believe within the last forty or fifty years our grants of public lands to the new States have amounted to over one hundred millions of acres. The result of all this is the unparalleled progress of which I have spoken.

Now, sir, when this is the case, what is the motive for squandering this public domain of ours? What public necessity demands it? What necessity for any particular new State demands it? What benefit to individuals makes it necessary? And above all what principle of public policy has been pointed out to justify it? Are we going to forget so soon the determination which we came to a few days ago that we would not sanction eleemosynary gifts of lands by this Government? The Senate determined that they would not. I do not know which call the majority which sustained the President's veto of the bill giving lands for the benefit of asylums for the insane holds the doctrine that such grants are unconstitutional; but at all events, they determined that this Government cannot properly give away the lands for eleemosynary purposes, even when the grants are so apportioned as to be for the common benefit of all the States in this respect. Are we, then, to give away the public lands to actual settlers, on the ground of their inability to pay for them? Besides, there is no an industrious and honest man in the United States, where labor is more highly rewarded than in any country in the world, who cannot, with his unassisted labor, in the course of one or two years, earn enough to pay for a subdivision of the public lands, on which he and his family may live with comfort and increasing prosperity. Why, then, should we adopt this system? I have not perceived, as yet, the shadow of a reason given for it.

Besides, sir I do not believe that it is desired by the people of this country.—I know it is not only not desired by, but that the bill is odious to the people of my own State. They look upon it as a gross inequality and injustice. They have seen without complaint the large grants of public land made to the new States for education, and for internal improvements, though there have been complaints in regard to the railroad grants and well founded ones, I think; but they have never been dissatisfied with liberality which has built up the new States so rapidly. There is, however, an abiding conviction, with them that this is a seizing upon and squandering of that, in which they have an equal interest with the other States of the Union; and that conviction will not be the less if you put upon the public lands the sham price of twenty-five cents per acre which everybody knows is far beneath their value.

Why, sir, during the war of the Revolution, it is known to Senators, I presume, that my State refused to accede to the Confederation because, his matter of the public lands was not properly adjusted, and they only entered into it in February, 1781, after Congress had passed a resolution calling on the States to cede their wild lands for the common benefit. The resolutions of the Legislature of Maryland, adopted in 1779, set forth the grounds of their objections to the retention of these lands by the States which then laid claim to them and amongst others was the very evil which is now about to be reached and practiced under this bill. They objected that the States retaining these lands might put down the price far too low, might fix it at a nominal sum, and thus endeavor to drain, and, perhaps, succeed in draining the old States of their population. To that immigration which would follow naturally upon the wise and liberal system of administering the public lands to which I have referred, they did not object; but to anything beyond that they did object, and they object now. They feel now as they felt then, that this property cannot be squandered, or given away—which is squandering it—except with gross injustice to them.

Well, sir, it is proposed not only to give these donations to our own fellow-citizens, but to give them also to foreigners, who are unnaturalized. That increases the injustice, and renders it still less a measure of common benefit to all the States; for you will observe, sir that under whatever pretext of its universal application this bill may be advocated, it is manifest that not one man in a hundred in the old States can avail himself profitably of the opportunity which you here profess to afford him to settle upon the public lands. There are great bodies of hard working, industrious, honest men in the country, in the new States as well as in the old, skilled in particular arts and trades, who have no capacity for, and no desire to engage in agricultural employment, who cannot avail themselves of this measure, and can derive no benefit from it. They cannot give up the trades which are their sole means of obtaining a livelihood. They do not desire to do so.—They wish to know why you adopt a system which, in practice, however different the hypothesis may be, will result in grants of the public property to one set of individuals, and a denial of it to them. Sir, it is a reasonable objection. If we are to have these large sets among the people, and I consider this to be nothing less, let them be scattered broadcast among all, so that every one may not only have a legal opportunity to get his share of it, but may have an actual and practical opportunity to avail himself of the benefits of it. That they cannot do under the system proposed in the bill or the amendment.

But, sir, you propose to bring in foreigners who are not naturalized. This is another grievance with them. I do not mean to utter any sweeping denunciations against foreign immigrants, whom the beneficence of our institutions may have invited to our shores, nor even against those who, without regard to our political institutions, have supposed that here they could enjoy better opportunities of material progress and prosperity than at home. I do not deny that many of the foreign immigrants are men of noble hearts, of gallant spirits, and cultivated understandings—such as every good man would cherish. I know it, sir. I know that among a large portion of them who are not of that cultivated class, there are honest, worthy people who make good citizens when they have gone through the process which our laws properly require, who will assimilate with us, and not keep themselves in separate bodies, nor strive to maintain a distinct nationality, and refuse to mingle with the mass of Americans, and partake of, and become imbued with their nationality. I know that; but I know that besides these there is quite a large number of foreign immigrants who are not desirable, and not acceptable as inhabitants in our country. It is only necessary to look at the statistics which we have in official documents to know that such is the fact.

Why must we invite these people to accept donations of public lands before they are naturalized? Have they any claim of right? Some gentleman, I think, has spoken of it as a measure of justice. Whether he meant justice to ourselves or justice to them, I do not know; but what claim can they have in the nature of right to an equal participation to these benefits? Naturalization itself is a boon to them. They have no right to it except as the laws confer it upon them. It is true, sir, that we open our arms to them, we admit them to come into our country, to receive all the benefits of our general system of equal laws, to acquire property, and to obtain that protection for life, person, reputation, and property, which every native and naturalized citizen enjoys. Is not that enough? Are we so destitute of merit among ourselves that we must seek to invite this infusion among us with a view to the improvement of our national character? It might be thought so, it seems to me, from many things which have fallen from gentlemen on this floor, though I can hardly suppose that such was their meaning.

We boast of this being the freest, the most enlightened, and the greatest nation on the earth. It is often asserted in congressional speeches. Though we are the greatest, freest, and most enlightened of nations, yet it seems we must invite, by extraordinary inducements, such as never were heard of before, these foreign immigrants, of all classes, and conditions, and characters, to come amongst us, as if for the purpose of exalting our national character! I hardly think that our intellectual standard is likely to be more highly elevated by bringing in this class of people. I do not know that our moral character is likely to be greatly improved. I suppose, myself, that no foreign admixture can raise the morals and mend the heart of the American people. If I thought so, I should blush for my country.

Well, sir, have we not all the practical skill and sagacity among our artizans which any other nation on the earth can boast of? I had supposed that Yankee ingenuity, Yankee perseverance, Yankee untiring energy could not be beaten in the world. Why, then, do we invite foreigners by these extraordinary inducements? I admit that I am willing that they should come on the terms on which they have come; but I am not willing to offer these superfluous bounties to swell an immigration from what we call the down trodden nations of oppressed Europe, which is already as large as a prudent liberality would desire.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding the respectability of a very large portion of these foreign immigrants, there is another very large number who "leave their country for their country's good," and who do not come here for ours.—The statistics of crime prove this. In a table furnished by the Census Bureau, I find that of about twenty-seven thousand convictions in our criminal courts during the year ending the 30th of June, 1850, fourteen thousand were foreigners, and but thirteen thousand Americans. And what is the proportion of foreign population to the native? In 1850 there were two million two hundred thousand foreigners, and upwards of twenty-one millions of native population; so that, whilst the proportion of native to foreign population was as ten to one, the amount of crime is absolutely greater among foreign immigrants than among native citizens; and it is to be recollected that among these native citizens, as enumerated, are included the negro population, among whom the smaller class of offenses, such as petit larceny, are very numerous. I am not willing to furnish inducements to the vicious and depraved to come among us. I wish to keep this class out. If we could segregate them, if we could discriminate between the worthy and the unworthy foreign immigrants, I should gladly receive the former, and treat them with all the liberality with which we have hitherto shown them, and more if that were possible; but the other class I should desire to exclude altogether, if I could. But no system has yet been devised by which this can be accomplished. We are to look at things as they are, and to consider that if we adopt this system by which new inducements to immigration are held out, we shall be in fact inviting that class among whom there is the greater proportion of criminals as well as those who merit our kind feelings.

Mr. BRODHEAD. I should like to enquire of my friend from Maryland whether he has turned his attention to the statistics as to paupers or not? How does the number of paupers in our almshouses and other public institutions compare, as between the foreign and native-born population?

Mr. PEARCE. I had looked at that, though I did not intend to mention it, lest I might be misunderstood. I do not mean, when I answer the Senator's question, to throw any reproach upon these people for their poverty, but the same census report states that there were 131,000 paupers who received support in 1850, and of these, 68,000 were foreign, and 66,000 native born. I will not weary the Senate by repeating or by expanding what I have already said, but content myself with saying that numerous as may be and are, the respectable people who come to our shores from abroad, there is a very large class of them who are the very reverse of desirable citizens. We make no discrimination between them in this bill, and we cannot make any discrimination. I have said that the foreign immigration to this country is quite large enough already, and needs no additional stimulous. Why, sir, the number of immigrants who came into this country some years ago, even as far back as 1849, I think, was about 300,000 in one year; but I understand that the number is increasing, and that during the last four years about 1,500,000 foreign passengers have arrived in the United States.

Now, I can very well comprehend why a State, feeble, small in population, without military resources, in danger from enemies who are near it, might seek to build up rapidly its population and strength by extraordinary inducements to foreign immigrants, even by giving them lands free of cost; but that