American Volunteer.

BY JOHN B. BRATTON. "OUR COUNTRY—MAY IT ALWAYS BE RIGHT—BUT RIGHT OR WRONG, OUR COUNTRY" AT $2.00 PER ANNUM.

VOL. 37. CARLISLE, PA., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1851. NO. 37.

THE VOLUNTEER.

John B. Bratton, Editor and Proprietor.

CARLISLE, THURSDAY, FEB. 20, 1851.

THE EUROPEAN ADVICES.—There is no special feature of interest in the news from Europe by the Canada, beyond the new aspect of affairs in France, and the settlement of the Schleswig-Holstein question. The Holstein story is soon told. The near approach of a well appointed Holstein army has induced the Duchies to consent to place their cause in the hands of the German Powers. The restored harmony between the Cabinets of Vienna and Berlin, joined to the interest taken by the Emperor of Russia in the Danish question, and the determination of England to bring about the suspension of hostilities, have rendered the further continuance of the strife on the part of the Holstein revolutionists useless.—The termination of this difficulty, which at one time seriously threatened to embroil all Europe, is another guarantee for the general peace; but how long that general peace is to continue, it remains for France in all probability to tell. The English news is altogether unimportant. The Duke of Newcastle died on the 12th ult., at Clumber Park, Nottingham. He was born in 1785, his family name being Pelham Clinton, and was the fourth Duke of the house. From Rome we hear of constant quarrels between the French and Pontificial troops, in which the populace always side with the papal soldiers.

THE STEAMER ATLANTIC.—We are still without any intelligence of the missing steamer Atlantic, and much anxiety begins to be felt for her fate. The Philadelphia *News* says:—The more considerate, however, do not yet give up the hope of her safety, or indeed doubt that she will shortly make her appearance, perhaps even before she is heard from from the other side. The chief fear, hitherto, has been that she was burned, but it appears by statements made by her owners, that she was well supplied with all the necessary apparatus for the extinguishment of fire, and that it was the custom of Capt. West to inspect this daily, that it might be kept in perfect order, in case of accident. She was provisioned for thirty-five or forty days, and if running out of fuel, or becoming disabled, she has doubtless shaped her course for the Azores, where after coaling or repairing, she has doubtless resumed her trip to New York. It is further said—and the fact is important—that although there is an abundance of coal at the Azores, yet the mode of coaling—by means of lighters—is so tedious, that it would require ten or twelve days for such a ship as the Atlantic to take on board a sufficient supply to bring her to New York. The next steamer due from Liverpool is the Africa, which was to sail on the 1st inst. The Baltic succeeds her on the 8th. Neither of these, possibly, may bring anything of the Atlantic, but still she may be safe.

SOUTHERN CONGRESS REPUDIATED.—The Legislature of Florida adjourned on Friday night, the 24th ult. Amongst the most important business transacted, was the organization of a separate Supreme Court, a Board of Internal Improvements, and a Board of Agriculture; the incorporation of the Atlantic and Gulf Central Railroad Company, and of some half dozen or more plank road companies; the incorporation of the State Bank, the passage of a law to secure the swamp and overflowed lands, &c. The Assembly took no action at all upon the slavery question. The Senate never had a proposition upon the subject before it during the session. The House had a good many, but none of them had ever proceed a vote. The committee on the Nashville Convention proceedings, &c., never reported, and the proposition to elect delegates to the Southern Congress was laid on the table.

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER.—By a resolution, passed by the Second Municipality of New Orleans, and recently concurred in by the Third Municipality, and which will no doubt be adopted by the First, the city of New Orleans will be authorized to offer to this distinguished jurist and statesman a retaining fee of $2,500, in order to secure his services in maintaining the rights of the city to the estate of the late John McDonough.

MONSTER CATTLE.—The Messrs. J. P. & W. Eyre, of Chester, have in their possession a pair of cattle, which, in point of beauty, size and weight, are said to exceed any ever raised in Delaware county, and perhaps in the State. They measure six feet in height, ten feet in length, ten feet six inches in girth, and two feet seven and a half inches across the hips, and are estimated by competent judges to weigh, when dressed, *thirty-six hundred pounds*. They were raised and fed by the Messrs. Eyre, under the care of Robert Blythe.

☞Miss HESSER, of Juniata county, has recovered $1,725 by a suit instituted against Mr. Martin, of Mifflin county, for a breach of promise. It was tried last week in Lewistown, after several years' delay.

A Plain Spoken Judge.

Judge MCCLURE, of Pittsburgh, is decidedly the plainest spoken Jurist we think we ever heard of.—He is fond of "shouting upon the wing," and his shots always tell with terrible effect. In a recent trial for murder, in that city, the jury brought the defendant, James Kelly, in as guilty of murder in the second degree. The Judge did not like this, and when he came to sentence him, he addressed the prisoner as follows:—"You, James Kelly, well merit the gallows, and that you have not got it is no fault of mine. I charged the jury pointedly that you were guilty of murder in the *first* degree. The blood that will hereafter be shed, on account of the verdict of the jury by whom you are tried, will not be upon my skirts; had I charged otherwise, I would have considered that I might as well have left a wild tiger loose on the streets, or placed a rattlesnake under the pillow of an infant. There is no doubt as to the atrocious guilt in the fiendish and diabolical murder of John Cox. You stand before this Court spotted all over with the *crime of wilful and premeditated* murder—unparalleled in the annals of crime, and instead of passing a sentence consigning you to dwell in the Penitentiary, we should at this time be pronouncing sentence of DEATH upon you—you richly deserve it."

THE PLEASURE OF PAYING DEBTS.—What pleasure is there to pay ones debts? I remember to have heard Mr. Littlejohn make the same observation: It seems to flow from a combination of circumstances, each of which is productive of pleasure. In the first place, it removes that uneasiness, which a true spirit feels from dependence and obligation, it affords pleasure to the creditor, and therefore gratifies our social affection; it promotes that future confidence, which is so very interesting to an honest mind; it holds a prospect of being readily supplied with what we may want on future occasions; it leaves a consciousness of our own virtue; and it is a measure we know to be right; both in point of justice and of sound economy. Finally, it is a main support of simple reputation.

MR. BONHAM'S REPORT,

On the Subject of the Tariff, made in the House of Representatives, Monday, February 3, 1851.

The undersigned, two of the select committee to which was referred, bill No. 35, on the files of the House, on the subject of the tariff, submit the following report:

That they regret exceedingly there should have been any difference of opinion in the committee in reference to the duties assigned them by the House. *The subject, however, submitted for their consideration*, is one about which there has long been a great contrariety of views, involving as it does vast interests, and being more or less connected with the politics of the country, from the commencement of the government. But from the best lights before them, the undersigned cannot see the propriety of the proposed change in the existing tariff laws, either as a matter of principle or expediency. If the coal and iron interests of Pennsylvania are depressed, as is alleged, it may be fairly attributable to other causes than a want of a fostering care by the government. That, we believe, has already been exercised to the extent of the constitutional power vested in the government—and that the manufacturing and mining interests of the country should not complain, when a tax of thirty per cent. is levied upon the agricultural, commercial and maritime interests of the nation, for their peculiar benefit.

The excess of capital employed in the manufacture of iron, superinduced by the tariff act of 1842, is no doubt one of the leading causes of its present embarrassment. Such a cause would produce revulsion and ruin in any business. Another cause is, no doubt, the failure of large enterprizes in the construction of railways in Great Britain, and throwing the surplus iron left unemployed by that event upon the markets of the world. To attribute, therefore, the depression of the iron interests to the rate of duties affixed by the tariff of 1846, without reference to the causes above named, the laws of trade, the plethora of the business, and the thousand disasters incident to all the pursuits of life, is both illogical, and as we believe untrue.

Be this as it may, the policy of passing instructing resolutions on a subject of this kind, and after public opinion has been matured by repeated and prolonged discussion and agitation, is, to say the least, a mistaken one. Our representatives in Congress are responsible to their constituents, and were elected when *this issue, which is now sought to be brought forward again*, was made up before, and decided by the people. With those representatives, then, rests the responsibility, and the whole subject will, no doubt, receive respectful and anxious attention and deliberation at their hands. We are here as the representatives of the people for local and special purposes. Why then consume the time of this House, and the money of the people, in attempting to do that which, *in the end, we have no power to do?* Besides, instructions sometimes defeat the very object desired to be effected. A memorable instance of this kind occurred when the tariff of 1846 was passed, and our members of Congress were tied hand and foot, as they conceived, in favor of the tariff of 1842, and rejected the very proposition as to Pennsylvania interests, that is now so anxiously pressed upon our consideration.

The Democracy of Pennsylvania are doubtless in favor of a revenue tariff, affording such incidental protection within the revenue limit, as the imposition of such a tax will provide. That is also the doctrine of the Democratic party of the Union on this subject. But in the imposition of such a tariff, we should be careful not to discriminate so far in favor of our own peculiar interests, as to pass beyond the revenue standard, and afford a protection that *amounts to almost a prohibition* of the imported article, or increases the duty so much as to materially lessen the revenue. Protection would then no longer be the incident, but the principal object aimed at and attained, while the purposes of revenue would be defeated. Thus, if twenty per cent. on an import be necessary to support the government, and forty per cent. be levied, in order to favor, or, as it is said, to protect one branch of industry, the additional *twenty per cent.* is levied for a distinct object, aside from that of the support of government. This is not only inexpedient, but as we conceive, unconstitutional.

By the first clause of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States, Congress has power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts, and to provide for the common defence and general welfare—but all *duties, imposts, and excises* shall be uniform throughout the United States." This does not give power to lay duties for the purposes of protection, no more than it would authorize the levying a direct tax for the same purpose—as the laying duties and levying taxes are grants given in the same clause of the Constitution, and could both be exercised in the same way, to the same extent, and for the same purposes. Now no one would seriously contend that Congress would have power to collect a tax in kind upon the mass of the community, to be paid over by the excise officers into the pockets of the manufacturers. Yet this is the solecism into which the advocates of the doctrine of protection, and of the power of the government to enforce it, are driven.

It is instructive to trace the history of the tariff laws which have been enacted since the formation of the government, and the gradually increasing demands of those who are in the habit of looking to government as the almoner of all kinds of bounties, when they should rely upon themselves. The protectionists have besieged the National Legislature and attempted to influence its enactments with a pertinacity and zeal worthy of a better and more righteous cause. They have increased in their demands, until they now ask as a right, what they would have been ashamed to receive as a gift in the *early days* of the republic. But it is the tendency of the system to defeat itself, and the exercise of the privileges of protection begets the necessity for more—and for a very simple reason. So far as the manufacturer is concerned if the protection afforded him, increases his profits beyond the average profits of other employments, competition will follow, and capital will flow into it, whatever may be its advantages, until its profits shall fall to the general level. *Hence we see the reason why*, when once a duty is imposed for the protection of a particular branch of manufactures, it is not long before an increased protective duty is demanded. Hence we see the reason also why a protective duty which at first is attended by great manufacturing enterprize and success is so universally followed by a depression of the business thus supposed to be peculiarly favored.

The first tariff under our Constitution was passed *July 4, 1789. Our population at that time numbered* only 3,500,000, and were encumbered with a debt to the amount of $65,000,000. And yet so moderate were the views of men of all parties at that day, under such circumstances, that the tax levied by the new law amounted to five per cent. only on manufactured goods. The plan of that tariff was very similar to that of 1846, except that the duties were far lower. There was [illegible]nation with a view to protection.

The amount of imports under this act was $23,000,000, and the revenues derived from it were $2,239,746, being rather less than an average of ten per cent. A tax of twelve and a half per cent. was *imposed on teas and China goods, thus discriminating* against protection rather than in favor of it, as the duty on manufactured goods was only five per cent. as above stated. This would show the disposition of the fathers of the Republic to tax what were then considered the luxuries of life highest, and the necessaries lowest—the reverse of the rule adopted in these latter days.

The tariff of August 10, 1790, went into operation *December 1, of that year, and continued until June* 30, 1792. It was entitled "An Act to make further provision for the payment of the public debts," and the preamble set forth, that "to discharge said debts" it was necessary to increase the duties. By this act the tax on woollens, cottons, silks and most manufactures, was advanced from five to seven and a half per cent. *ad valorem*, which was considered so important as to require a special report from Alexander Hamilton, the then Secretary of the Treasury, explaining and justifying the increase at great length. That report spread abroad at that early day the fallacies and delusions of the protective theory, which was the settled policy of England, with whose institutions and form of government he was especially enamored. Strange as it may seem, however, he considered seven and a half per cent. a sufficient protection. Under this law, the imports were $60,700,000, and the duties raised were $8,401,666, being an average of thirteen and a half per cent. The discriminations being again in favor of the consumers of manufactured articles which were the necessaries of life, and against those who used imported luxuries.

In May, 1792, a new tariff law, entitled "An Act to *raise a further sum of money* for the protection of the frontiers," &c., was passed. It took effect the 30th June, 1792, and continued two years. Under it the importations were $65,700,000, and the duties $15,166,823, being twenty-two and a half per cent.

In 1794 a new tariff law was passed, and took effect in June, which, with an explanatory act of the following year, continued in force until June 30, 1797. Under it the imports were $226,571,838, and *the duties $37,611,521, or rather more than sixteen* per cent.

The act of March 3, 1797, was an act "for raising a further sum of money by additional duties," &c. This continued until June 30, 1800, and under it the imports were $238,873,516, and the duties $42,657,876, or eighteen per cent.

The act of May 30, 1800, imposing additional duties, took effect in June following, and continued until June, 1804. *Under this the imports were* $337,363,600, and the duties $69,959,912, or twenty-one per cent.

The tariffs of March 26 and 27, 1804, continued in force until July 1812. The imports during the eight years were $720,730,000, and the duties $141,379,824, being an annual average of twenty per cent.

The act of July 1, 1812, doubled all duties during the continuance of the war. This act remained in force four years, until July, 1816. *The duties were* levied as a war tax, but being too high failed to produce the desired revenue. During the four years the imports were $295,114,274, and the duties $82,315,140, or twenty-eight per cent. Had the law produced the revenue anticipated, the duties would have been one hundred and thirteen millions of dollars, or forty per cent. The mistake consisted in supposing that a high duty would yield more revenue than a low one, *but being high it merely excluded* foreign fabrics, and consequently failed to produce revenue. The heavy duty imposed, and the commercial influence of the war itself, produced a most stringent protective policy. Hence we find at the conclusion of the war of 1812, that an increased portion of our population had been tempted by the hope of large profits into manufacturing pursuits, who found it impossible to compete with the holders of large stocks of similar goods, that had accumulated abroad, and only awaited the return of peace to flow out to the markets of the world. Our manufacturers therefore demanded of the government to prolong the duties which had been imposed for war purposes, and had only been endured as evils attendant upon a state of hostility and non-intercourse between two great powers. Those interested in such legislation were unfortunately but too successful. Better to have met the crisis then, than for the government to have adopted, even for a limited period of time, a wrong principle and an injurious policy.

The tariff of 1816 followed, and was the first framed to recognize protection as a principle, and not as an incident of the taxing power. None of the tariffs before that period, except that of 1787, had recognized protection, and that was merely as an incident to a further cent. duty. The tariff of 1816 *first introduced the minimum valuation*, or a fixed value at which goods were to be taxed. This tariff continued in operation two years, and under it the imports were $221,000,000, and the duties $47,794,133, or twenty-one per cent. But the protection afforded by this tariff, was thought by incompetent and unskilful experimenters in manufacturing to be insufficient, and more protection was again demanded.

In 1818 a new tariff was enacted, which continued in force six years, and under it the imports were $465,530,539, and the duties $128,192,685, or twenty-eight per cent.—being about the same average taxation as during the war. The operation of this tariff was soon found to be injurious to all other interests, and the commercial and maritime interests of New England felt themselves particularly aggrived by its provisions. Daniel Webster said, in relation to this subject, at a meeting held in Faneuil Hall, October 3, 1820, that "For his part he had supposed that restrictions on trade and commerce, in order to benefit particular classes of manufacturers, were now very generally understood to be mischievous, and inconsistent with just notions of political economy."

The tariff of 1824 followed, and continued in operation four years, during which time the imports were $349,308,444, and the duties $115,637,962, or thirty-one per cent.—higher than any tariff previous to that period. Notwithstanding the high rate of duties, many and ruinous failures took place among the manufacturers.

The law of 1828 was passed, and continued in operation two years. The imports under it were $145,369,447, and the duties $56,078,206, or forty per cent.

In 1830, a law reducing the duties on tea, coffee, salt and molasses, was passed, and the imports for the two years, to 1832, were $204,220,390, and the duties $65,937,894, or thirty-two per cent. The diminution of the average arose from the reduction of duties last mentioned, but did not affect the high and oppressive duties on articles which came in competition with our own manufactures. The average of taxation had increased from ten to forty per cent., and the manufacturers were as clamorous as ever for protection—protection to *American* industry!—as if no other industry was American but that employed in manufacturing pursuits. The point of non-intercourse with the rest of the world was almost reached.

The act of 1832 was passed and continued in force one year, during which the imports were $108,118,311, and the duties $24,177,578, or twenty-eight per cent.

In December, 1833, the compromise act took effect. That tariff increased largely the list of free articles, and clung to discriminations less for revenue than protection. The principle of protection was in it fully recognized, but provision was made also for *its final abandonment*, when in the course of ten years the duties were to be gradually reduced to the uniform rate of twenty per cent. Under the descending scale of this act, the average ranged from fourteen and a half to sixteen per cent., and at the lowest rate the amount of revenue was larger than ever before or since. By an act of September 30, 1841, twenty per cent was laid upon all fine goods, which were exempted by the act of 1833. In the last year of the *compromise law, the imports* were $100,162,087, and the duties, together with those raised by the twenty per cent. tax on the free list, in violation of the stipulations of the compromise, were $16,666,746, or sixteen and a half per cent.

The tariff of 1842 followed, and took effect Sept. 1, of that year—and in the first nine months of its operation, the whole imports were but $64,753,799, of which about $24,000,000 only were dutiable goods, paying nearly *thirty-six per cent*, average duty. In the next two years of its operations the imports were $225,089,599, and the duties $60,188,774, or twenty seven per cent., with a long list of free articles. The imports for 1845 amounted to $108,435,035. Of this amount $52,315,292 was charged duty on the ad valorem principle, $31,352,863 on the specific and minimum, and about $24,000,000 admitted free of duty. Great inequalities existed by means of the *minimum and specific duties, some* of the more favored articles being taxed at enormous rates—over three hundred per cent. On cotton goods the inequalities were very striking. There were three minimums which applied to fabrics, all or a part of which were cotton—the 20 cents, 30 cents and 35 cents minimums. But one need be mentioned for illustration. "On all the manufactures of cotton; or of which cotton is a component part, not dyed, colored, printed or stained, *not exceeding* in value *twenty* cents per square yard, *shall be valued at twenty cents* per square yard;" and on that assumed value a duty of thirty per cent was imposed, which amounted to six cents on every square yard. Take for instance coarse cotton shirtings, which cost three cents per yard in England. The tariff of 1842 professed to levy on all cotton *manufactures, coarse* as well as fine, imported into this country, only a duty of thirty per cent ad valorem. At that rate the duty would have been nine mills. But the cotton fabric was estimated at the custom house, by the provisions of the act, for purposes of assessing the duty, as costing twenty cents per yard, and a duty of six cents was accordingly paid on that valuation.

In the matter of iron in its various forms of manufacture, the tax by *means of specific* duties, when reduced to ad valorem, on the average importations, and as calculated from actual importations, ranged from thirty-four to two hundred and seventy per cent. On the article of coal there was a specific duty of one dollar and seventy-five cents per ton, which reduced to ad valorem on the average importations amounted to sixty-one per cent, and as calculated from actual importations from sixty-two to one hundred and sixty per cent.

On this subject we would refer to the tables appended to the report of the committee of ways and means, 28th Congress, 1st session, doc. 306, House of Representatives—also to the report of Mr. Bibb, late Secretary of the Treasury.

Thus from this brief history, two things are manifest—first, that a low duty is productive of a large revenue, and that a high duty diminishes revenue and *cripples commerce. From* 1790 to 1866 when we had a low tariff imposed only for revenue, our exports increased from $20,205,156 to $108,843,150. From 1607 to 1815, which embraced the period of the continental system of Napoleon, the British orders in council, our own embargo, and the war with Great Britain which followed, the restrictions upon trade were almost as absolute as could have been produced by a prohibitory tariff—and our commerce was necessarily *circumscribed and limited. In* 1816 was imposed the first tariff avowedly for protection, which was increased in 1820, and still further increased in 1824, 1828 and 1832. In 1816 our exports were $81,920,452, and in 1831, they were only $81,310,583. Had they increased from 1816 to 1831, when we had a protective tariff, as they did from 1790 to 1806 when we had none, they would have amounted in 1831 to an enormous sum—equal to the whole *amount of the surplus products of the country*, stimulated by an active commerce, with the farming and planting interests unfettered and free from onerous exactions. From 1833 to 1841, during the existence of the compromise act, the exports increased from about $81,000,000 to $121,851,503. Since the passage of the act of 1846 they have perhaps averaged $130,000,000.

Such have been the fruits and such the demands *of the protective policy. Alexander Hamilton declared* in 1791 that a duty of from five to seven and a half per cent was sufficient, and yet the staple interests of the country have been taxed by unjust laws since that period to an amount that is disgraceful to an enlightened people having the power to control their own legislation, and highly detrimental to their own best interests, as is susceptible of the clearest demonstration.

After many fluctuations and changes the tariff of 1846 is now the law of the land. The absurd system of specific and minimum duties has been abandoned by the enlightened sense of the country, as is to be hoped, forever, and all imported articles, except what are on the free list, are now taxed thirty per cent. on their cost value. It might be supposed that thirty dollars in the hundred would be a sufficient tax upon the consumer for the agricultural, commercial and maritime interests of the nation, to pay to the manufacturers, for it is no longer seriously denied that the duty imposed is added to the cost of the article. The present tariff yields a revenue of nearly $40,000,000, and the duty imposed raises the price of the domestic article under the law, perhaps to the extent of the levy. By a fair estimate, therefore, it may be set down, that the consumers who pay this amount into the treasury for the support of the government, pay in addition $40,000,000 more into the pockets of the manufacturers, making an annual tax upon the consumers of manufactured articles of $80,000,000.

Under the tariff of 1842, it can be satisfactorily shown by statistics, that during the year 1844, when the whole amount of revenue raised on foreign imports was $28,980,556, that in order to raise this sum for the benefit of the government, the consumers were taxed in the whole to the enormous amount of one hundred and twenty five millions of dollars, and mainly in the form of bounty to the manufacturers. In the article of pig iron alone, while the consumers paid as duty on the imported article $134,496, into the treasury, the people of the country were compelled to pay the sum of $3,973,000—$134,496 in the shape of duty to the government, and $3,808,504 in bounty to the iron masters. In the matter of bar and rolled iron, by the same calculation, *the people were* obliged to pay the sum of $6,361,454, in order to get $1,148,263 into the treasury—in other words, $1,148,263 in the shape of duty to the government, and $4,868,713 in the shape of bounty to the iron masters.

The amount of pig iron manufactured in the U. States in 1840 was 286,003 tons and estimated at an increase of twelve per cent. was supposed to be in 1844, 309,391 tons. The amount of bar and rolled *iron in 1840, was 197,233 tons, estimated in 1844 at* 220,901 tons. It is now much greater, but we have no method of knowing the exact amount, until the census be again published.

We have no correct data by which to judge of the amount of the manufacture of iron in Pennsylvania. By the published proceedings of the iron masters' convention, which was held in Philadelphia in June last, it appears, that the whole number of iron works in the State, including *furnaces, bloomeries, forges*, rolling mills, &c., is five hundred and four, in which is invested a capital of $20,502,076. This published statement is made by gentlemen interested in the business, and is no doubt as large as the facts will justify. Yet when this interest is compared with the agricultural and other interests of the Commonwealth, it holds an entirely subordinate position in regard to the capital invested and the number of persons engaged. *The assessments of real and per*sonal property of the whole State may be safely set down at $500,000,000, to which may be added thirty per cent. for omissions and under valuations in assessments, $150,000,000—total, $650,000,000. This does not include the capital employed in merchandising, which pays a license, nor the bank and other corporation stocks, and moneys at interest held by non-residents, nor a vast amount of other property not made *taxable by law. We have no means* at hand of approximating an estimate of the capital employed in the State, which is not assessed and valued; but we apprehend we would not err much in setting it down at $150,000,000, which added to the above would make the whole capital of the State $800,000,000. The iron interest therefore is not more than one-fortieth part of the whole capital of the Commonwealth. The agriculturalists and other *classes of the citizens of Pennsylvania*, have, it would seem, some interest at stake also in this important question. They will not object to purchasing the iron they use at moderate and reasonable rates—and under equal and just laws all branches of industry may flourish without further invoking the aid of government. The agriculturalists ask for no protection; and all the protection that can be afforded them is to prevent unequal exactions being made upon them by special and class legislation.

Under the tariff of 1818, when the duty averaged twenty-eight per cent. and on an increased duty being proposed in 1824, Mr. Webster in the discussion of the bill on the floor of the Senate made use of the following language in reference to the *iron interest*; which may be repeated with profit in the present crisis:

"The bill proposes to raise the duty from $15 to $22 50 per ton, which would be equal to a tax of $1,125,000 on the whole annual consumption. So that suppose the point of prohibition which is aimed at by some gentlemen, to be attained, the consumers of the article would pay this last mentioned sum every year to the producers of it, over and above the price at which they could supply themselves with *the same articles from other sources*. There would be no mitigation from this burthen, except from the prospect, whatever that *might* be, that iron would fall in value by domestic competition, after the importation should be prohibited. It will be easy, I think, to show that it cannot fall; and supposing for the present that it shall not, the result will be, that we shall pay annually a sum of $1,125,000, constantly augmented, too, by increased consumption of the article, to support a business *that cannot support itself*."

If the manufacture of iron cannot be sustained when the home demand is for twenty-three millions of people, by a duty of thirty per cent, then from past experience and the protection it has enjoyed, it is useless for the government to support a business that in the language of Mr. Webster in 1824, "cannot support itself." He also stated that the tax at that time paid *by the consumers to the iron interest* was $1,125,000 per annum. This as we have shown, has since largely increased. But, taking that as an average, the amount paid to protect the manufacturers of iron from 1791 up to this period, would be $67,000,000 or a sum greater than the debt of the nation at the close of the revolution, incurred to achieve our liberties.

If our iron masters observed a rigid economy and *frugality in the management of their business, so* generally practiced by the agricultural portion of the community, and if they relied more upon their own energy and skill, and less upon the government, we have little doubt they would soon forget the cry of ruin and distress, which for many years has been so common among them. It is not to be denied that those iron establishments unfavorably situated, have not been able to sustain themselves, and others will not be able, *no matter what duty may be imposed by* the government, but the cause is attributable to their being far from market, and having other disadvantages of locality to contend with, which must remain insurmountable barriers to the successful prosecution of their business.

The truth is, the manufacturing classes of the community are far too clamorous for their numbers. The whole number of manufacturers in the United States was by the census of 1840, 791,545, and of these only 284,351 were of the protected classes, out of a population of nearly twenty millions. The amount of capital invested in agriculture in this country *is estimated* by the ablest and most intelligent statisticians at four thousand millions of dollars, while the amount of the capital invested in manufactures of all kinds is about *four hundred millions*, according to the best authorities.

From careful estimates made from the census of 1840, it appears that the annual products of agriculture in the U. States amount to twelve hundred millions of dollars; while the value of manufactures of all kinds, the cost of the raw material and labor included is only about three hundred millions. The disparity of persons employed, and in those branches of manufactures claiming protection, is still greater. In the manufacture of wool only 21,342 persons are employed. In that of cotton only 72,119 persons. In the iron business and other branches of mining, 33,242 persons are employed.

So that not only does the agricultural interest employ ten times the amount of capital, fourteen times the number of persons employed in the branches of manufactures claiming protection, and produce four times as much in value, but it furnishes four-fifths of the exports from this to foreign countries. The annual exports of this country now average at least one hundred and thirty millions of dollars. Of this more than four-fifths are produced by the planters and farmers, as appears from the most reliable authority, the custom house returns.

These surplus products must find a market. It is a settled axiom of political economy, that trade between nations must be barter, or an exchange of *commodity for commodity*. If one nation buys the products of the labor and capital of another nation, it must pay in the products of its own labor and capital. If one nation will not buy the products of another, the latter cannot buy the products of the former, unless it can sell the same amount to other nations. When the duties are levied beyond the revenue standard, the importing merchant cannot buy the manufactures of those countries, bring them here, pay the duties imposed upon them and sell them at a profit. He cannot, therefore, purchase of our planters and farmers the products which he must pay in exchange for the manufactures of other countries. The consequence is the products of the farmer must be sold at a sacrifice. Thus in this country, producing large surplus agricultural products, a tariff beyond the revenue standard causes a fall in the price of those products. And this system causes the home manufacturers to increase their profits, by excluding the foreign article, and manufactures rise in price.

Thus, the tendency of the tariff laws is to cause a fall in the prices of the agricultural products of this country, as well as a rise in the price of manufactures. This position can be abundantly sustained by facts and figures.

In this connexion we must glance at the boasted home market. What can the iron masters and miners do, numbering less than forty thousand persons, towards consuming the one hundred millions of dollars worth of the surplus agricultural products of this great country? The home market, caused by all the manufacturers in the Union, is but a sorry market for the vast agricultural products of the valley of the Mississippi, and the widening fields of agricultural enterprise. But the idea of the home market is a fallacious one. The manufacturers would consume the same amount of agricultural products were they engaged in the business of agriculture themselves, that they now consume. They must eat to sustain nature; and the home market in the end, is but the effect produced in the diminished supply of agricultural products, to the extent of the diversion to manufacturing pursuits and the consequent enhancement to that extent of the value of those products. What is called *protection* changes only the mode of labor; that is it takes men from one mode of labor, to employ them upon another. In both modes, however, they consume *the same amount of products*, or very nearly so; and the exchange of pursuits, the increase of the one branch of business, and the diminution of another, to the extent of the persons thus shifting, is the length and breadth of the home market, about which so much has been said and written.

The time is fast approaching, when the doctrine of protection, either incidental or direct, will be an "obsolete idea." It is a system of gratuities and bounties and in the worst possible form.—It would be much cheaper to give the manufacturers what they ask in money, to pay them a certain sum, sufficient to place their business beyond the fear of absolute failure, or give them any reasonable profit. By the system of bounties we would pay only for what is made, while, by *discriminating* duties we pay the same, whether anything is made or not. For instance we pay a heavy duty on cutlery in this country, while not a hundreth part of the cutlery used is made here. If that be the proportion, between the quantity made here and used it would be one hundred times cheaper to pay a bounty equal to his present duty on cutlery to the manufacturer and it would be just as beneficial to him. One bad effect of the mode of encouragement by means of discriminating duties, is that the whole community is taxed in the purchase of articles to enhance the price of the articles of manufacture here, which may be so few as not in any degree to supply the demand.

The people are beginning to understand *this* system. It originated in a dark age, and was adopted as a cunning device; to rob the laboring masses for the benefit of the protected few. It has been tried in Great Britain, where it has enriched her nobility and impoverished her people, and even there the iron grasp of the monopolist under the protective system, by the force of truth and the power of public opinion, has been compelled to let go the fruits of the poor man's toil. And while this is so, the relaxation of commercial restrictions by that great power, the abolition of her corn laws, and the opening of her ports to our increasing agricultural products, give us no excuse at this day for making a retrograde movement on the subject of the tariff, whatever might have been deemed a sound policy by our earlier statesmen—when our manufactures were in their infancy, in time of war when the restrictive system closed almost all the ports of the world against us. But how long are our manufactures to be considered in their infancy? The days of pupilage have long since gone by, and what is now asked, is to pamper the pride of manhood, rather than guide the tottering steps of infancy. We expect no increase of duties ever to be made by an American Congress. The next change will be a further reduction unless the signs of the times mislead us, and we are happy to say from a careful review of this whole subject that a better day is dawning upon us. We are striding forward in the light of truth made manifest by the great advances of modern civilization.

The undersigned therefore see no necessity for the contemplated modification of the tariff of 1846. Founded on the ad valorem principle, it is just and equal in its operations—and we cannot close this report without adding the testimony of one, who has long been looked to by the country, as an able and patriotic statesman, in favor of ad valorem duties. Mr. Clay, in a speech delivered in 1842, said—"For one, I am willing to abide by that principle. *There* are certain vague notions afloat as to the utility and necessity of specific duties and discriminations, which, I am persuaded arise from a want of a right understanding of the subject. We have had the ad valorem principle practically in force ever since the compromise act was passed; and there has been no difficulty in administering the duties of the Treasury on that principle." Again, he says—"Compare the difference between specific and the ad valorem system of duties, and I maintain that the latter is justly entitled to preference. I believe upon the whole, that is the best mode. I believe if we adopt a fixed rate ad valorem whenever it can be done, the revenue will be subjected to fewer frauds than the injustice and frauds incident to specific duties. In England (as all who have read the able report made by Mr. Hume, a Scottish member of the House of Commons, must perceive) they seem to be giving up specific duties, and the tendency of the public mind appears to be, instead of having a variety of ad valorem duties to have our permanent fixed rate of duty for all articles."

Neither can the undersigned see the propriety of changing the foreign to the home valuation, as set out in the joint resolution referred to this committee. If that were done, the duty would no longer be levied *according* to the cost of the article, *but on the cost of the article, with the ex*penses and the profits of the importing merchant added. It would no longer be an ad valorem duty, but a duty that professed to be so, and was deceptive in its character. Frauds as stated by Mr. Clay, are incident to specific duties. The frauds alleged to have been committed under the present system, could in a great measure be prevented by the appointment of competent appraisers at the different ports of entry, who were capable of attending to their duties, and knew the markets of the world.

The undersigned therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, That Congress ought not to repeal or modify the tariff of 1846, unless by so doing there can be substituted a *more just and equal system of taxation*, without affecting the revenue.

Resolved, That the *ad valorem* rate of duties, by which all foreign productions are taxed according *to their quality and value*, justly apportion the burthen of taxation on the people of all classes, so far as it can be adjusted by levying duties on foreign imports, and therefore ought not in any case to be abandoned, or the foreign valuation exchanged for that of a home valuation.

Resolved, That specific duties exact an uniform rate on foreign productions of the same material or fabric, without regard to their quality or value, thereby demanding of the people a double tribute, one to the government, and the other to the home producer, and that too without discriminating between the ability of the rich and poor to bear the burden of taxation. That as the people would resist such an abuse of their rights, if attempted by direct taxation, therefore they ought not to be deceived by the sophisms of a protective tariff, founded on specific and minimum duties.

Resolved, That the great interest of this country is agriculture, and if not more entitled to consideration on that account, ought at least to be protected against the attempt, now making, to drive its products out of foreign markets.

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress, from this State are hereby respectfully requested in their legislation on the subject of the tariff, to observe and adhere to the principles and sentiments expressed in the foregoing resolutions.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to our Senators and *Representatives* in Congress, by the Speaker, with the request that they will present the same to their respective bodies.

J. ELLIS BONHAM.
WM. BRINDLE.

HANG OUT THE SIGN.—Several young ladies feeling agrieved by the severity with which their friends speculated on their gay plumes, flounces, necklaces, rings, etc., went to their pastor to learn his opinion. "Do you think," said they, "there can be any impropriety in wearing these things?" "By no means," was the prompt reply, "when the heart is full of ridiculous notions it is perfectly proper to hang out the sign."

Blackstone, speaking of the right of a wife to dower, asserts that if land abide in the husband for a single moment, the wife shall be endowed thereof; and he adds, in a note, that this doctrine was extended very far by a jury in Wales, where the father and son were both hanged in one cart; but the son was supposed to have survived the father, by appearing to struggle the longest, whereby he became seized of an estate by survivorship, in consequence of which his widow obtained a verdict for her dower.

BEAUTY.—Whatever you have, have beauty: Let beauty be on the paper on your walls. It is as easy to choose a paper suggestive of the lovely in color and form, as the uncouth. Why should not every household object be sanctified with this grateful charm? Each chair, each object, each tea or dinner service, and every object for kitchen or parlor, for the home of the poor man, artisan or mechanic, I would have them all worthy of a home of taste.