

13852
NO
YCLP
4157

SPEECH

OF

MR. RANDOLPH, OF NEW JERSEY,

ON

THE TARIFF BILL.

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

JUNE 20, 1842.

—•••••
WASHINGTON:

PRINTED AT THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER OFFICE.

1842.



SPEECH.

The Tariff Bill being under consideration—

Mr. RANDOLPH said :

It is to be regretted, Mr. Chairman, that, at the commencement of the session, the entire subject of the tariff had not been referred exclusively to some one committee, in which case it is presumed that, before this time, a satisfactory bill would have been reported and acted on, and the measure adjusted. But concurrent jurisdiction was given to two committees, and that fact, with the delay in receiving the requisite information from the Treasury Department, has postponed action on the subject to the present time. Two bills are before us, either of which, with some slight modifications, will be satisfactory to the country, and will produce the requisite amount of revenue. The one from the Committee of Ways and Means is the more specific, and the duties laid on iron and some other important articles are higher than those laid by the other committee. They had been thus placed at a higher rate on account of revenue alone, and on such articles only as it is manifest from the tables will bear a high rate of duty. The bill from the Committee on Manufactures is more uniform in its rate of duty, and the specific duties are generally lower, though the ad valorem rates are in many instances a little higher. The bill was drawn in that way in the hope that, as it conformed more to the principles of the compromise act, whilst, at the same time, "it afforded sufficient revenue and protection," it might give more general satisfaction, and become more permanent. The resolution under which the committee acted referred to them the subject of discriminating duties, by which they understood the entire tariff. Some gentlemen have attempted to draw a distinction between revenue and discrimination. Now, it appears to me, Mr. Chairman, to use the simile of another, that you might as well talk of love without woman, as of discriminating duties without revenue. The bill, sir, was based upon certain resolutions offered by me to the committee, and which were commended by the honorable chairman, in his speech a day or two since, certainly much beyond their merits. As, however, I have been accused of being ultra on the subject of the tariff, I hope gentlemen will permit them to be read. Here they are as adopted by the committee :

Resolved, That there be appointed a sub-committee to draft a tariff bill, and a report thereon with all convenient speed, upon the following principles, viz :

1. No more duty shall be levied than is absolutely necessary for the "economical wants of the Government;" and the same shall, as far as practicable, be so levied as to raise the greatest amount of revenue, and be the least burdensome to the community, and so as to preserve the existing interests of the country.

2. The bill shall be supplementary to the act of March 3, 1833, and, as far as is practicable, conformable to the same.

3. Duties shall be levied in the following manner, with such exceptions as may be deemed necessary, viz : 1. All articles paying ad valorem duties amounting to 20 per cent. to have the same extended, according to the wants of the Government, to a duty not exceeding 30 per cent. on the foreign costs and charges. 2. Article heretofore paying specific duties to have the same levied in the same manner in future, but to be reduced, as far as is practicable, having regard to revenue and the preservation of existing interests.

4. All existing laws for inspection and appraisement shall be continued in force; and collectors shall be authorized, for the purpose of preventing fraud, to take the duty in the goods, at their cost and charges, and have them sold for the benefit of Government.

5382.709

R193

VAULT

5. In order to prevent frauds, smuggling, a sudden surcharge of the market, and the taking of the trade from our own merchants, there shall be levied a duty on auction sales of foreign goods held within six months of the time of their importation.

6. The bill shall repeal or modify the 20 per cent. clause in the land bill.

7. The Secretary of the Treasury shall be authorized to convert the ad valorem into equivalent specific duties, by taking, from time to time, the average prices at different places.

The House having refused to grant power to the committee to send for witnesses, and to compel them to testify even against their interests, or, indeed, to grant them any facilities whatever, they were compelled to collect evidence in the best manner they could, and, of course, to receive the statements of such persons as came voluntarily before them. The gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BROWN) had on Saturday objected to this evidence as being interested, and I understand one of the city papers made him say that all persons not interested were excluded from giving evidence. No such statement was made in my hearing; nor is the fact correct. The gentleman knows that I offered, in committee, a resolution requesting each member to introduce a certain number of witnesses. The gentlemen of the minority were particularly requested to bring forward their most practical and able men, for the committee desired to be convinced of their error if wrong. No such witnesses, however, were produced, and the gentleman himself, when the resolution authorizing the committee to send for witnesses was before the House, moved an amendment to except all such persons as were interested in manufactures; and, not satisfied with that, he then voted to lay the resolution, with his own amendment, on the table, thereby showing that he was opposed to all light and to all evidence, interested or disinterested. The first question which the committee had to determine was the amount of revenue to be raised. This, after an ineffectual effort to procure the necessary information from the Committee of Ways and Means and from the Treasury Department, the committee settled at \$27,000,000. The amount was not considered extravagant under the existing state of the finances and the public debt, accumulated prior and subsequent to March, 1841; particularly as it was about a million of dollars less than the average expenditure of the four years preceding that period, although that expenditure was some seven millions a year more than the income. These facts will appear from the following Treasury statement, which also shows the amount of imports that were suffered to come in free of duty, and the loss of revenue for those four years by deducting the tenths under the compromise act:

Receipts and expenditures, exclusive of trust funds, Treasury notes, and bonds of the Bank of the United States, and the imports that came in free of and those that paid duty, with the reduction of the tenths under the compromise act, for the years 1837, 1838, 1839, and 1840.

Years.	Revenue.	Expenditures.	Free im-ports.	Dutiable im-ports.	Deduction under compromise act.
1837	\$18,286,618 94	\$31,610,003 09	\$69,250,031	\$71,739,186	\$1,365,182 20
1838	19,610,553 12	31,546,613 27	60,860,005	52,857,399	2,630,424 40
1839	29,003,098 33	25,503,301 84	76,401,792	85,690,340	3,158,460 51
1840	17,037,576 73	23,339,754 89	57,196,204	49,945,315	3,174,892 10
Aggregate	\$83,937,847 12	\$111,999,673 09	\$263,708,032	\$260,232,220	\$10,528,959 21
Average	\$20,984,461 78	\$27,999,918 27	\$65,927,008	\$65,058,055	\$2,652,239 80

The next question which the committee determined was, to raise the necessary revenue from *customs* alone, without taking into account the proceeds of the public

lands. This subject was understood to be settled, as well by a fair construction of the compromise act as by the distribution and the revenue laws of the last session. A clause was therefore introduced in the bill simply to neutralize the proviso illegitimately introduced by the Senate to suspend the distribution in case duties should be raised above 20 per cent., which suspension, if it ever took place, was, by the proviso itself, only to "continue until this cause of its suspension shall be removed," of course by a repeal of the proviso, for every body then knew that duties must and would be raised above 20 per cent. Sir, I voted against this amendment of the Senate, preferring rather to lose the land bill than to embarrass the tariff question with such a provision. I was then opposed to the union, and I shall now vote for the divorce. But, sir, the committee had no intention or desire to trench upon any opinions of the Executive, or to excite the least political feeling; they desired to place each measure upon its own independent foundation. As to party, sir, I regard it as little as most men. In some remarks at the commencement of the session, I stated that the subject now under consideration, involving as it does the support of the Government and the interests of the whole community, was paramount, in my judgment, to all mere party considerations. What was then said, time has strengthened, and is now repeated. And I say, in the name of the American people, wo to the man, or men, or that party, by whom this measure shall be defeated, under any pretext whatever. Would to God, sir, that we could banish party and mere political considerations from this Capitol, and from the other end of the avenue, until the great measures of the country are settled! Would, sir, that we might all, if only for one short month, bid a truce to politics, and be ready to exclaim

"Let names and sects and parties fall,
The *public good* be all in all!"

Mr. Chairman, the sub-committee referred to in the resolutions, consisting of the chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island, (Mr. TILLINGHAST,) and myself, after mature consideration, concluded to adopt the imports of 1840 as a fair estimate of the probable imports for some years to come: the same estimate has been subsequently adopted by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by the Committee of Ways and Means. The imports of that year were much less than the average of the seven preceding years, and about twenty millions less than those of last year, and amounted, after deducting foreign exports, to \$88,951,207; and after deducting the amount of goods proposed to be left duty free, would leave the amount of dutiable goods at about \$80,000,000, including tea and coffee, without taxing which, I am satisfied that no rate of duty can raise the necessary amount of revenue. The duty proposed to be raised in the construction of the bill was twenty-seven millions. By an estimate which I made after the bill was drawn, including tea, coffee, and auction duties, it will produce twenty-six and a half millions. Subsequently the estimates of the Treasury Department on the bill, excluding auction duties and including about a million and a half additional duties on sugar and iron, make the bill raise twenty-seven and a half millions, or ninety-four thousand more than the Secretary's bill. The only modes of levying duties are by *ad valorem* or specific rates, and the former may be either horizontal or uniform, discriminative or on the home valuation. It would require a uniform duty of about thirty-five per cent. on eighty millions of imports to produce twenty-seven millions of nett revenue; but every body admits the necessity of discriminating below that or any other maximum rate of duty; jewelry and many other varieties of articles would not bear as high a duty. If, then, sir, discrimination below the maximum be admitted, it follows that we must discriminate above it also, else the revenue would be deficient; and the necessary consequence is, that any mere horizontal rate of duty is utterly impracticable. The committee have come as near to that plan as they deemed it possible to go, by placing a duty of thirty per cent. on all articles not specially provided for, amounting in the aggregate to more than one-half of the imports. I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that the minority of the committee, in their

report; and the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. HABERSHAM,) in his amendment now pending, and his speech made a day or two since, have taken a different view, and insist on a uniform duty of twenty-five per cent., upon the ground, as alleged in the report, that low duties will produce the most revenue. The proof relied on for this position is a quotation from the evidence in Hume's report, made to the British House of Commons, and a table of duties and customs published by the minority. The principle of the quotation is applicable to prohibitory duties only; but none are intended to be so by either bill now under consideration. As Hume's report has been frequently referred to, permit me, Mr. Chairman, to state a fact in relation to that document not perhaps generally known. The document, which has been widely circulated in this country, and with which every member has been gratuitously furnished a copy or two by some unknown hand, although purporting to be the entire document, consists of *garbled extracts, carefully culled out, printed at Carlisle, in England, and sent to this country in sheets, to enlighten us poor republicans in the doctrine of free trade.*

Let me, sir, instance one or two deceptions. Sir John Guest, M. P., is said to be the largest iron-master in Great Britain; he was examined before the committee, and in the report circulated here his examination occupies ten lines, and the only thing he there states of importance is, "He was not aware that the iron trade required any protection at all." Whether this was merely intended to furnish an argument to the anti-tariff gentlemen I cannot say, sir; but whoever will examine the original document, (a folio volume of 365 pages, instead of a pamphlet of 32,) commencing at page 32, will find that Sir John's evidence occupies four folio pages, in which he gives the reason why English iron needs no protection, which is simply that, owing to their capital, the price of labor, and the facilities possessed, the English can make iron cheaper than any other nation, and of a better quality, too, except Swedes iron, which does not come in competition because of its peculiar quality, all that can be procured being required for the manufacture of cutlery ware. He also says:

"I have conversed with persons who know the United States very well; and the general opinion is that it will be several years before they will do much with that ore (in Maryland) to affect this country, in consequence of the *high rate of wages* and the coal not being adapted to make iron."

Why all this was omitted I leave, sir, for others to determine, presenting this as a single example, out of many that might be given, to show what credit is to be attached to the garbled document. The next evidence of the minority report against high and specific duties is the table, page 36, of imports and customs from 1801 to 1807, inclusive, and for 1840, from which it is stated that \$78,856,442 of imports (consumed) in 1807, under the then low duties, produced several hundred thousand dollars more revenue than \$88,951,207 of imports (consumed) in 1840 under the higher duties of that period; but the gentleman does not state what proportion of the imports for either year were free goods. Unfortunately, the Treasury documents do not distinguish the free goods prior to 1821; but it is presumed that there were comparatively few free goods in 1807, whilst in 1840 they amounted to about one-half the entire imports. But why did the gentleman omit the imports and duties from 1807 to 1840, skipping thirty-three years and the operation of four tariff laws?

Mr. Chairman, by the kindness of the officers in the Treasury Department, I am able to supply the omission from a table now at the printer's. The following statement has been carefully prepared:

A statement of the average amount of imports and duties for four years under the tariffs of 1816, 1824, 1828, and for seven years under the compromise act.

Years.	Free of duty.	Paying duty.	Total.	Duties.
1821 to 1824	\$9,748,270	\$66,240,614	\$75,988,884	\$16,890,242
1825 to 1828	11,937,389	75,389,721	87,326,110	21,589,463
1829 to 1832	13,064,456	74,333,003	87,397,459	24,323,484
1834 to 1840	71,728,309	69,748,456	141,476,765	17,564,286

Now, sir, as to whether high or low duties produce the most revenue, I believe, in the language of the gentleman, "further comment on the table is unnecessary."

The next matter, Mr. Chairman, that the committee had to determine was as to the *home valuation* mentioned in the compromise act. With the most sincere desire to adopt it, if practicable, the committee made every effort and inquiry of practical men to satisfy themselves; but the universal opinion was, that it was impracticable, and to that conclusion, also, the committee came at length with reluctance. The first method suggested was an actual appraisement of every cargo and invoice. This, besides taking a very large number of officers, would want uniformity, both as to place and time, and would, therefore, be both objectionable and unconstitutional. The next plan was, to fix the home valuation of the goods themselves in the bill itself. As to all fancy and a great variety of other goods, this would be impossible, and even on others the valuation must be a mere arbitrary one, and the whole plan an indirect method of levying specific duties, possessing no advantages over the old plan, but liable to the same and other objections. These were the reasons, sir, that influenced the committee to reject the plan: an able committee of the Senate, however, have it under consideration, and if their indefatigable chairman can obviate the difficulties, (and he, if any one, can,) I shall be happy to yield my judgment to his. The only remaining plan was the adding a certain per cent. to the foreign invoice. This contained no advantages over an ordinary ad valorem duty; for you might as well charge a duty of twenty-five per cent. on the foreign cost, at once, as twenty per cent. on the cost and on twenty-five per cent. thereof added for home valuation; all the difficulties arising from frauds and false invoices would apply equally to either case. The late distinguished Senator from Kentucky recently remarked that, under an ad valorem duty, we might fix the *rate*, but the foreigner would adjust the *amount* of duty; and this had been eminently the case under the compromise act, which, in fact, reduced all duties to an ad valorem basis. The mode and the amount of frauds that had been practised under that system were incalculable: Government had been defrauded of millions of revenue; the manufacturer of his just protection; and the American merchant had been literally driven out of his own market by foreigners. In the heavy French trade of New York I understand there are but some six or eight Americans left, in the German but few more, and in the English dry-good business but a small proportion. The committee, sir, have provided various remedies, which will be explained whenever they may come under consideration; but the most effectual remedy is, that *duties should be specific*. This method commends itself for its simplicity and its facility of execution, and is enforced by the fact that all nations have adopted it; it is also of peculiar importance at this time, as it is more productive of revenue. This will appear from the table in page 23 of the report, from which the following averages are deduced, viz:

Average imports and duties from 1834 to 1840.

		Imports.	Duties.
1840.	Ad valorem -	\$83,453,742	\$8,319,272
	Specific -	34,482,407	15,708,454

The gentleman from Georgia had made a large part of his argument against specific and minimum duties, shielding himself, as he remarked, behind the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. ADAMS,) an extract or two from whose report of 1832 on manufactures he had read. Now, the gentleman must pardon me; for his attempt to shield himself behind the gentleman from Massachusetts reminded me of the old story of Sawney's hiding himself by thrusting his head through the board fence, leaving his entire person exposed: and finding the gentleman in that situation, his good nature will excuse me if I give him a single shot, and then leave him to his friend from New York. The gentleman, unfortunately, was in the same situation as the poet whom he quoted. Virgil could not discriminate between the qualities of his heroes, and therefore proclaimed them—

“Fortem Gygan! Fortem Cloanthum.”

And the gentleman could perceive no distinction between “the graduated minimums upon the manufactures of woollens” and the simple minimum or valuation of cotton goods, and had therefore proclaimed them the same. Now, sir, the first was introduced into the tariff bill of 1828, and run thus: All woollens which cost over fifty cents and under one dollar were to be valued at one dollar; all which cost over one dollar and under two dollars and a half were to be valued at two dollars and a half; and all which cost over that sum and under four dollars were to be valued at four dollars—three minimums on the same kind of goods, and the duty placed at forty per cent. on the valuation. Consequently, cloth which cost one dollar a yard paid a duty of forty cents; if it cost one dollar and one cent, or any other sum between that and two dollars and fifty cents, it paid one dollar duty; and if it cost only one cent more, (\$2 51,) it paid a duty of one dollar and sixty cents a yard. This was called a *graduated* minimum; and it was against the injustice of this that the argument of the report of 1832 was directed in the extracts quoted. If the gentleman had looked more fully into the subject, he would have ascertained that the gentleman from Massachusetts had admitted into his report and bill the simple minimum or valuation, and that it constituted the distinction between his scheme and that of a gentleman from your State, Mr. Chairman, (Mr. Stevenson, of Pennsylvania,) who urged the *graduated* minimums on woollens; nay, if my honorable friend from Georgia had looked still further into the bill reported from his committee, he would have found but one minimum in it, and that a simple valuation upon cottons, which was copied by myself, with a slight variation, from the bill of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and by him taken from the act of 1816, where it was placed by Southern votes. But the gentleman has drawn from this his argument that we make the poor man pay more for his coarse goods than the rich for his fine. Sir, the gentleman could not have been more unfortunate in his illustration; for it was this very minimum that, by securing the home market and exciting domestic competition, had reduced the price of the poor man's coarse muslin from twenty-five cents a yard, for a miserable article made of India cotton, to six cents a yard for substantial goods made of American cotton. The minimum made the duty seven and a half cents a yard; but as the article itself sold for six cents, pray, sir, who paid the duty, or how much was the poor man injured by this high tax, as the gentleman called it? Did time permit, sir, I might allude to nails and hats; and numerous proofs might be adduced to show that the effect of high duties on articles that we have abundant means to produce has invariably been to secure the home market, excite competition, and lessen the price, whilst, at the same time, the higher the rate of duty, if it be not prohibitory, the greater has been the amount of revenue raised. The standard of the specific

duties adopted by the committee is that of the year 1840 generally, being a deduction of four-tenths under the compromise act. In some few cases there has been a variation, a little higher or lower. It is believed that, taking the entire bill, with the duty on auction sales, cash duties, and the various guards against frauds, it will give ample protection and abundance of revenue. Sir, it is a self-evident proposition, that, where the inducement of the foreigner in committing fraud is not only to cheat the Government, but at the same time to destroy competition by destroying the domestic manufacture, there is a double necessity for specific duties—the one to guard the revenue, the other to protect our own industry. Sir, the subject of protection is not a new one; and the collision between this country and Great Britain, who should be our manufacturers, is almost as old as the settlement of the country. That the colonies should not be permitted to manufacture even a hob-nail was not the mere idle remark of an English statesman; for as early as 1699 Parliament declared that “no wool, yarn, or woollen manufactures of their American plantations should be shipped thence, or even laden in order to be transported to any place whatever.” In 1719 the House of Commons resolved “that the creating manufactures in the colonies tended to lessen their *dependence* upon Great Britain.” And in 1731 they directed the Board of Trade to inquire and report “with respect to the laws made, *manufactures set up*, or trade carried on, *detrimental to the trade*, navigation, or *manufactures of Great Britain*.” The next year the board made their report; and a precious document it is. Would, sir, that time permitted me to quote largely from it: a short extract or two, however, must suffice. Massachusetts, it alleges, had passed an act to encourage the manufacture of paper, “which law interferes with the profit made by the British merchant on foreign paper sent thither.” Again: “New England, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and in the county of Somerset, in Maryland, they had *fallen into the manufacture of woollen cloth and linen cloth*.” The Yankees also made “brown holland for women’s wear, which lessens the importation of calicoes;” “also some linen and cotton for ordinary shirting;” and “ships for the French and Spaniards.” They had also “erected six forges and nineteen furnaces;” and they and the good people of New York and New Jersey manufactured “great quantities of hats, of which the companies of *hatters in London* have complained.” And in the same year, (1732,) an act of Parliament was passed “to prevent the exportation of hats from the colonies.” By this act no master could have more than two apprentices, who must serve seven years. No negro could be taught the trade; and it was made a heavy penalty for exporting hats from the colonies or lading a horse or cart for the purpose. In 1750 Parliament prohibited the erection or continuance of any mill or other engine for rolling or slitting iron or any plaiting forge, or any furnace for steel, under the penalty of £200; and moreover declared them to be a public nuisance, which the Governor was required to abate within thirty days, under the penalty of £500. Subsequently Parliament prohibited the exportation to this country of the tools to make iron. These and similar acts of oppression that might be named aroused the spirit of liberty, which eventually burst forth in the Revolution, was complained of in the Declaration of Independence, partially provided for in the Confederation, and finally secured against in the Constitution. Sir, I have neither time nor inclination to enter on a never-dying constitutional question: permit but a passing glance. The States divested themselves of the power of protection; and to suppose that they did not provide for it somewhere is to stultify the whole convention and the people of that day, and to suppose that they had in a few short years forgotten all their wrongs for which they had battled. Sir, they did provide for it: they gave ample power to the Federal Government to regulate commerce, which in the Constitution is synonymous with trade. The power extended to regulating it either by treaty or by laying and collecting “taxes, duties, imposts, and excises;” the duties might be high or low, or prohibitory; and the balance of the clause, as it now stands in the Constitution, and which was subsequently added, gave

no new power, but only restricted the power, so that the duties, &c., should only be levied to "pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare." Without this addition, imposts could have been laid to regulate commerce or to carry out any of the other express powers of Congress, generally, without restriction; with the addition, Congress were merely restricted in their power to lay duties, to regulate commerce, or carry out any other power, by the proviso that such duties so levied must be either to pay the debts, or levied in such way as, whilst it carried out the express power, it should provide for the common defence and general welfare. At the organization of the Government, the encouragement of domestic manufactures was rife—Washington was inaugurated in a full suit of American broadcloth, manufactured at Hartford, in Connecticut, and the example was followed by some of his successors, particularly by the gentleman on my right, (Mr. ADAMS.) I regret, sir, that the wholesome example has of late years been discontinued; it operated as a stimulus to the nation, like the annual ploughing exhibition of the Emperor of China. But if it is discontinued here, sir, it is not even in the fashionable saloons of Great Britain, as appears by the following notice:

"FASHION.

"HER MAJESTY'S STATE BALL.—The following notice has been issued from the Lord Chamberlain's Office: 'All persons invited to the ball at Buckingham palace on the 12th of May are expected to appear in dresses of British manufacture. Ladies not to wear plumes or trains. Gentlemen to appear in costume, uniform, or full Court dress.'"

The tariff of 1789, the second act of the Government, as well as the discussion attending its passage, affords abundant proof that no constitutional difficulty was then dreamed of, but all were in favor of protection. This will particularly appear in the speeches of Mr. Madison, Mr. Fitzsimons, and of some others, whom it would be profitable to quote did time permit. It is a remarkable fact, sir, that almost the only prohibitory duties of that act were for the benefit of the South, viz: three cents a pound on cotton, and fifteen cents a pound on indigo. Some gentleman across the House says cotton was not then raised there: if he will examine the debates, I think, (the speech of Mr. Tucker, of South Carolina, in particular,) he will find that preparations were then making to raise cotton, and this duty was intended to encourage the experiment. In 1790 a bill was passed extending some of the duties; and, as if "to make assurance doubly sure," the object of the law was inserted in the preamble, viz: "for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and *the encouragement and protection of manufactures.*" About the same period, Mr. Hamilton made his very able report on manufactures, which every statesman should read, and which it would be profitable to quote on the present occasion, were it possible to do so. In 1791 the British Board of Trade make an ineffectual effort to have the United States bound by treaty not to raise the duties. In 1809, in consequence of the numerous aggressions upon our commerce, the embargo was laid, and a new spirit for manufactures excited, and Mr. Gallatin made his able report on that subject, in compliance with the following resolution, passed by the House of Representatives, June 7, 1809:

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to prepare and report to this House, at their next session, a plan for the application of such means as are within the power of Congress, for the purpose of *protecting and fostering the manufactures of the United States*, together with a statement of the several manufacturing establishments which have been commenced, the progress which has been made in them, and the success with which they have been attended, and such other information as, in the opinion of the Secretary, may be material in exhibiting a general view of the manufactures of the United States."

"On the adoption of this resolution, which contemplated a 'plan' for '*protecting and fostering the manufactures of the United States*,' the four Southern Atlantic States voted as follows:

Virginia	-	-	-	Yeas 12	-	-	Nays 6
North Carolina	-	-	-	" 8	-	-	" 3
South Carolina	-	-	-	" 6	-	-	" 1
Georgia	-	-	-	" 1	-	-	" 4
				<hr/>			<hr/>
Total	-	-	-	27			16"
				<hr/>			<hr/>

For a time domestic manufactures seemed to spring up with new vigor ; but the wars in Europe at this period affording an ample market for our grain, the spirit soon abated, and did not again revive till war commenced between Great Britain and this country, when they shot ahead with rapidity, but only to be prostrated by the excessive imports immediately on the return of peace, in 1815, about which period Mr. (now Lord) Brougham declared in the House of Commons that " it was well worth while to incur a loss upon the first exportation, in order by the glut to stifle in the cradle those rising manufactures in the United States which the war had forced into existence." And, sir, in pursuance of this advice, our manufactures were well nigh being forever " stifled in the cradle ;" but, fortunately, the act of 1816 came to our relief and saved the country from ruin. I regret, sir, that the debates of that period are not preserved ; but I have fortunately been able to find a single speech, from which permit me to read a quotation or two.

Extracts from the speech of John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, on the motion of Mr. Randolph, of Virginia, to strike out the minimum valuation on cotton.

After alluding to the situation of the country, arising from the war and its evils, he says :

" To this distressing state of things there were two remedies, and only two ; one in our power immediately, the other requiring much time and exertion, but both constituting, in his opinion, the essential policy of this country : he meant the navy and domestic manufactures."

Again he adds :

" Where shall we now find full employment for our prodigious amount of tonnage ? where markets for the numerous and abundant products of our country ? This great body of active capital, which for the moment has found sufficient employment in supplying our markets, exhausted by the war and measures preceding it, must find a new direction. It will not be idle. What channel can it take but that of manufactures ? This, if things continue as they are, will be its direction. It will introduce a new era in our affairs in many respects highly advantageous, and ought to be countenanced by the Government. Besides, we have already surmounted the greatest difficulty that has ever been found in undertakings of this kind : the cotton and woollen manufactures are not to be introduced ; they are already introduced to a great extent, freeing us entirely from the hazards, and, in a great measure, the sacrifices experienced in giving the capital of the country a new direction. The restrictive measures and the war, though not intended for that purpose, have, by the necessary operation of things, turned a large amount of capital into this new branch of industry. He had often heard it said, both in and out of Congress, that this effect alone would indemnify the country for all of its losses. So high was this tone of feeling when the want of these establishments were practically felt, that he remembered, during the war, when some question was agitated respecting the introduction of foreign goods, that many then opposed it on the ground of injuring our manufactures. He then said that war alone furnished sufficient stimulus, and perhaps too much, as it would make their growth unnaturally rapid ; but that, on the return of peace, it would then be time to show our affliction for them. He at that time did not expect an apathy and aversion to the extent which is now seen. But it will no doubt be said, if they are so far established, and if the situation of the country is so favorable to their growth, where is the necessity of affording them protection ? It is to put them beyond the reach of contingency."

Sir, the cotton minimum was carried, on that occasion, by the efforts of Mr. Calhoun and the six votes from South Carolina ; but I regret that his efforts were not equally successful on the proposition to insert a similar minimum or valuation on woollen goods. Mr. Calhoun voted in favor of it, but the proviso was lost by most of his Southern friends abandoning him on that vote. They could not seem to be able to understand why wool should not be manufactured in this county as well as cotton—an obliquity of understanding, sir, which appears to have continued

to the present period. During the discussion of 1816, sir, I have good authority for saying that the constitutional question was not raised. I believe, sir, it was not got up till some twenty years afterwards; and it is rather a singular coincidence that, about the same period, a distinguished writer in the *Edinburgh Review* (Rev. Sidney Smith) was abusing our pusillanimity in the following sarcastic strain:

“In the four quarters of the globe, who reads an American book? or goes to an American play? or looks at an American picture or statue? What does the world yet owe to American physicians or surgeons? What new substances have their chemists discovered, or what old ones have they analyzed? What new constellations have been discovered by the telescopes of Americans? What have they done in mathematics! *Who drinks out of American glasses? or eats from American plates? or wears American coats or gowns? or sleeps in American blankets? Who?*”

The tariffs of 1824 and 1828 grew out of the exigencies of the country; the latter in particular was intended to counteract the change of the British tariff on wool, and to afford more ample protection to the manufacturer in this country. Unfortunately the principle of protection was carried too far in the compound or graduated minimums, and produced the unhappy excitement at the South. In 1832, however, the whole subject was revised, and resulted in the act of that year, drawn by the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. ADAMS;) and, amongst the many distinguished acts occurring in that gentleman's eventful life, permit me to say that this is not the least distinguished. Its wisdom, justice, and perspicacity would have appeared most manifest, had it been suffered to remain unaltered to the present time. It was the *true* compromise act, raising a sufficient revenue to save the Government from bankruptcy, and affording sufficient protection to have shielded the people from their present distress. Unfortunately, however, the spirit of dissatisfaction produced the next year *the* compromise act, originating no doubt in the purest motives and from the loftiest patriotism, but from the wisdom of which I must be pardoned for dissenting, though of that and its necessity none can properly judge but those who were then actors on the busy scene. But, sir, that act never intended to abandon the doctrine of protection. Whoever will examine the debates of the period must be satisfied to the contrary; and, indeed, its illustrious author—a man to whom a large share of the glory of the protective system is due, and on whom has fallen all its odium and all the venom of its opponents and time-serving friends—is a sufficient guaranty on that point, if the bill itself did not contain a list of free goods, cash duties, and home valuation, all inserted, sir, for protection.

By the report of the then Secretary of the Treasury, it was supposed at that period that fifteen millions of dollars a year would be a sufficient amount of revenue, and that twenty per cent. on the home valuation, considered with cash duties to be equivalent to thirty per cent., would raise sufficient revenue and afford ample protection; or, if it did not, the act itself guaranteed the safety of the manufacturers for nine or ten years, when by its terms legislation was required, and any difficulty might then be remedied. Under the peculiar circumstances which then existed, this reasoning was thought to be satisfactory by many, but since that period a change has come over our country and over the world; our national expenditures have been doubled; what was then thought a fair protection of our domestic industry is now no protection at all, in consequence of the over-production of every branch of manufacture and the great reduction of wages in Europe, arising from the long continued peace of the world, and the uninterrupted success of the peaceful arts. But, sir, viewing that act with our present lights, we cannot but look upon it as the most unfortunate ever passed—not so much to censure those who, under the circumstances, passed the measure, as those who, with all its evils blazing before them, have suffered and now ask for its continuance. Sir, the act has afforded neither sufficient protection nor revenue; the latter will appear from this table, prepared from official documents:

Loss of revenue under the compromise act.

Years.	1st. Of the 10th.	2d. Free goods.	Total.
Deduction in 1834	\$689,723 12	\$1,830,000 00	\$2,519,723 12
1835	959,225 50	2,507,972 85	3,467,198 35
1836	2,086,281 04	3,383,500 50	5,469,781 54
1837	1,365,182 20	1,938,581 85	3,303,763 05
1838	2,630,424 40	1,591,568 60	4,221,993 00
1839	3,158,460 51	3,048,687 85	6,207,128 36
1840	3,174,892 10	1,541,562 95	4,716,454 05
1841	*3,915,000 00	2,153,253 95	6,068,253 95
Total loss from 1834 to 1841	\$18,979,188 87	\$17,995,108 55	\$35,974,295 42
Add duties remitted on railroad iron from 1832 to 1840 - -			4,285,957 37
Total - - - - -			\$40,260,252 79

Thirty-six millions lost in eight years! And, if to this we add the duties remitted on railroad iron, we have upwards of forty millions of revenue, or five millions a year lost, whilst the Government, for at least four years of the time, is expending seven millions more than its income. Not only this, sir, but the country constantly going down, down, down to destruction, in consequence of the excessive importation of free and cheap goods, and the inadequate protection of our own. Sir, had the compromise act never been passed, or had it been repealed in time, we should have had abundance of revenue to pay the fourth instalment arising from the sales of the public lands, and to have kept the Government from debt and embarrassment; and yet an honorable gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GAMBLE) told us a few days since that the South had kept their part of the compromise act, and now the North must keep their part. Sir, there is but one part about it, and that is all out of the manufacturing and grain-growing States. Continue the compromise act! Why, sir, are gentlemen deranged? With one, two, three, four-tenths of the excess above 20 per cent. deducted, our revenue is seven millions a year short of our expenditure, our manufactures in ruins, and our entire country in a state of unexampled embarrassment and distress, and when we thought, at least that we had arrived at

“The lowest deep,

“A lower deep still threatens to devour us.”

In the name of all that is dear, how much worse will gentlemen have matters grow before they will open their eyes to the public calamity? How much lower will Southern gentlemen have their cotton and other interests descend before they will discover that they cannot be in prosperity whilst the rest of the country are in adversity? Sir, numerous reasons might be given in favor of protection: time will not permit to dwell upon or even mention the half of them. The security of a sound currency, the regulation of exchanges, the safe investment of capital, and the honest reward of industry, all require it. How else, with a foreign debt of two hundred millions, are the business concerns of this vast nation to be regulated? The safety of the large amount of capital now vested in manufactures loudly calls for protection. Sir, this investment was not rashly made; it was an offering at first of the purest patriotism of the heart; it was when the war-drum was beating and the battle-cry was pealing throughout our land, when we were dependent on the enemy we were fighting for the very blankets that covered our soldiers, that this capital was

* Estimated.

embarked. And my own constituents, many of them, sir, invested their all when the enemy's fleet was hovering upon their own coast; and although but too much of that capital is already sunk, yet they appeal to you now, in the name of justice, to enable them to save the remnant. I have endeavored, sir, from the imperfect returns of the census, and other sources, to make something like an estimate of the capital invested in manufactures and their product. It has been, I confess, with most of the details of this bill and subject, with which the committee had charged me, rather a dull business, yet, still, not quite as dull or as profitless as listening here to dull speeches, or making them myself when there was no necessity.

Statement of the capital vested in manufactures, the product thereof, and persons employed in the United States and New Jersey, transferring the product of the mines to manufactures.

	Capital.	Product, 1840.	Persons employed.
Manufactures in the United States	267,726,579	434,000,000	791,545
Manufactures in New Jersey -	13,250,000	20,000,000	27,004

Some of the details run thus:

Production of various manufactures in the United States and New Jersey.

Manufactures.	United States.	New Jersey.
Cotton goods - - - - -	\$46,350,000	\$2,086,144
Woollen " - - - - -	20,696,000	440,710
Flax " - - - - -	322,000	83,314
Mixed " - - - - -	6,555,000	151,352
Machinery - - - - -	10,980,000	755,050
Hardware - - - - -	6,451,000	83,575
Leather - - - - -	38,176,000	1,582,746
Hats and caps - - - - -	8,704,000	1,181,552
Soap - - - - -	2,400,000	
Candles - - - - -	2,687,000	
Sugar - - - - -	3,250,000	
Paper - - - - -	6,155,000	569,000
Furniture - - - - -	7,552,000	176,566
Cordage - - - - -	4,078,000	
Iron, bar and castings - - - - -	39,316,000	3,000,000

The entire cotton crop of the year 1840 has been stated at \$64,142,000, and the product of agriculture at \$694,453,000, employing 3,717,756 persons, of whom 56,701 are employed in New Jersey. Some of the agricultural products of 1840, according to the census, will stand thus:

	Bushels of wheat.	Bushels of rye.	Corn.	Oats.
United States - - - - -	84,823,272	18,531,875	377,531,875	123,071,341
New Jersey - - - - -	774,203	1,665,820	4,361,975	3,083,524

STATEMENT—Continued.

	Buckwheat.	Potatoes.	Butter and Cheese.	Product of orchards.
United States -	7,291,743	108,298,060	\$33,787,008	\$7,256,904
New Jersey -	856,117	2,072,069	1,328,032	464,006

The entire production of the United States for 1840 has been stated as follows. I regret that I have not the data to add that of my own State :

The value of the aggregate productions are—

Agriculture -	-	-	-	-	\$694,453,000
Manufactures -	-	-	-	-	395,300,000
Mines -	-	-	-	-	59,868,000
Forests -	-	-	-	-	17,615,000
Fisheries -	-	-	-	-	11,206,000
Horticulture -	-	-	-	-	3,199,000
					<u>\$1,282,041,000</u>

Some profitable reflections might be made over these statistics. The proportion of the cotton crop is large, but not so large as to entitle it to that preponderance which it has sometimes possessed. It is but one-twentieth of the national productions, one-tenth of that of agriculture, and about one-sixth the product of manufactures, and not double that of butter and cheese, and less even than the product of the manufactures of cotton and wool, or of leather and iron. My own State, sir, is an agricultural State, yet the produce of its manufactures in 1840 exceeded by several millions the entire cotton crop of South Carolina and Georgia; and even the potato crop of the United States, at only 30 cents a bushel, exceeded in value the cotton crop of South Carolina, Georgia and Alabama; yet who ever heard of legislation or nullification for potatoes! I make these remarks, sir, in no unkind feeling, but to convince gentlemen that there are other interests to be looked to besides those of cotton; a statesman, sir, should consider them all.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not the manufacturers alone who are mainly interested in this question. It is the laborers, the working-men, and working-women, sir—for Northern females are not ashamed to work when it is necessary—that immense class, of all ages and sexes, who are dependent for bread upon the operation of the factories and other extended business. What, sir, is to become of them if you refuse them protection? Strike down the manufactory and the owner may perhaps save something from the wreck with which to jostle his way through life, but what becomes of the little group of families that have clustered around the establishment? Labor is from one-half to two-thirds cheaper in Europe than in this country. One of the witnesses before the committee stated that he had at work for him a German shoemaker, to whom he paid the same wages for a day that he received in his own country for a week. It was recently stated in the House of Commons that, in England, a man, his wife, and two children capable of assisting, got but two dollars and thirty-three cents a week for wages; whilst a factory girl at Lowell will earn three dollars and a quarter. The following statement, from authentic sources, will give some idea of the condition of the working classes on the continent of Europe:

Wages in France.—Calais, common laborers 7½d. per day with board and without dwelling; Boulogne, 5d. per day do. do.; Nantes, 8d. per day without board and without dwelling; Marseilles, 4d. to 7d. per day with board and without dwelling. The food in some districts “con-

sists in rye bread, soup made of millet, cakes made of Indian corn, *now and then* some salt provisions and vegetables; rarely, if ever, butcher's meat." In others, "wheaten bread, soup made with vegetables, and a little grease or lard twice a day, potatoes or other vegetables, but seldom butcher's meat."

Sweden.—"The daily wages of a skilled agriculturist are 7d. or 8d.; while the unskilled obtain no more than 3d. or 4d. and board themselves. Agriculturists in the southern provinces live upon salt fish and potatoes: in the northern provinces, porridge and rye bread form their food."

Bavaria.—"Laborers are paid at the rate of 8d. per day in the country" without board.

Belgium.—"A skilled artisan may earn in summer 1s. 2d. to 1s. 5d.; in winter from 10d. to 1s. 2d.; unskilled, half as much without board; live upon rye bread, potatoes, and milk." Agricultural laborers have less.

Germany.—Dantzic, laborers 4½d. to 7d. per day without board; Mecklenburg, 7d. per day do.; Holstein, 7d. per day do.

Netherlands.—South Holland, laborers 3d. to 4d. per day with board; North Holland, 20d. per day without board; Antwerp, 5d. per day do.; West Flanders, 96s. to 104s. per year with board.

Italy.—Trieste, laborers 12d. per day without board; do. 6d. per day with board; Istria, 8d. to 10d. per day without board; do. 4d. to 5d. per day with board; Lombardy, 4d. to 8d. per day do.; Genoa, 5d. to 8d. per day do. and without lodgings; Tuscany, 6d. per day without either.

Saxony.—"In 1837, a man employed on his own loom, working very diligently from Monday morning to Saturday night, from 5 o'clock in the morning until dusk, and even at times with a lamp, his wife assisting him in finishing and taking home the work, could not possibly earn more than 20 groschen (about 60 cents) per week. Nor could one who had three children aged 12 years and upwards, all working at the loom as well himself, with his wife employed doing up the work, earn in the whole more than \$1 weekly."

I know, Mr. Chairman, it is said that the price of labor must be reduced; but, even if that were desirable, how is it to be done; what is to be its effect? In a new and thinly settled country, capital and labor will always command a higher price than in an old and densely populated one. In monarchies and aristocracies there are classes of the very wealthy and of the very poor. In a republic both extremes are avoided; there is more uniformity of character and standing, and all classes assimilate more to each other. In our country we have no class like the miserably poor found in Europe; all are free and equal, and, with our extended right of suffrage, if any should be infamous enough to desire such a degradation, it would be impossible to effect it. There would be such a constant change of occupation, of location, of rulers, of taxes, and of State policy, that the principle of assimilation of all classes would still be kept up. Reduce the price of labor, and the value of produce and of property of all kinds goes down with it: the man who to-day is the holder of property, but indebted, to-morrow becomes a laborer, and the tendency of things would thus be to drive all property into the hands of the wealthy; but would the all-potent but all-wretched people let it remain there? Are there no demagogues, and is there no delusion in a republic? And do the South expect that amidst this general wreck and ruin they will be unscathed? As well might they expect to keep that portion of the Atlantic which washes their shore at a level of forty feet above where it dashes against the coast of my own district. Rely upon it, sir, wretchedness, like water, will find or make its own level. The manufacturing business has not been profitable: visionaries and politicians have made streams of gold flow into the pockets of manufacturers, but practical men have not found it there. The tax, wherever the duties have operated as such, is equal on all, and goes into the Treasury, and the protection, whatever it be, is but mutual, and against foreign rivalry, which is particularly necessary on account of the drawbacks and bounties allowed by foreign nations—in some instances greater than the amount of our duties. It is also necessary to prevent our own industry from being crushed by the sudden shipment of immense amounts of goods, the surplus of foreign markets, or which bankruptcies or the revulsions of trade force into our market to be sold off at auction at any price that can be got for them.

I have endeavored, Mr. Chairman, to make some estimate of the value of the home market. From the imperfect returns of the census, we learn that there are 791,739 persons engaged in manufactures, who, with their families, will make about two millions and a half; and these consume, at the lowest estimate, forty cents'

worth per week, making, in the aggregate, a home market for \$52,000,000 worth of agricultural products consumed in each year, whilst the average exports from 1834 to 1840, exclusive of cotton, rice, and tobacco, were only \$9,737,920. The honorable gentleman from Georgia (Mr. HABERSHAM) has thrown out in his report, and again in his speech, that not only will the market at the South be cut off for the manufactures of the North, but also for the stock and produce of the West, and that, sir, in consequence of the inability of Georgia and Carolina to compete with the richer lands of the new States of Mississippi, Alabama, &c., in raising cotton. Sir, I thank the gentleman for the argument that he has put into my mouth. This inability to compete in cotton must increase, and consequently the market for the West must decrease; and thus, as the gentleman has shown the destruction of one market, permit me to show the fallacy of depending on another, and thereby demonstrate to my honorable friends from the West that they stand more in need of protection and a home market than we on the seaboard do; for if, for the want of protection, manufactures are to go down, we certainly have the benefit of location for the local market that may be left. New Jersey, sir, being between two large cities, and rich in agriculture, is eminently so.

Sir, in my humble judgment, our farmers can have but little reliance on a foreign market. All the nations of Europe produce a surplus of corn except Great Britain, and the operation of her sliding scale of duties has been such as almost entirely to exclude us from her market, except when grain has been at famine prices, or for that portion sent indirectly through her colonies. By the act of George IV the duty is arranged according to the price, the one decreasing as the other increases: thus the price ranges from 50s. per quarter, or \$1 50 a bushel, to 73s. per quarter, or \$2 19 a bushel; and the duty from 36s. 8d. per quarter, or \$1 09 a bushel, to 1d. per quarter, or 3 cents per bushel. When wheat is \$1 50 per bushel, the duty is \$1 09, and as the price goes up to the famine point of \$2 19 a bushel, the duty comes down at a shilling or two shillings each change of price till it is only 3 cents; but as Great Britain produces a sufficient supply in good seasons, and at all times a large quantity, very little grain is imported except at famine price. Of the 11,322,085 quarters of wheat imported, from the passage of the act in 1828 to 1841, nearly nine millions and a half, or over 80 per cent., were admitted when the prices were over 70s. per quarter; or \$2 10 a bushel, and the duty only 12 cents. The price is arranged by taking the weekly average of 150 towns, and is constantly fluctuating, from the operations of the London speculators and from other causes. In 1828 the price changed thirty-five times, and the average for the last twelve years has been over twenty changes of price per year; though from 1831 to 1838 the duty was never below 20s. 8d. per quarter, or 61 cents a bushel. By reason of this constant fluctuation the United States has been, to a considerable extent, shut out of the market of Great Britain, although she admits us to be her best customer for manufactures. No mercantile house in England would dare give an order on this country for grain, because, before it could be filled, the orders to the near ports in Europe would be answered, the market gutted, the price lowered, the duty raised, and the merchant ruined. Let us suppose a case. Wheat in New York is worth \$1 20 a bushel, and in England it is 65s. per quarter, or \$1 95 per bushel, and the duty down to 21 cents: a London merchant, with a fair prospect of making a handsome profit, gives a large order on New York for wheat; but before it arrives the market is filled from Europe, and the price falls only 1s. per bushel, which it frequently does in a week—the consequence is, that when the American wheat comes in it is worth 55s. per quarter, or \$1 52 a bushel, and the duty has gone up to 42 cents; thus, instead of making a profit of about 50 cents a bushel on an order for 50,000 bushels, (\$25,000,) he loses about 14 cents, or \$7,000 on the whole. A British merchant, at a large meeting held in Derby, after describing the operations of the sliding scale upon a cargo of flour shipped by him from New York, thus concludes his speech: "*He had once imported flour; but he should deserve to be branded as a gambler, and*

have his credit destroyed, if he were to venture again upon a like experiment." This is the operation of the British corn laws upon the American farmer. In 1840, although we imported more than thirty-three millions of her manufactures, and she imported to the value of \$42,839,818 28 of foreign grain, yet she only took \$4,149,504 of our flour and grain and breadstuffs; and this was a year of scarcity and high prices with her, and of great abundance and low prices with us—the crop, according to the census, amounted to 641,942,514 bushels of grain of all sorts, valued at \$381,340,954.

I know it is said that the corn laws will be repealed or modified so as to admit American grain; but, considering the influence of the aristocracy and landed interest, their system of long leases, high rents, and land taxes, and the recent occurrences, I see but little prospect for the better. Nothing but a moderate and permanent duty will answer for this country. On that question the whig ministry were defeated in Parliament, and again before the people, and again in the House of Commons, when they surrendered up their power; and, recently, the proposition of Lord Russell, to substitute a permanent duty of 8s. per quarter for Sir Robert Peel's modified sliding scale, was lost by over a hundred majority, and Mr. Peel's bill adopted—a similar proposition being defeated in the House of Lords by a still larger vote. Thus, while the corn bill will, in some measure, relieve the starving subjects, stop the clamor of the radicals, strengthen the ministry, and, in connexion with the income tax, relieve the Government from financial embarrassments, without materially interfering with the leases and rents and landed interests, it will be of little or no benefit to this country. The old sliding scale is adopted, and the duty glides from 1s. a quarter, or 3 cents a bushel, to 20s. 6d. per quarter, or 61 cents a bushel, instead of from 1s. a quarter, or 3 cents a bushel, to 36s. 8d., or \$1 09 a bushel.

I remark, in the first place, that, in consequence of our distance, no sliding scale whatever will enable us to compete with the European countries in the British grain market. It appears from the British documents that the average of the highest and lowest prices of wheat in that country, for ten years, ending in 1838, was 56s. 4d. per quarter, or \$1 68 a bushel; and this, by the new law, would pay a duty of 16s. per quarter, or 48 cents a bushel, which leaves \$1 20 a bushel to pay the importer, shipper, American farmer, and all expenses. I need not say that, at that rate, wheat could not be exported to England, when the average price at Philadelphia, for ten years, from 1830 to 1840, was \$1 29 a bushel.

But, sir, not only does Sir Robert Peel's modified sliding scale decrease the prospect of our being able to compete with the nations of Europe in the British grain market, but Mr. Gladstone's resolution or bill respecting the colonial intercourse, which, it is presumed, has before this become a law, increases the difficulty. Wheat was heretofore admitted *free* into all the British colonies, there ground, and sent to England; it is now to be taxed nine cents a bushel. Flour was admitted free into Canada; it is now to pay 48 cents a barrel, this being less than the duty heretofore paid in the other colonies. Besides which, butter and salt meat, which heretofore went free into Canada, are now to pay, the former 92 cents, the latter 72 cents, a hundred. Sir, I call the attention of the gentlemen representing the Northwestern States, particularly, to this subject. Their wheat and flour and butter and meat are no longer to go free through Canada; and, if they do not understand their own interest, permit me to say that the British manufacturers do understand it. One of them stated, before Mr. Hume's committee, that the fate of a new tariff bill in this country depended upon the new grain-growing States of Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and others at the West; and whether they would go for the tariff depended upon the fact whether Great Britain would take their produce. Gentlemen now see how that produce is to be taken.

Nor is the recent modification of the English tariff any more beneficial to this country than that of her corn laws. The reductions are, principally on articles not produced in this country, whilst on the important articles the duty remains as it was, or, if reduced, the discrimination is so great on colonial produce as to render

the reduction useless to the United States. Thus the duty on tobacco is the same. Sperm oil is 1s. if from the colonies, £15 per ton if from the United States, or 300 per cent. difference; timber 1s. from the colonies, £1 10s. a ton from this country; and lumber 2s. to £1 15s.; and beef, pork, and other provisions from this country, are to pay four times as much duty as from the colonies. The duty on cotton is small, but a discrimination is made in favor of the colonies of about nine hundred per cent. on the duties. The gentleman from Georgia says that the duties are reduced to twenty per cent.; but does not the gentleman know that that is prohibitory there, and is more there than fifty per cent. is here? Sir, of England's seven hundred prohibitory duties, none of them are rescinded. By this bill she retains all her prohibition and all her protection: her reductions generally benefit none but her own subjects; nor, Mr. Chairman, is it the object of any of these bills to benefit this country. Great Britain did not see her interest lie in that direction. The United States might be put off with essays on free trade and professions of reciprocity; but there were other interests that required something more substantial. The colonies must be taken care of, the landed interest at home must be protected by a sliding scale whilst their income was taxed for revenue, and the disaffected must be appeased with reduction of the prohibitory duties on the great variety of small but important articles and interests. The plan was a magnificent one, boldly put forth and nobly sustained by the author and his supporters, but it affords little or no benefit to the grain-growers of the United States. By an examination of the evidence accompanying Mr. Hume's report, it will be seen that an intelligent agent of Great Britain was sent through the different kingdoms of Europe, in 1839, to inquire into the interests of his country abroad. He ascertained and reported to his Government that manufactories were springing up all over Europe to compete with the English in the foreign market; and that, in many parts, owing to the cheapness of labor, they could undersell them. Germany, in particular, which is represented to have been the best customer of Great Britain next to the United States, could manufacture woollen goods cheaper than could be made in England; nay, she could pay a duty of fifteen per cent. and successfully compete with the English in their own home market: and this is ascribed by the witness to the corn laws and high tariff. It was an alarming discovery. And we find by the British documents that, in the following year, (June, 1840,) certain specific interrogatories were sent by the Secretary of State to the consuls at fifteen of the most considerable grain-exporting ports in Europe, requiring them to ascertain the quantity of grain that might be exported to England under a moderate duty, the average price, freight, &c.; and "whether, if there were a regular and steady demand in England for foreign corn, the quantity of corn produced in said country or district would, without much difficulty, and in a short space of time, be materially increased." The answers showed that, from these ports, except Riga, Rotterdam, and Antwerp, from which no quantities are stated, there might be shipped to England ordinarily 2,222,464 qrs. of wheat, 912,259 qrs. of rye, 852,566½ qrs. of barley, and 808,714½ qrs. of oats, making 38,368,032 bushels in all, and that this quantity might be greatly increased with proper encouragement. Now, the average consumption of foreign wheat in Great Britain in fourteen years, ending in 1841, was but 900,863 qrs., (and about the same proportion of other grain it is presumed,) or considerably less than one-half of the present capacity of these nine ports to supply. The prices are reported at from 78 cents to \$1 68 cents a bushel, and the freights from 6 cents to 30 cents—the whole averaging \$1 34 cost and 13 cents freight per bushel, the cost in England amounting to \$1 44. This of course is less than it could ordinarily be exported from this country; yet, with the variations in the seasons and climates, we might frequently successfully compete for the English market, were it not for her virtually prohibitory sliding scale. And if Great Britain really desired a reciprocity with her "best customer," we might inquire, why this proceeding? She knew that at all times, when her ports were opened, an excess of grain flowed in. Why, then, wake up the Danes, the Dutch, the Swedes, the Russians, Prussians, Austrians, and Italians, to an increas-

ed production of grain? Sir, she wanted to divert her too successful rivals in manufactures to the subversion of the soil; she could manufacture for them and take their grain, and at the same time could manufacture for us and take our cotton.

The present theory of free trade in England, Mr. Chairman, amounts to no more nor less than this: England has the capital, the skill, the facilities, and all the elements of manufacturing cheaper than other nations, except that the prices of labor and provisions are greater than in other nations. Cheapen, say the philosophers, the price of corn, and thereby cheapen and invigorate labor, and England can compete with the world, and may safely proclaim free trade and open market with all nations. This is the doctrine running throughout Hume's report and evidence; for no branch of industry is proposed to be given up there for the want of protection, not even the manufacturer of sugar toys and artificial flowers, about which there are some very specific interrogatories. The theory does not propose that England shall change her principles of buying or importing nothing that she can make or produce, but of first putting the country into a condition that, according to the notion, she can undersell all the world, and then proclaim free trade. Whatever may be thought of this plan in England, it certainly does not suit in this country. Give the Yankees a fair start, and they will run free trade against the world; but they are not quite far enough advanced yet for it.

Sir, I have some statements that I wish to make respecting the trade between this country and Great Britain, as well in regard to her manufactures as to our grain. They have been collected with some care, and I believe may be relied on.

The domestic exports of Great Britain.

	Total.	To U. States.
In 1840 (all but about £3,000,000 of which were manufactured) they were - - -	<u>£51,406,430</u>	<u>£5,283,020</u>

In the same year were imported for home consumption 531,197,659 pounds of cotton, and the exports of cotton manufactures were £23,403,428.

By the United States documents, the trade between the United States and Great Britain, for 1840, stood thus:

Imports.		Exports.	
Bar-iron, cloths, and cassimeres, white and colored		Cotton -	\$41,945,354
cottons, and the manufactures of silk, worsted, and linen, amounting to	\$16,066,413	Tobacco -	3,227,880
All other articles -	17,571,286	All other articles -	10,018,922
Total -	<u>\$33,637,699</u>		<u>\$54,192,176</u>

Exports from Great Britain in 1839.

	Total.	To U. States
Woollen manufactures - - -	£6,271,645	£2,142,352
Hardware and cutlery - - -	1,828,520	849,640
Bar-iron, tons - - -	124,137	54,509
Pig iron, " - - -	43,460	11,090
Cast-iron, " - - -	10,836	2,156
Average of iron and its manufactures from 1835 to 1839, inclusive, tons - - -	<u>236,141</u>	<u>74,346</u>

From this statement it appears that, of the entire amount of British exports in 1840, about one-tenth is sent to this country; that the imports are principally paid for in cotton; that, of her entire manufactures in 1839, of wool thirty per cent., of hardware and cutlery, and bar iron, forty-five per cent., and of pig and cast iron, twenty-six per cent., were exported to this country; and that, of her annual exports

of iron and its manufactures, from 1835 to 1839, inclusive, an average of twenty-nine per cent. was sent to this country. Now, sir, let us see how much wheat our farmers have been able to dispose of heretofore. I have not been able to procure a satisfactory statement of the grain trade with Great Britain alone; but let us look at it with all the world.

A table of the average exports of wheat and flour, and prices and value thereof, for each ten years from 1790 to 1840.

From—	Barrels of wheat flour.	Price at Philad'a.	Bushels of wheat.	Price at Philad'a.	Average value of wheat and flour at each period.
1790 to 1800	710,443	\$9 54	538,404	\$1 65	\$7,515,992 88
1800 to 1810	797,372	7 93	268 620	1 58	6,748,580 14
1810 to 1820	1,012,049	9 18	133,055	1 85	9,539,723 17
1820 to 1830	904,992	5 55	17,524	1 08	5,041,531 58
1830 to 1840	743,712	6 56	755,412	1 29	6,053,232 20
1840	1,897,501	5 07	1,720,860	1 00	11,341,190 07

The following table exhibits the estimated crop of wheat, the proportion exported, and the population at each period of ten years:

Year.	Crop.—Bushels.	Per cent. exported.	Population.
1790	17,000,000	28	3,929,328
1800	22,000,000	15	5,309,758
1810	30,000,000	14½	7,239,903
1820	38,000,000	15½	9,638,166
1830	50,000,000	12 3 8	12,866,020
1840	80,000,000	14	17,068,666

I ask, Mr. Chairman, that these statements in regard to grain may be recollected and compared with the statements in relation to cotton. There is a section, sir, in the bill from the Committee on Manufactures, imposing an additional duty of ten per cent. on certain imports, as a countervailing duty to the restrictions and heavy duties imposed by foreign nations on our grain, tobacco, and other produce. This clause was inserted, in the distinct form in which it exists, in the hope that it may lead to some satisfactory adjustment of this difficult subject. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us turn our attention to the subject of cotton. The following table shows for one year its comparative exports with all other articles to some of the principal countries:

Domestic exports of 1840 to several countries.

	Russia.	Belgim.	Great Britain.	France.	Trieste.
Exports of cotton	\$212,392	\$1,183,318	\$41,945,354	\$14,841,725	\$1,151,754
Total exports.	234,856	1,834,229	54,192,176	17,733,743	1,590,356

The minority report, sir, groups together eight of the Northern States, and exhibits them and their manufactures in unfavorable contrast with the other States. There is no propriety in this division, because most of the other States have a community of interest with these eight States, and the contrast might as well have been made between Louisiana and all the other States, because that State alone produces sugar. The fact is, sir, that the productions of all the States, except cot-

ton, require protection or countervailing legislation. This, then, draws a fair line of distinction between the cotton States and the others; and, in order that we may understand the entire exports of all the States, I have prepared, from the official documents, this table of the value of domestic exports from 1834 to 1840, inclusive:

Value of domestic exports from 1834 to 1840, inclusive.

YEARS.	The sea.	The forest.	Agriculture.	Rice.	Cotton.	Tobacco.	Manufactures.	Coin.	Total.
1834 - -	82,071,493	84,457,997	88,761,953	82,122,272	849,448,492	86,595,305	87,313,385	8405,500	881,024,162
1835 - -	2,174,524	5,397,004	9,075,562	2,210,331	64,961,302	8,250,527	7,837,999	729,601	101,159,084
1836 - -	2,666,658	5,361,710	7,444,179	2,548,750	71,284,925	10,058,640	6,915,448	345,738	106,916,680
1837 - -	2,711,452	5,472,513	7,039,253	2,309,279	63,240,102	5,795,647	7,711,849	1,283,519	95,564,414
1838 - -	3,175,576	5,200,499	7,623,788	1,721,819	61,566,811	7,392,029	8,990,358	472,941	96,033,821
1839 - -	1,917,969	5,764,559	11,391,711	2,460,198	61,238,983	9,332,943	9,019,171	1,908,338	103,533,891
1840 - -	3,198,370	5,323,185	16,328,999	1,942,076	63,870,307	9,833,957	10,613,767	2,235,073	113,895,634
Aggregate -	17,915,342	36,977,197	63,165,443	15,314,725	435,600,831	57,748,898	58,401,977	7,375,730	698,157,684
Average -	2,559,320	5,282,456	9,737,920	2,187,817	62,514,404	8,249,842	8,343,138	1,053,675	99,736,812

From this statement it appears that the average for seven years of the entire domestic exports was a little short of one hundred millions; that the exports of manufactures were about one-twelfth, of tobacco about the same, of all agricultural products, except cotton, rice, and tobacco, about one-eleventh, and of cotton nearly two-thirds of the whole. Suppose (which, however, is not the case) that the slaves consume as much of foreign imports as others, I draw these general results, Mr. Chairman, from the statistics: that the cotton-producing part of the Union, say six States, with less than two millions of white inhabitants, and a little over three millions in all, whilst they produce $62\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of our entire exports, only consume 18 per cent. of the imports, nearly two-thirds of which are purchased with their own produce, and consequently pay only 18 per cent. of the customs or taxes; whilst the other twenty States, with a population of near fourteen millions, produce only $37\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the exports, though they consume more than double that amount, viz: 82 per cent. of the imports, and pay that proportion of the imposts or taxes. I have made this statement, Mr. Chairman, not for the purpose of drawing any invidious comparison between the Southern and the other States, but rather to repel the unjust contrast in the minority report, and for the purpose, if possible, of convincing Southern gentlemen how unreasonable they are in their opposition. Why, if this comparison stood as badly towards them as it does towards the North, how long would it be before they would talk about resistance? Sir, the North wish to convince the judgment, not to oppose the law; and yet, Mr. Chairman, we are in effect asked to keep still, nay, to lessen the duties, shut up our factories, throw waste our lands, and fill up our mines; and for what? Why, to enable the South to supply us from abroad with what we can ourselves produce, in order to increase the foreign cotton market. Will the South take our grain or other productions, or find a market for them, to enable us to pay for our coats, and hats, and shoes, imported by them in exchange for their cotton? Or how can the North, the Middle, the West, wear manufactured goods, if they can neither make them nor have the wherewith to buy or exchange for them? Or, if the whole country is to be prostrated, how are the excessive imports to be paid for? who are to consume them? or of what value will they be to the cotton planter? Make the North prosperous, and they will consume double the amount of imports; make them wretched and embarrassed, and the South will not be far behind them. And it is a remarkable fact that, as the duties have gone down, the price of cotton has gone with them, though the exports have largely increased. And this, I apprehend, Mr. Chairman, shows the utter fallacy of the idea prevailing in some quarters that high duties have been in some way injurious to the cotton planter.

The cotton crop is stated to be thus: in 1820, 319,655 bales, worth about 17 cents a pound on an average; in 1830, the crop had increased to 746,147 bales, and worth from 5 to 10 cents per pound; and in 1840 the crop is set down at

2,171,293 bales, and worth only from 4 to 6 cents; whilst the imports into Great Britain during that year are placed at 1,415,341 bales. These facts, sir, go to show that the decrease in the price of the cotton is attributable to over-production, and not to the tariff. So far, indeed, from the tariff having the effect, it has kept up the price by creating a home market, which is now estimated at 300,000 bales, or nearly equal to the entire crop in 1820, and one-fifth the market of Great Britain. Nor will any change of our policy affect the foreign cotton market. Great Britain will purchase of us no longer than she can do it on better terms than she can procure it otherwise; and this she will do at all events. She is now making great efforts in her East India colonies to raise a sufficient supply: with what prospect let this statement show:

Years.	Imports of cotton into G. Britain from	
	East Indies.	United States.
1821	30,095 bales	300,070 bales.
1826	64,699 do	395,852 do.
1831	76,764 do	608,887 do.
1836	219,493 do	764,707 do.
1837	145,174 do	844,812 do.
1838	107,200 do	1,124,800 do.
1839	132,900 do	814,500 do.
1840	216,300 do	1,415,341 do.
1841	279,984 do	902,191 do.

From 1821 to 1826 the increase from the East Indies was 108 per cent., whilst that from the United States was only 16 per cent. During the twenty years the first increased twelve-fold, the other only three-fold; and during the last ten years the increase of the East India was nearly four-fold, whilst that of the United States was only about 50 per cent.

The following statement of imports, from January 1 to May 20 of each year, further illustrates this subject:

Imported in twenty weeks.

Year.	American.	East India.	Other kinds.	Total.
1838	511,300	19,800	69,200	600,300
1839	283,500	13,700	62,200	358,400
1840	517,700	29,600	50,200	597,500
1841	418,900	97,200	59,800	515,900
1842	533,000	67,800	46,400	647,200

It is in vain, sir, to tell us that the East India cotton is so poor that it cannot compete with ours. It does compete; it has driven us out of the South American market for cotton goods; and Mr. Gray states before the committee that, under a twenty per cent. duty, it will drive us out of our own. Sir, it is the poor article that always affects the good, by underselling it. Every body is a judge of price, but not of value. It is the poor English and not the good Swedes iron that interferes with the American; and so it is with all other articles, cotton included. Great Britain at least understands this subject if we do not.

I am no eulogist, Mr. Chairman, of England; no admirer of that sickly philanthropy which traverses the world to discover objects for her sympathy, whilst thousands are suffering at home for its support; no advocate for that protection which exhausts itself in preserving wealth to the wealthy, and entailing poverty and misery on the poor and the wretched. But look at England as she is: "with all her

faults," there is in her history and policy much to admire, much to imitate. With a small territory, scarcely as large as that of some of our States; with no peculiarity or variety of soil or climate, producing an insufficient supply of the necessaries and but few of the luxuries of life, and but a portion of the raw materials that sustain her arts, yet she promptly meets the interest on her immense national debt, disburses for her annual expenses upwards of fifty millions of pounds sterling, sustains an army of a hundred thousand men, a navy of over five hundred ships of war, the most extensive commercial marine in the world, gives laws to a hundred and fifty millions of subjects, and rules over one-sixth of the globe. It was well said of her that "her military posts are dotted round the entire globe, and their morning drum-beat, following the course of the sun, sends forth a continuous strain of the martial airs of England."

Yet, in comparison with her shuttle and loom, her machinery and steam engine, all her martial array are but "the pride, pomp, and circumstance" of power; these may awe her own subjects, overthrow the hordes of Asia, or battle against some prouder foe, but those send the products of her power throughout the inhabitable world, and paralyze the energies of mighty nations; and if England were blotted from existence to-morrow, the historian could a thousand years hence write from the medals and devices of her manufactures a more accurate account of her power and greatness than has ever been deciphered of the past from the imperishable monuments of genius; for even these tell not a tale of civilization so impressive as the simple winding sheet torn from the skeleton that it has enshrouded for thousands of years.

The secret of England's power and greatness is *the protection of her own industry*. From the days of her Edwards and her Henrys, when she launched her first battle-ship and imported sailors to man it—when, to foster her own manufactures, she excluded those of other countries, and even made the exportation of raw materials felony, and required the dead to be buried in woollen, unto the present time, she has pursued the same policy of protection. It is inscribed upon the sails of her ships, stamped upon the products of her arts, emblazoned upon every monument of her genius, her enterprise, and her power. Through all change of time, of sovereigns, of ministries, and of parties, beneath this broad shield England has stood armed against the world. With her unchangeable position of buying nothing that she could make, and of importing nothing that she could produce, she has successfully competed with all opposition. Within the last half century, our own country has sprung forth her rival. We have successfully contended with her in peace and in war, upon the ocean and the land. But another and more potent conflict is at hand: and that is, whether, by protecting our own industry, we will insure our own wealth, and power, and independence, or, by basely yielding, become tributary to our mighty rival. In this contest our own country possesses peculiar advantages: a broad expanse of territory in the heart of a new continent, laved by an ocean on either side, stretched out like a beautiful carpet through every variety of clime, and intersected with magnificent mountains, and valleys, and rivers, and lakes; with every peculiarity of soil, producing all the necessaries and most of the luxuries of life, sparkling all over with the richest minerals, abounding in all the elements of national wealth; with immense facilities of internal and external communication, and teeming with a population literally panting for the conflict, yet who are now languishing for the want of that support which we indirectly yield to others, and who, unless speedy relief is bestowed, must, in spite of all these advantages, become but the tributaries of foreign policy. But that relief, I most sincerely hope and trust, is at hand. It is here, sir, in this bill. Pass it, and you give happiness to the wretched, permanency to our institutions, character to the country; you replenish the Treasury, relieve the Government, restore confidence, put in motion millions of machinery, give employment to thousands of citizens, cheer the husbandman with the certainty of a market, whiten the ocean with canvass, speed the canal boat and the car, and electrify this entire nation into new life and energetic action.