

THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

VOLUME VII.

"REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER."

NUMBER 8.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY, AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O. & H. P. GOODRICH.

TOWANDA:

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1846.

SPEECH

HON. D. WILMOT,
OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, July 1, 1846. In Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, on the Bill reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, amendatory of the Tariff law of 1842.

Mr. WILMOT addressed the committee as follows:

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: If I felt at liberty to consult my own inclinations, I should refrain from taking part in the present discussion. It is always unpleasant for a man occupying a public position, to find himself constrained to separate from those with whom he is more intimately and closely associated, especially upon a question of such deep and absorbing interest as the one now under consideration. For each and every one of my colleagues on this floor I entertain the kindest and most respectful feelings. My association with them has been of the most agreeable character, and it is with unfeigned regret that I find myself constrained, by a high sense of representative duty, to take a position on this subject differing totally and fundamentally from the one occupied by them. But, sir, I must abide by my own convictions—I must stand by my own judgment. While I intend to speak of the restrictive system and its advocates as I believe the truth demands, I trust that friends with whom I differ will not understand me to imply the slightest reproach upon the course they have felt it their duty to take. Others, doubtless, speak the sentiments of their constituents—I shall endeavor to speak the voice of mine; to their judgment, and their sense, we are alike responsible. And, while I doubt not that their constituents will approve their course, I will meet mine as best I can.

Sir, believing as I do, I cannot give the influence of my voice, however humble it may be, in support of the tariff of 1842. I believe it unjust and oppressive: imposing heavy bur- den upon the labor and industry of the coun- try for the purpose of building up a monop- oly and privileged class. I am opposed in principle to all partial legislation. I believe it is war with the spirit and genius of our institu- tions, and dangerous to the equal rights and liberties of the people. This Government was established for the equal benefit and protection of all its citizens. If confined within its proper and legitimate action, its duties are simple: resulting our intercourse with foreign nations, affording protection to person and property, seeing that to pursue that particular employ- ment or branch of industry which he may deem most profitable, or best adapted to his taste and habits. When it turns aside from these objects, and seeks to build up one interest, which can only be done by depressing others, it ceases to be a just Government—it becomes a tyrant, unworthy of the confidence or support of the people.

It is urged by the protectionists, that the im- position of high, restrictive and prohibitory du- ties benefits alike the whole country and every branch of domestic industry. This, sir, I de- nounce as a clearly demonstrable and unmathe- matical problem. If what was taken from one man was returned to him by another, and so on throughout the whole community or State, it would benefit no one, but leave each standing exactly where he was when the process com- menced. Again: all wealth is the product of labor. If, by any system of legislation, you enhance the profits of a particular department of labor beyond what they would otherwise be, you must necessarily draw those increased profits from the labor of some other. If this proposition be correct, the subject would seem to resolve itself into an answer of the single question: Do high protective tariffs increase the profits of the manufacturer? If so, it fol- lows that those increased profits are drawn from some other department of industry. It would seem unnecessary, to those having the slightest knowledge of this subject, to expend a moment in proof of an affirmative answer to the question, Who is it that year after year pours millions so loudly for protection? Is it the farmer—the industrious and enterprising day-laborer? No, sir; these men have never seen about your halls, asking the question of legislation in this Government in their own behalf. They rely upon their industry and energy to obtain for themselves and their families a livelihood. It is the manufacturers who come here asking bounties and protection for the particular business in which they have invested their capital. Do they ask that you endeavor to lessen their prices and diminish their profits? It is too absurd for serious at- tention.

It is said by the protectionists that the "in- dustry of the country" must be protected.— This clap-net phrase, together with others, such as "home markets," "protection against foreign labor," &c., have lost their power over the ignorant and reflecting men. Is that protection to the interests of the country which levies contributions upon nine-tenths of its labor to build up a favored and privileged class? The bold pioneer, who with his axe fearlessly en- counters our heavy forests and subdues our rugged soil, makes a valuable and permanent acquisition to the benefit of man.— He has added something to the world's stock, and made that which before was useless, sub- servient to the happiness and support of his fellow-men. Has he in his noble undertaking asked the bounty of Government in his behalf? Has he come with greedy and selfish grasp, demanding from the public treasury a premium upon the land cleared by him, or upon the wheat and corn raised as the product of his la- bor? Sir, this man asks only protection from the protectionist, we desire to give to the farmer a market for his surplus productions.— Give to him, then, the markets of the world—

not seek to restrict him in his choice, by a sys- tem of restrictive and prohibitory duties, which leads to countervailing restrictions, and by its narrow and selfish policy renders those who would otherwise become purchasers unable to buy. But it is a home market that is to be given to the farmer. That is, by shutting him out from the markets of the world, and confin- ing him to one, you place him completely in the power of those who control that market, either to sell at their prices, or not sell at all. Not only this, but he must be prohibited from seeking the best and cheapest market in which to purchase articles necessary for the comfort of himself and family, but must buy of this same privileged class at the prices they may find fit for their interest to demand. Thus upon both sides the farmer is fleeced. I am an- swered by the protectionists that this is not the case—that the farmer is benefited by the restrictive policy, inasmuch as he obtains more from the manufacturer than he could otherwise get for his produce, and buys of him manufac- tured articles cheaper than he could otherwise procure them. This, sir, is begging the whole question. It comes back to the old argument, that high duties cheapen the articles upon which they are imposed. I cannot but repeat my surprise, that any man who has given to this subject one hour of cool, unprejudiced reflec- tion, should insist upon this position as correct. Yet, sir, on this subject such perversity is shown by the advocates of restriction, that the friends of a more liberal and enlightened policy are called upon to prove, over and over again, the simplest axioms of political and economical science.

What is the meaning of the word protection? It is to guard—to shield from danger or harm. This the manufacturer desires. To what dan- ger is he exposed? From what threatened harm does he seek the shield of legislative pro- tection? From the competition of a cheaper article, is it not? Not so, says the protectionist; he merely desires to be secured and protected in the home market. I answer, that the cheapest goods secure the market without fur- ther protection. If our manufacturers can and will sell an article, equally good, at a cheaper price than the foreigner, they have the market to themselves by the fixed and established laws of trade. But, says the protectionist again, we are in favor of protecting American labor against the pauper labor of Europe. How, pray, do the half-starved paupers of Europe injure the domestic manufacturer? He will not burn down his factory, or derange his machinery. But he labors so cheaply, is the reply, that the manufacturer at home must be protected from the cheap article of his make. Why protec- tion? Certainly not that he may sell the article cheaper still. Do sagacious and shrewd men—men capable of embarking successfully in a business requiring so much of skill and good management as does that of manufactur- ing—come and ask of Congress to legislate as to reduce their prices and diminish their profits? If so, Congress has, as yet, failed to accomplish their wishes. The profits of the large manufacturing establishments in the East, have, I am fully satisfied, realized, in the last year, from 50 to 75, and even 100 per cent.—I know their dividends have fallen far below this, ranging from 15 to 30 per cent.; but it is easy to divide only a portion of the profits, placing the balance to different funds. Again, many of the largest and most profitable estab- lishments are carried on as private partnerships, and the profits divided without any public declaration of dividends. I have derived some information from a friend upon this subject, in whose statements and estimates I place great confidence—one long and intimately connected with the manufacturing business. He tells me that the coarse cotton shirtings are man- ufactured here at a cost of three-and-a-half cents per yard at the most.—I have considered the cost at four cents in my estimate. Let us take a manufacturing establishment in which has been invested \$200,000—a sum amply and more than sufficient to build one of the capacity of my calculation. There would be in such a factory at least fifteen hundred looms, each loom making one piece of thirty yards per yard. I have stated the cost at four cents per yard.

Thus, one pound of cotton, costing eight cents, will make four yards, 2 cents per yard. One girl will attend two looms, making sixty yards per day, and allowing her fifty cents per day, it will be less than one cent for the cost of weaving per yard—say.....1 cent per yard. One cent more will cover cost of spinning, wear of machinery, interest upon capital, and all other expenses.....1 cent per yard. Cost of coarse shirtings.....4 cents per yard.

Fifteen hundred looms, making each thirty yards per day, gives 45,000 yards, which, at four cents, is the sum of \$1,800 the cost of run- ning the factory one day. This article has been sold in the market during the last year at from 6½ to 7½ cents per yard. I will consider the sales made at six cents, which, upon 45,000 yards, gives the sum of \$2,700 as the daily products or receipts of the factory—leaving as the net profit for one day, \$900. The mill will run three hundred and twelve days in the year, but allowing for accidents, stoppages, &c., say that it runs three hundred days, this will give as the net annual profit the sum of \$270,000 on an investment of \$300,000.

I believe this calculation correct, only in the profits being under-estimated. If there is any error in the data upon which it is based, I would be most happy for any gentleman acquainted with the subject to point it out. We do know, that coarse shirtings are manufactured in England at a cost even less than 3½ cents per yard; and all agree in the fact that we man- ufacture these goods as cheaply as they are made abroad. Indeed we were so told on this floor, by one of the most earnest of the advocates of high duties. Certain it is, that they have not been sold in the American markets for less than six cents the yard, if as low as that, during the last year.

Where, I inquire, do these enormous profits come from? I answer, from the pockets of

the people. Every man, woman and child, who wears a yard of this manufacture, con- tributes to make up the sum of those profits.— How long can the country and the people stand up under this system of taxation? If persisted in, and finally established as the per- manent policy of the country, it must in time, and that at no distant day, impoverish the masses by concentrating all wealth in the hands of the few. No wonder that your Lawrence and Appletons are so zealous in their efforts to protect American labor. What gives to these men so deep and exclusive a sympathy with the mass? Is it for the laborer, that they annually expend thousands in their efforts to mould public opinion to their views? For him do they hold tariff conventions, and pass tariff resolves? Is it for him that they petition the brightest talents of the country to plead the cause of protection? Truly, their interests in the laborer must be deep and sincere, that at such cost and trouble they seek to protect him against the pauper labor of Europe. I wonder of these men should have application made to them by a cargo of paupers freshly landed from Europe, to work in their factories at wages one-half, or one-third less than they were paying American laborers, if their patri- otism would not take fire at such an attack upon American labor? What say my friends upon the other side? Do the manufacturers employ those they can hire cheapest? I think they would not be seriously alarmed at the pauper labor of Europe presenting itself under such circumstances. It is only when labor comes over in the form of a cheaper rival man- ufacture, that his patriotism rises to the fever heat. His interest in the laborer rises and falls in exact ratio with his dividends. Sir, I have no faith in these hypocritical pretensions.— Your lords of the spindle seek by every means in their power to depress American labor.— They have, from time to time, reduced prices and increased the hours of labor. Their rules and regulations have the force and authority of law over a large class of those in their employ. Most of them are females, in a great degree dependent upon them for employment, and who obey their edicts, whether for reducing prices or increasing labor, rather than lose their means of support. I recollect to have seen, some two years since, a petition from some factory girls to the Legislature of Massachusetts, praying for a redress of grievances of which they complained. They had engaged to work in a factory at stipulated prices; after working a short time, an edict was issued reducing their wages some 20 or 25 per cent.— They at first remonstrated, and finally left, seeking work in other factories. They went from one to another asking employment, but were everywhere refused. The sequel proved that their names had been sent to every factory in the State, and they were denied employment, because they had refused to submit to the injustice and tyranny of their first employer. If there is no truth in this—if it were a mere elec- tioneering story, some of the gentlemen who represent that State on this floor can set me right. No denial, sir; it is then true. A wicked and unholly combination was entered into by these moneyed lords, to deprive these girls of labor, or compel them to submit to their prices. This is the way in which they aid and sustain the labor of the country. Thus, sir, it will ever be. Privilege and monopoly are ever selfish—ever grasping. Interest is the sole governing principle of all their actions. These are the men to whose tender mercies you would deliver over the working men and women of the country. Build up by a system of restriction and prohibitory duties, what some gentlemen are pleased to term the great inter- ests of the country, enable capitalists by spe- cial legislation to embark in large enterprises, securing to them large profits, and they will buy the produce of the farmer, and employ the labor of the poor. In short, sir, it comes down to an old maxim of an old party.— "Take care of the rich, and the rich will take care of the poor." This, if I understand it, is the long and short of this argument in favor of the restrictive system.

Sir, the efforts to sustain on the one hand, and to break down on the other, this protective policy, is, in my humble judgment, a contest between capital and labor—the former, struggling to perpetuate its privileges, and the latter for its rights and just rewards. Why should those who are already blessed with abundance and wealth, ask of this Government, that was established for, and is sustained by the people, to legislate for their especial benefit? What right have they to demand a monopoly, that they may make even 30 per cent. upon their capital? Is it to enable them to protect and take care of American industry? With what justice or truth can they claim that their looms and machinery constitute American industry? Sir, it is an arrogant and insolent assumption, and should be met and denounced by every man who values the equal rights and liberties of the people. I solemnly believe, if this policy could be permanently established, that not one century would pass away before the free and independent laborers of this country would be reduced to the degrading condition of the laborers of Europe. It would sap and under- mine our republican institutions. The people would lose the control over their own Govern- ment, and wealth become firmly entrenched in all the seats and high places of power. The vastness of our country, and the cheapness of the full development and workings of this sys- tem. Had our limits been confined between the Atlantic and the Alleghenies, we should ere this have witnessed the fruits of this system upon the labor of the country. This I should have seen here, as in England, men, women, and children, working from fourteen to eight- een hours in the day for a mere subsistence. It is this accursed policy of legislating for the capital of the country, together with the paper-mo- ney system, that has contributed more than all other causes, to fasten upon the English laborer a slavery worse than that of the lash. The condition of his existence is, work or starve. If sickness or accident interrupt his labors but for a day, famine stares him in the face. This is what the capitalists and privileged classes

have done for the English laborer. So, sir, it will ever be when wealth and privilege are al- lowed to levy their exactions upon labor.— When avarice becomes liberal—when wealth ceases to desire new acquisitions—when capital is satisfied with moderate profits—then, and not till then, will labor, under this system, receive its just rewards. It does not now receive them, but, on the other hand, is cruelly and unjustly plundered of its rightful earnings. All business in which capital and labor are employ- ed, is a joint enterprise, in which there should be a fair and just division of the profits. After paying to capital a fair interest upon its invest- ment, and a reasonable per cent. for the risk incurred, the balance ought, and of right does, belong to labor. But labor obtains a mere subsistence, while capital can scarcely count its gains. Is this justice to the laborer? It is the only measure of justice he will ever receive at the hands of privilege and monopoly.

Sir, I am in favor of protection. I here avow myself a protectionist in the highest and truest sense of the word. I demand protection for labor, against the cruel exactions of capital. I demand protection for the equal rights of the people, against a privileged and monopolizing class, upheld and sustained by partial legisla- tion. I claim protection for the hard earnings of the poor, against an insidious system that plunders by stealth, and eats out his substance. Why, sir, in the name of humanity, seek to heap burden after burden upon the back of la- bor? Is not the lot of the poor already suffi- ciently hard? Has not wealth, already suffi- cient advantages over poverty? It has influ- ence and power, and too often, even in this free country, commands the high stations of honor and profit. The rich live in affluence, sur- rounded with all the elegancies and luxuries of life. Their children grow up around them, and are amply advanced and provided for.— The poor toil in heat and in cold for a plain and homely subsistence, suffering many re- verses and enduring many privations.— His children toil by his side, or leave home at an early age to toil in the field or workshop of the stranger. Against this, Democracy makes no complaint. Democracy seeks not to deprive wealth of any of its legitimate advantages; it seeks not to take from the rich one farthing of his riches; but it does demand that these advantages shall not be increased by the partial enactments of the Government; that no system of direct or indirect bounties be established, by which a portion of the earnings of the poor be taken to swell the already overflowing coffers of the rich. Yet, under the thin and flimsy disguise of protection to American labor, such a policy is attempted to be fastened upon the country. I will war against it while I have breath. I have warred against it at home before my own people, and I shall not desert their cause now. Sir, I had no concealments upon this subject. I am under no pledges, except the high and solemn pledge implied, that I would here carry out in my ac- tion the principles I publicly avowed in the van- nass.

I have already, sir, glanced at the argument so much insisted upon, that this system will give to the farmer a home market. What, I inquire, has it yet done towards that end? The surplus agricultural productions of Ohio alone would feed, twice over, all the persons employed by these manufacturing establish- ments that have grown up under this system. What is to be done with the remaining surplus of the vast West, and of the middle States? For thirty years we have heard that a home market was to be created, and yet, during this time the agricultural productions have in- creased in a ratio as ten to one, over the consump- tion of these large manufacturing establish- ments. Does the farmer look to the prices current of Lowell to ascertain the market price of his wheat, his pork, and the products of his dairy? No, sir; he looks to the prices they bear in the great commercial cities of our sea- board, and their price there, under a sound currency, is in the main governed by the price they command in the foreign market. More of the productions of the American farmer have found a market during the last year, in the de- pendencies of Great Britain alone, than all that has been consumed by this same home market promised us by the protectionists. Yet by their policy they would destroy the foreign market, that they might control absolutely the price of the farmer's products, as they do that of the woollens and cottons he weaves; and when one State had glutted this home market, they would cry out, as I have heard some of the savans of this school, that there was too much wheat, corn, and pork raised; that the farmer was too industrious and produced too much. This, I suppose, is one mode of en- couraging home industry. They would, I repeat, destroy the foreign market; for by refusing to purchase of foreign countries, you make those countries unwilling, and indeed unable, to buy of us. Suppose, sir, that the Potomac was the dividing boundary between two na- tions; which, for convenience, I will name after the adjacent States of Virginia & Maryland; that the soil of Virginia was adapted to agri- cultural pursuits,—wheat, and all the produc- tions of the farm could there be raised cheaply and in abundance; that the lands of Maryland were of a cold and unproductive soil, but, owing to her mineral treasures, water-power, and other facilities, all the branches of manufactur- ing could be carried on advantageously.— Would it not, I inquire, be for the mutual in- terests of these two nations to exchange their respective productions to the extent of their wants? Would they not naturally and bene- ficially do so under the ordinary laws of trade? No one, I think, will deny it. Let us now, suppose the beauties of this restrictive system to break in upon the hitherto benighted farm- ers of Virginia. They learn to talk about pro- tecting Virginia labor—the advantages of a home market, and resolve, by high restrictive and prohibitory tariffs; to shut out the man- ufactures of Maryland. Having done this, some quit their former pursuits and engage in man- ufacturing. The labor bestowed in making a yard of cloth in Virginia, if laid out upon the soil, would have purchased two yards of the Maryland manufacturer. The manufacturer

of Maryland can no longer, as formerly, buy the wheat of the Virginia farmer, because he cannot pay for it, the farmer no longer taking his manufactures in return; and thus the for- eign market of Maryland is destroyed to the farmer. But the Marylander cannot starve; wheat he must have; and he sets about digging in his cold ungenial soil for the purpose of raising wheat and corn. The labor he expends in producing a bushel of wheat, if expended in his former business of manufacturing, would have bought him two bushels of his neighbor, the Virginia farmer. What, sir, have these two communities gained by this system? They have destroyed each other's markets; they have forced their citizens into unpropit- iable employments, because unnatural to their soils and physical resources. In short, they have protected labor, and created a home market at infinite cost and sacrifice to both—a sacrifice that must continue until their policy is changed. This, sir, I believe to be a true pic- ture of the restrictive system, when applied to the great nations of the earth. True inde- pendence consists in freedom from restraints—untrammelled to all things not morally wrong; and labor is best protected when its productions are allowed to seek their natural and best markets, purchasing in return where it can buy cheapest.

Another argument of the protectionists, and, in my judgment, as fallacious as those I have already noticed, is, that unless this restrictive policy is adhered to, all the money will be taken from the country to pay for our importations.— "The trade between nations is nothing more than an exchange of their respective productions. If in any given year we should buy of England more than we sold to her, we would pay the bal- ance with the proceeds of the trade with some other country where we had sold more than we bought; or if the balance against us should be general, we would be compelled by the laws of trade to curtail our purchases the next or follow- ing year, until the balance was restored. Under a sound currency no nation can much over- trade, before a self-acting remedy will be ap- plied. We cannot purchase unless we can sell.— Nor can we for any length of time purchase a much larger quantity than we sell. Again: the precious metals are like any other commodity in the market; they are carried by commerce from one place to another, according as the demand for them may be, and their value at different points in the commercial world. If wheat were so scarce as that it was more valuable here than in Europe, it would at once be brought to us from there; or if in a season of plenty, from a speculating mania, or an inflated currency, wheat should rise so much in price as to make it profitable, it would be brought to us, as was done from the Baltic during some of the periods of inflation through which we have passed.— So, sir, it is with the precious metals—they ebb and flow according to their value and the demand for them at different commercial points. It is in the power of this Congress, by an arbitrary enactment, to cause a great influx of the precious metals. Let a law be passed giving a premium of five or ten per cent. upon all foreign gold offered to the mint for re-coining, and millions of foreign coin would almost immediately find its way here; but it would not follow that the coun- try was thereby enriched.

In my judgment this restrictive policy is ruin- ous to the labor and industry of the country, and if persisted in, will, in a brief time, paralyze the great agricultural and planting interests. These great and truly national branches of industry are passed by as unworthy of notice, and the steam- engine, the machinery driven by water, the power-looms and spindles of eastern capitalists, are dignified, as if alone worthy, with the appella- tion of American industry, and protected as American labor. The farmer and planter must rest quiet & be fleeced, content with the promises of a home market—protection for pauper labor—national independence and the like—words long stereotyped in the vocabulary of the pro- tectionists, and used as popular catchwords to mislead the unreflecting and uninformed. The day of their power is past. Inquire is abroad, and men will look into the workings and opera- tions of this system for themselves.

I have attempted to show, in part, how the farmer fares under the restrictive policy; let us see how it operates on the mechanic. Surely he must be benefited. This I deny; he is as well as every other interest, pays tribute to the man- ufacturer, without receiving any adequate com- pensation in return. Let us take the shoemaker, as an example of the worthy artisans scattered over our country. It is said that he is pro- tected under the present high tariff, by the ex- clusion of the work of French and English arti- sans—that large capitalists have been induced to embark extensively in the business, thereby afford- ing employment to more than could otherwise obtain it. Any capitalist who has engaged in this business has done so for the purpose of find- ing a profitable investment for his capital. It is out of no feeling for the man who does the la- bor. These capitalists lay in their stock in large quantities and to the best possible advantage.— Many of those they employ are the least meri- torious class of journeymen—men without fami- lies, who hang about our larger towns and cities spending their substance in dissipation. They are employed at the most reduced wages, thus reducing the wages of the more meritorious, who work by their side. In this way are turned off annually immense quantities of this manufac- ture, which is sent over the whole country, pen- etrating the remotest corners and by-places, fill- ing every country store and retail shop, and thus brought directly in competition with the mecha- nics of our villages and country districts, who con- stitute at least three-fourths of the whole. No French boots or shoes ever found their way there to cut down the business and depress the prices of the country mechanic. It is the large establishments, carried on by capitalists, that operate injuriously upon him. The mechanics of my district want no such protection as is given them by the tariff of 1842. If this sys- tem is to be longer continued, they would like to have it extended—they would like to have a prohibitory duty imposed upon Massachusetts boots and shoes. Such protection they could understand. It would come home to their busi- ness and bosoms; but they think "you not for the kind of protection you give them." It can be

seen the cost of their material, and all the expen- ses of living. About two years since, I met an old school-mate, who had worked for some time in one of these large establishments at Newark, New Jersey, and he said he found it impossible, at the prices paid, by the hardest labor he could endure, to support himself and a small family; that he could obtain, in the remote country dis- tricts, more of the necessities of life by nine hours labor than he could there by fifteen; and that the further he could get from these large establishments the better he could do.

It is not the agricultural and mechanical inter- ests alone that are injured and defrauded by this restrictive policy. The great maritime and com- mercial interests are most seriously affected.— Every restraint and clog imposed upon commerce cannot but be injurious to all engaged in that legitimate and enterprising business. Carry out the system to its furthest limits, and all foreign commerce would be destroyed—our ships would idly rot down at their wharves—our commercial marts would become deserted. Yet the city of New York alone, built up and sustained by foreign commerce, affords a larger market for the productions of the farmer than all the manufac- tories of New England—another example of the ability of this system to afford a home market. Let us block up at once every channel of access to our coast; let us shut ourselves in by a wall of adamant from the rest of the world, holding no intercourse with our fellow-man beyond; and then the splendid theory of the protectionist will be fully realized. Why has the bountiful Giver of all things spread over the globe, this diversity of climate, soil, and production? Did he design that his children, separated into fami- lies of nations, should be confined in their enjoy- ments to the products of their respective national limits? If so, it would be rational to pre- sume that their wants would have been circum- scribed within the same narrow bounds. He gave the earth, with all its fruits and means of enjoyment, to man, inviting him to a friendly interchange one with another.

The cause of humanity, the highest and best interest of man, is indissolubly connected with the course of a more liberal and free commercial intercourse. It breaks down national prejudices and animosities; it brings man in closer con- nexion with his fellow; binding each to the other by the strong cords of mutual interest and good will. It is the cause of philanthropy—of human ad- vancement and progress. It is the cause of jus- tice and right; and must and will prevail. It may be retarded, but it cannot be turned back.— Selfishness may for a time impede its progress, but, like the waters that are obstructed, public opinion will swell higher and higher; until it overbreaks all impediments, sweeps away every obstruction. You might as well attempt to shut out the light of heaven, as to resist the power and progress of truth.

The advocates of a more liberal commercial policy in this country, are not unfrequently charged with belonging to the British party—of advocating British interests. If there is any party in this country to which the appellation of British party can be given with any shade of justice, it is to the advocates of restriction. The grounds assumed by them in favor of the man- ufacturers, are identical with those occupied by the advocates of English monopoly. Monop- olies must of necessity be enjoyed by the few, at the expense of the many. They cease to be such when the many participate in their privileges. England is a small island; its territory is con- fined by the ocean within narrow bounds; its lands are in the hands of the few. Of the twenty millions of population of England and Ire- land, the soil is owned by a few thousand. The corn laws were enacted, and have been main- tained for many generations, for the purpose of giving to the landowner a monopoly of the bread- stuffs—of enabling him to obtain higher rents from his tenants. It is the landholders of En- gland that talk there about protecting English labor and English industry. They raise the cry of panic and alarm as lustily as their co-workers on this side of the Atlantic. "Repeat the corn laws," say they, "and you strike a fatal blow at English labor. Large bodies of land, now oc- cupied, will be abandoned as unprofitable, and thousands and tens of thousands thrown out of employment." The landed aristocracy of En- gland, in struggling to hold on to their unjust privileges, cry out as loudly, and I doubt not as sincerely, in favor of English labor, as do the manufacturers of this country in behalf of Ameri- can labor. They stand in the same relation with the masses of their respective countries.— Each have enjoyed, by unjust and iniquitous legislation, the privilege of plundering the mass, to increase their own wealth. In this country, thank God, there can be no monopoly in the lands for a century or two to come. Here the many are landowners, and the few seek a monop- oly in manufactures. Threaten to repeal the corn laws, and thereby to reduce the rents of the one, and he cries out in behalf of English interests and English labor; talk of modifying the tariff by a reduction of duties, thereby dimi- nishing the dividends of the other, and he de- clains patriotically in favor of American inter- ests and American labor. It is that party, us- ing the arguments and the language of the aris- tocracy of England, seek to build up a similar aristocracy at home.

Doubtless, sir if the remarks I have made should ever see the light, and be so fortunate as to be read, I shall be set down by all monopoli- sts of whatever name or party, as a free-trade man. I deny that I am such in the sense that term is usually employed by the protectionists and Whig party of the North. I am in favor of a tariff for revenue; of an equal, just, and con- stitutional tariff; one that shall protect all inter- ests equally, granting favors to none. By a revenue tariff, I understand one levied upon revenue principles, and in which those who are adhered to, in its details. The Constitu- tion confers upon this Government the right to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and ex- cises, for the purpose of paying its debts and providing for the common defense and general welfare. There is no authority to resort to either of these modes of revenue, except for the objects named; or if authority to impose one, for any other object, as protection, then either or all. What would be thought of the constitu- [SEE NEXT PAGE.]