

TERMS: ONE DOLLAR a year in advance. One Dollar Fifty Cents if not paid within three months, and if delayed until after the expiration of the year, two dollars will be exacted. Discontinuances optional with the Publishers, unless arrangements are made. Letters to the Publishers on business with the office must be post-paid to insure attention.

SPEECH OF HON. A. H. HEAD, On the Tariff Question.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, July 6th, 1842.

Mr. Chairman: The subject now under consideration is one of deep and all-absorbing interest to the People of this Union. Its effects, for good or for evil, its multifarious ramifications, will reach every hamlet and log-cabin in the United States. The working man, the poor laborer, the busy artisan, the independent cultivator of the soil, the shoemaker, the merchant, the shipper, and the paper-money nabob—in short, the smaller as well as the larger interests of the country will feel either its paralyzing or its renovating touch—the former, if it shall be adjusted upon short-sighted sectional feelings and local prejudices; the latter, if it shall be made to foster and stimulate national industry the only source of national wealth and national prosperity. It is therefore entitled at our hands to the most grave and deliberate consideration. We should look at the subject divested of all sectional interests and party animosities, with fixed and resolute determination to promote the best interests of the country at large, and to settle the policy of the Government in regard to revenue and incidental protection on a firm and permanent basis, in such manner as to release our constituents from all apprehensions of change hereafter. The industry, the exercise of the physical energies of man; assisted by those machines and inventions designated as labor-saving, is, in truth and in fact, the only source and origin of national wealth and prosperity; it is a proposition so unquestionably true, that no one who has turned his attention to the subject, and investigated the principles of political economy, can for a moment hesitate to adopt it as a postulate. Cast your eye, Sir, over the civilized world; and without a solitary exception you will find those nations whose industry is protected and nourished, occupying an elevated position in the family of nations, and exercising a controlling influence over neighboring nations; and on the other hand, in those countries where their peculiar institutions operate to paralyze industry, you will find the people in a miserable and abject state, subject to the most unjust exactions, and incapable of demanding satisfaction for the insults of their haughty neighbors. Such is the aspect presented by the map of the civilized world.

But it is unnecessary to argue a question which has been settled for ages, and which has grown into a maxim with political economists. It is more important to inquire into the mode of attaining so desirable an object, as the greatest possible prosperity of our common country. Before proceeding to these questions, it may be proper to notice some objections to the views of those who are in favor of action upon the subject at this time. The first objection—and one which I presume will be strongly pressed on the committee—is the compromise act of 1833. It will be urged upon us, that no action can be had upon the subject except for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of that act, without a breach of faith. Although it is admitted, in the abstract, that as a general principle, one Congress cannot bind a subsequent Congress, yet it will be contended that the peculiar situation of the country, the dangers which threaten us, and the excitement and irritation caused by sectional interests, at the time of the passage of the compromise act, ought to make this an exception to the general rule. The morality of Congress will be invoked to consider that particular act in the nature of a binding and sacred compact which cannot be touched without tarnishing the moral character of the government, and trampling in the dust the first principles of common honesty and moral rectitude. Now, Sir, if that act had proved adequate to the wants of the country—if it had passed with a full knowledge of the results to be produced—if its framers had legislated with a presence of its practical operations, in all time to come—these would be cogent arguments for adhering to it as a binding compromise.

But when time and experience have shown that what was adopted under an erroneous impression of all parties with respect to its results; when it is found totally inadequate to the necessities of the country, in view of revenue alone; when it is admitted if not by every member of Congress, by the great mass of all political parties among the people, that it cannot supply more than one half the necessary revenue; when it is apparent that its continued operation would irretrievably prostrate the public credit and bring the nation to bankruptcy upon a nation possessing energy and enterprise unequalled in the sisterhood of nations, together with all the elements of wealth in an eminent degree; when it is remembered that its effects already joined to the anticipation of its stunted fruits hereafter, have involved us in debt and embarrassments beyond the wisdom and power of the constituted authorities to overcome; that your six per cent. stocks go begging in the market, and finally, are sold at a ruinous discount, while money in Europe is abundant at 2 1/2 to 3 per cent.; when it is known to have paralyzed domestic industry, to have arrested the plough of the farmer, and the hammer of the artisan, and the machinery of the manufacturer; when it has seasoned your dinner with foreign salt, warmed your parlor with imported coal, and laid your railroads with English iron; when it has already involved this country in two hundred and fifty millions of debt, without any available means of liquidation; when it has ruined your citizens, prostrated your currency, locked up your stores of inexhaustible mineral wealth, bankrupted your banks, legged your states, and brought your Federal Government humbly suing at the feet of a board of brokers for the means of keeping the wheels of government in motion; when all these evils have followed in its train, and would be multiplied four-fold

THE PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE.

"EVERY DIFFERENCE OF OPINION IS NOT A DIFFERENCE OF PRINCIPLE."—JEFFERSON.

VOL. 1.

MONTROSE, PA. THURSDAY OCT. 1, 1846.

NO. 16.

Terms of Advertising.

Advertisements conspicuously inserted at the usual rates of Five Cents per square for the first, and Twenty-Five Cents additional for each subsequent insertion. Yearly Advertisements, with the privilege of alteration, not to exceed Quarter Column, with the paper, per year, \$5.00 Half Column do do 3.00 One Column do do 2.00 Business Cards do do 1.00 All other advertisements inserted at reasonable rates. Advertisements should be marked with the number of insertions required.

by its continuance "who will contend that the compromise of 1833 should bind us?"

Sir, if a compact be made under a mistake of all parties to its provisions, which fails to effect the specified and only purpose for which it was intended, there is no principle of moral honesty violated in disregarding its letter, when that which was supposed to be its life and spirit is found not to exist. And when it is agreed on all hands that that act will not and cannot sustain the operations of Government—when it would furnish but a moiety of the revenue required, by the most economical administration of its affairs, let me ask gentlemen, in what mode or manner they propose to supply its deficiency? As has been shown here, the Constitution allows but three different modes of raising revenue, viz: direct taxation, excise, and imposts, or a tariff of duties on foreign productions imported and consumed by our own citizens. I will venture the opinion, Sir, no one solitary individual on this floor will seriously argue a resort to the first, or direct taxation, for the purpose of raising twenty-seven millions, or any other amount of revenue, except in a case of dire necessity, when the ordinary supply may be cut off, by collision with foreign nations. A continued and uninterrupted practice, from the adoption of the Constitution to this day, has sufficiently ascertained the sense, and settled the mandate of the people—that direct taxes are not to be imposed for revenue except under the extraordinary circumstances just indicated.

Sir, what then is to be done? You have no choice. It is a case of unyielding necessity. You have no other available source of revenue than imposts. Either the substantial compromise (for it is nothing more) must be repudiated, or the Government must cease to exist. In such a dilemma, will any man hesitate? No, Sir. We must raise the requisite amount by means of a revised tariff. The duty is imperative. It may be possibly alleged here—to my utter surprise I have heard the allegation made somewhere, by one standing high in the confidence of Southern politicians, that the compromise act will produce as much revenue as any other, or more than other tariff duties which can possibly be devised. This cannot be so. The assertion must have been made under some strange hallucination of the mind. It is ascertained that the utmost extent of its fruits can never exceed fifteen millions. And the Secretary of the Treasury has demonstrated, beyond a possibility of doubt, that his proposed rate of duties based upon the importations of 1840, would yield twenty-seven millions net income, after reducing expenses and drawbacks upon re-exportation. The importations of that year were far less than the preceding years, and were greatly reduced by the severe pressure in our money market, which commenced in the year 1837, and had increased up to and during the year 1840. But suppose the Secretary is wrong in selecting that year as indicative of future importations; and that the chairman of the finance committee is right in anticipating decreased importations hereafter, (and I hope he may be right in this;) yet the fruits of the Secretary's proposed tariff could never be less than twenty-three or twenty-four millions—a sum which under a system of the most rigid economy, with the reduction of the army and navy, might possibly be adequate to the wants of the Treasury. I do not desire to be understood as approving the proposition of the Secretary: on the contrary, I deem it greatly erroneous in many of its details. I only refer to it to show the absurdity of the notion that the compromise act would bear a comparison with other rates of duties, in filling your treasury and keeping the wheels of government in motion. Waiving, however, for the present, that absurdity, and admitting for the argument, that such might be the fact: what would follow? The increase of revenue, upon a 20 per cent. ad valorem duty, could result only from greatly increased importations and consumption of foreign products.

What is the disease under which this country is now languishing? Is it not a surfeit of foreign productions? What has prostrated your agricultural, your commercial and your manufacturing interests, your credit, your currency, your banks, your improvements, your States, your everything, but the inordinate and excessive importation, and the consequent extravagant consumption of foreign goods, for which you have no corresponding amount of exports in return? What but these have reduced us, in the language of Mr. Clay, to a condition of "infinite distress and embarrassment?" Or, in the language of the minority report of the Committee on Manufactures, "why has a cry of distress, almost of despair, come up to these halls from all parts of our common country?" Sir, there is not a man from Maine to Florida who will hazard his reputation as a statesman by standing up here and denying that a plethora of imports is the disease which is consuming the very vitals of our country. Where, then, is the statesman or the patriot who would desire to see these evils not only perpetuated, but increased and multiplied, (as there must be, at least to double the amount of the present importations,) if it were possible to raise the requisite revenue on the basis of the act of 1833? Such a state of things, were it attainable, would place a veto on domestic industry, destroy your independence, make you the vassals of foreign satraps, and reduce your country to positive ruin and universal bankruptcy.

The second objection to action on the subject is, that it is the purpose of the Eastern and Northern manufacturers to impose duties for protection as a primary object, and thereby unnecessarily tax the consumer, and enrich the few at the expense of the many; to oppress one part of the community for the benefit of another; to sacrifice the interests of the South for the special benefit of the North. Such is the allegation. Whether it be true I know not. But

if it be, the Democracy of Pennsylvania gives no countenance to, has no communion with, any such intent or purpose. We have a Pennsylvania doctrine, based upon no particular favoritism to the manufacturing interests. We hold that all classes of community, and all sections of country, are entitled to equal consideration in our legislative halls; that the North is not to prey upon the South, nor the South to subject all others to its peculiar local interests; that agriculture, commerce, and manufactures are so intimately blended and connected—as mutually dependent on the prosperity of each other—that neither can be beneficially or injuriously affected, without the others being similarly influenced; that the business of legislation equally to protect the rights and sustain the interests of all, and thereby to secure the greatest good of the greatest number. As the agriculturists (of course including the planters) constitute a vast majority of the people of this country, that interest should be the primary object of consideration.

Sir, I have the honor to represent a people decidedly agricultural; and the incidental protection of domestic industry, to be accorded by the measure now pending, I shall endeavor to regulate my conduct and my votes with a special view to the interests of agricultural industry. I have no exclusive sympathies for the lordly manufacturer as he is called; and if I would give incidental protection to his fabrics, it is with an especial intent of fostering agricultural industry, by creating a home market for those surplus products which are now rotting in our granaries in consequence of the exclusive policy of foreign governments. As before indicated, these benefits cannot be secured for the great and primary interest, without, at the same time, giving a healthful impetus to the commercial and manufacturing interests—the former by furnishing articles and increased surplus productions for exportation—and the latter by supplying abundant employment, at a reasonable profit, to our rapidly increasing numbers, who have no motive or inducement to cultivate the soil of the West, while it requires three hundred pounds of bacon to purchase a pair of boots, and the price of two cows to purchase a common hat; other fruits of the soil in proportion.

With regard to those articles which are necessary in a time of war, the first law of nature—the law of self defence—requires that we should take care to secure an abundant supply, at any sacrifice, and at all times, within our reach, to be prepared for any emergency that may occur. Here let me remark, Sir, that a fixed and settled policy on this subject is all important to the prosperity of the great interests of the country. It is vastly more important that we should know what the law is to be in a succession of future years, than it can be that the rate of duty should be fixed by any particular standard. The uncertain, vacillating policy of the Government heretofore, has done more to paralyze the arm of industry, and raise the cry of distress, almost of despair, from all parts of our common country, than any positive deficiency in the amount of protective discrimination.

The third objection of the minority report is, that the duty is necessarily paid by the consumer; and, therefore, a burdensome tax on him, without any corresponding benefit to the country. Is this so? It is admitted that the consumer pays a duty on those articles which, from climate, or other natural causes, cannot be produced in this country; and cannot be avoided, if subjected to duty. But all this, and four-fold more, is required for revenue; and, therefore, not objectionable on Southern principles. But these articles of consumption, if they become necessities, and are in general use, the Pennsylvania policy would place in the free list. This, so far as we are concerned, disposes of the labored argument of the minority of the committee on that subject. With regard to those articles, the facilities for the production of which exist among ourselves, the consumer does not necessarily pay the tax. He may pay the whole or part of it, temporarily; and until the new stimulant given to domestic industry shall have increased the home manufacture to something near a supply for domestic consumption. Competition then uniformly operates to reduce the price to the consumer far below what he paid for the foreign article before the home manufacture was established here by the fostering care of Government. There is no magic in this. It results from the ordinary operation of the law of trade. The meanest tyro in the science of political economy may perfectly understand that the price of any article mainly depend on the relative amount of demand and supply. If you augment the supply of any article of commerce, necessarily reduced; and on the contrary, if you increase the demand, (that is, enlarge the market,) the supply remaining the same, you necessarily enhance the price of the article to the same degree as the proportion of relative amount of supply and demand, causes indicated, with the same certainty that the laws of nature operate. Water does not more certainly seek a level, than the increase of supply in a given market reduces the price of the article. This law of trade is as immutable as any law of nature. This reduction not only overbalances the duty imposed, (if it be a reasonable duty,) but compels the foreign manufacturer to dispose with inordinate profits, such as a monopoly of the market would enable him to demand; and he having the power so to do, his inclination to demand inordinate profits, will not be doubted. It follows that the duty is not a tax on the consumer; but is wholly paid by the foreign producer or importer of both. In other words, it is deducted from their profits. The duty, to produce the greatest possible reduction of price to the consumer, should equal the difference in price of labor in this country and in the foreign countries furnishing the article.—If

the duty much exceed this standard, the foreign manufacturer will be driven from the market, the competition will cease, the price will be enhanced, and the revenue lost. We (the democracy of Pennsylvania) do not desire prohibitory duties. We are equally opposed to monopoly in the domestic and foreign manufacturer. Sir, let me illustrate this law of trade by an example, which shall come down to the comprehension of the most unlearned. Suppose we lay no duty on imported axes: labor is ten cents per day in England—an axe, therefore, can be made in England for 40 cents; but labor is 50 cents per day in the United States, and therefore an axe cannot be made in the United States for less than one dollar. The freight of an axe from England to the United States (say) ten cents. Consequently an English axe may be sold here at from sixty to seventy cents. While there is no protection against this difference in the price of labor, no American citizen will be so stupid as to invest a large capital in an axe factory, which may be broken down at any time by the English manufacturer.—While this state of things exist there will not be a single axe factory in the United States. The English manufacturer will have a monopoly of this market. Will he sell his axes at sixty cents? You must have an axe at any price he may demand, because you have no factories. He may charge you \$3. He will charge you \$3. Do you doubt it? No, Sir. He has the monopoly, he has the power, and he will use it at your cost; you must have an axe. This exorbitant price induces some twenty of our citizens to commence the erection of axe factories; knowing that they can sell axes at \$1.50, and make a good "business." The agent of the British manufacturer reports the fact: to his principle, who takes the alarm; his monopoly is in danger; he knocks down the price of the English axe to sixty cents; the American factories are all broken down; their owners ruined; the monopoly is re-established; and the price of an axe is again \$3. This is precisely what has occurred, continually in a vast variety of cases, in which a large investment of capital is required. This is the kind of vassalage to which some of our trade notions, unwittingly subject the African citizens. On the other hand, imported axes, and the American manufacturer is protected against the pauper labor of England; he cannot be broken down; his factory doors cannot be closed by his foreign competitors; he is now a free and independent man; he comes into market on equal terms; both are in the market; neither has a monopoly; the supply is doubled; the demand remaining the same; the price is reduced to the lowest point—say one dollar and fifty cents. And so far from the consumer paying the duty, he is relieved from the double price imposed by British cupidity and monopoly. Such is the effect of the protective policy. The American manufacturer cannot extort from the consumer, for his foreign competitor is still in the market, keeping him down to reasonable prices. There is no mystery in this; it is but the necessary operation of the law of trade; every body knows how the stage fare is reduced when the opposition line starts; and how he will be compelled to pay the old high fare the moment that the opposition is purchased or broken down. Hence it is that the protection of domestic industry necessarily reduces the price of manufactured articles of the consumer; while at the same time, it furnishes a home market for the surplus production of the farmer, and furnishes the material for commercial enterprise, by augmenting their exports, and thus promote the prosperity of all classes of the community. And, Sir, permit me to add, that actual experiment confirms this view of the laws of trade.

Look Sir, at the history of the cotton manufacturers of this country, which teaches us a lesson not to be overlooked or disregarded. What is this lesson? Previous to the year 1816, Great Britain enjoyed a monopoly of the cotton stuff market of these States.—The retail price of coarse English cottons was from 28 to 31 cents per yard—the same quality of cottons which are now selling for 7 to 9 cents. How many thousands—how many hundreds of thousands of dollars have been saved to the poor of this country by the reduction of the price of the article since 1816! True, it is alleged by the gentleman from Georgia, who gives us the minority report from the committee on Manufactures, that this reduction has resulted from improvement in machinery, and the introduction of steam power. Is this he is partly right and partly wrong. These causes doubtless had their effect; but unaccompanied by domestic competition could never have reduced the price to fourth the former amount. Say the improvements in machinery and the introduction of a new power, have caused two-thirds of this reduction, it still leaves one-third or one hundred per cent. reduction by domestic competition. The consumer had been enjoying the benefit of this 100 per cent reduction, for more than twenty years, and is to enjoy it under a "judicious tariff," for an indefinite number of years to come—a saving to him and to a hundred-fold amount of any temporary increase in cost which might have occurred in the two or three or half-dozen years immediately subsequent to the imposition of duties. Had the English manufacturer alone been permitted to avail himself of the labor of the steam engine—had he continued; to the present day, to enjoy the monopoly of this market—can any one for a moment believe that he would have voluntarily surrendered those prices which that monopoly had therefore enabled him to demand? When was the time, Sir, that the cupidity of the foreign manufacturer ever surrendered an advantage, from a sense of justice and equity, when it was in his power to reap the fruits of monopoly? Witness the effects of monopoly and competition on our railroad & steamboat lines: the latter, always reducing the fare from 75 to 100 per cent; and fre-

quently to two hundred per cent—and then say if the manufacture of cottons in this country has not reduced the price of the consumer at least 100 out of 300 per cent, actual reduction? It is impossible to doubt on this subject. A similar reduction to the amount of 80 or 90 per cent, has occurred in the price of paper, and various other articles which have heretofore received the fostering care of Government. If like causes produce like effect, it follows that judicious discrimination in levying import duties would reduce the price of hundreds of domestic articles far below the present price of the foreign fabric. In a long succession of years, therefore, the consumer is remunerated ten-fold the amount of any temporary burden which may occur from the earlier effects of protective discrimination. Is it not the business of any legislator to take an enlarged view of this subject—to extend his vision into the vista of futurity, and ascertain the ultimate results of the measures he may adopt? Is it not beneath the dignity of a statesman to legislate with an especial view to the consequence at the next election?

But Sir, suppose for the argument's sake, that the annual price to the consumer is not only maintained, but enhanced if you please, it does not follow that he is injured by the operation of a protective policy. No, Sir. If the farmer actually paid 10 per cent. advance on all his purchases, and by the establishment of domestic manufactures in his neighborhood, and the consequent creation of a home market receives 40 of 50 per cent. advance on his agricultural products—wise must perish on their hands—if he not thereby benefited rather than oppressed by this policy? And such is precisely the effect, as admitted by the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. Habersham,] the leader and oracle of the anti-protective policy of the South.—Such is the innate love of truth in that gentleman's composition, that he could not but admit the fact; although, when duly considered and appreciated, it goes to the entire destruction of his labored argument. Hear him, then, the great anti-tariff leader upon this subject.—I quote from page 7 of his report, where he quotes his appraisal, and the admission of its truth, the testimony of Mr. Schenck, of the Glenham woolen factory, of Dutchess county, N. Y.

That company has a capital of \$140,000. They manufacture wool into broadcloths, kerseys, &c. they consume of the products of the neighborhood: Fleece-wool 170,000 lbs., costing \$72,954 39 Soap, 11,174 lbs., 1,195 96 Teazles, 1,545 57 Fire-wood, 585 88 18,001 pelt for sizing, 584 54 46,000 gallons urine, 827 94 Pay of wages for operatives 35,587 42 \$116,281 80

This by the capital of \$140,000 of this single factory is furnished for the products of that country of \$116,000; now let us see the agricultural capital, now in requisition, which the factory requires to keep it in operation furnishing a market for agricultural investments.

First. To produce 170,000 pounds of wool requires the fleeces of 66,000 sheep. At their lowest prices in Dutchess county, at \$2 per head, \$132,000

Second. To support this immense flock of sheep at three sheep to the acre, requires 22,000 acres of land; the lowest price of land in Dutchess county, \$50 per acre, \$1,100,000

Third. Not less than 500 persons are supported out of the labor of 170 operatives who are employed in the factory, and consume annually of the products of Agriculture, beef, pork, flour, butter, milk, eggs, cheese, &c., at the lowest estimate, to the value of \$10,400. An industrious farmer, on a farm of 200 acres of fair average land, cannot sell off more than \$800 per annum, over and above the supply of his family and work hands.—Therefore to finish the supply for the manufacturers of the Glenham manufactory would require 13 farms of 200 acres each, or 2,600 acres, worth in that country \$70 per acre, \$182,000

Fourth. A further investment of agricultural capital is required to furnish the teazles, fire-wood, coal, provender for team horses, &c., estimated at 8,000

To sum up the whole in his own words, "Thus \$1,422,000 is the agricultural capital now in requisition to supply the manufacturing investments of \$140,000. This supply consists of wool, soap, teazles, and fire-wood, used in the factory, of winter fodder and summer pasture for sheep, and provender for the horses, and food for 170 operatives and their families. Here is a large expenditure, beneficial to most, if not all of the inhabitants of the county, in a greater or less degree, in the same manner as the whole population of England is more or less benefited by their manufacturers."

On page 16 of the same report, the organ of the free-trade politicians proceeds to say: "Now let us proceed to examine the truth of the position of those who admit the tax on the consumer, but insist that it is neutralized by the benefits derived from domestic manufacture. We may admit that it probably be true as relates to those who live in the neighborhood of the factory and work in it, or supply food to the laborer or furnish other requirements of the establishment, as in the case of Glenham wool factory above referred to." Here then is the admission distinctly made by the gentleman from Georgia, that one

single factory in the county of Dutchess, with a capital of \$140,000 gives active employment to \$1,422,000 of agricultural capital—more than ten times the amount of manufacturing capital employed. That is to say the benefit is shared by the two interests in the proportion of one-eleventh part to the manufacturer, and ten-eleventh parts to the agriculturists. Away then, with the senseless cry which has heretofore deceived and cheated the Northern and Western farmer into the belief that the protection of domestic industry is robbing them for the benefit of the manufacturer. Away with the sophistry of the South, which has inveigled the Northern legislator, into the surrender of the best interests of his country, and raised that "cry of distress, almost of despair," so graphically depicted by the gentleman from Georgia.

Here is the force and power of truth drawing from the great and acknowledged leader of the anti-tariff policy of the South, the distinct confession that the large expenditure of the Glenham factory of Dutchess county is beneficial to most if not all inhabitants of the county, in the same manner as the whole population of England are benefited by their manufacturers. Sir, let me commend this admission, to the serious consideration of Northern legislators. It is true that the gentleman from Georgia makes an oblique attempt to evade the force and effect of his admission, by going off into a far-fetched argument to show that the Glenham factory in Dutchess, does not effect the rice grower of the South. What then? Does this invalidate the admission in the slightest degree. Could not the gentleman extend his political vision beyond the present moment? Could he not anticipate the effects of a measure for a series of years to come? Is it not the peculiar province of a statesman, to act for the future, and politically speaking, to fashion and mould that future so as to secure the best interest and ameliorate the condition of the whole people, so as to protect the rights and secure the happiness of all? We ask for the adoption of a system which will locate not only one but half a dozen factories in every county of the Union; for a policy that will plant a factory in every township and school district throughout the broad expanse of our extended domain. We ask that the whole people may enjoy the advantages which the leader of the anti-protective policy is forced to admit that Glenham factory has conferred on the whole mass of the inhabitants of Dutchess county; and to use his own language, "in the same manner as the whole population of England are benefited by their manufacturers." Sir, you see that this admission covers the whole ground—surrenders the whole argument between the North and South—establishes the fact that manufacturing establishments are highly conducive to the prosperity and happiness of the whole people—that so far from taxing oppressively the farming interests, they confer a ten-fold benefit on the farmer, which the manufacturer enjoys. Every thousand dollars invested, gives active employment to ten thousand dollars agricultural capital or in the proportion of 140,000 to 1,422,000; which brings me back to original avowal, the benefits to be derived by protective discrimination will be in exact proportion to the numbers of the different classes of the community. And we believe that all these advantages may be attained, without raising one dollar more than will be required to supply the wants of the most economical Administration. Let us beseech the Northern legislators to re-examine the premises; to retract their errors; to escape if they can, the sophisticated sobriquet of "Northern dough faces," insultingly awarded them by southern courtesy; and to imitate the example of the South, by uniting in one solid phalanx, regardless of party animosities, when the vital interests of the nation are at stake.

We are exultingly referred to the fact that the British ministry have seen the error of their ways, are retracing their steps, and abandoning their protective policy. Sir, there is no difference between that analogy and Pennsylvania system. That Government imposed enormous duties, avowedly for protection, as a primary object, or rather as a prohibition, as the real object—the direct effect of which was to destroy revenue; and at last they were compelled in some measure to abandon a vicious policy. We ask no such thing. We ask no prohibitory duties nor for protection over and above the requisite revenue. We only ask revenue and incidental protection. That argument, therefore, does not reach us. If there are on this floor, or among the people, any advocates of this policy heretofore pursued by the British Government, in relation to protection, or prohibition, we disclaim all connection with, or analogy to such a policy; and if the Northern manufacturers desire to secure to themselves exclusively benefits, by a system operating prevalently upon other sections of the country, we repudiate any and every such intent and purpose. If any there are who have special reference to the interest of the manufacturer, at the expense of the farmer and planter, we denounce the motive and reject the policy. We look as before indicated, primarily to the protection of the agricultural industry—the creation of a home market, and consequent increase of exports, and the necessary enlargement of our commercial relations with all the civilized nations of the earth. We regard first the agricultural interests, for the reason that it comprises the great mass of the people of the United States; and moreover because it is the only sure basis upon which all legitimate commercial and manufacturing prosperity must be sustained.

We do not believe, for one moment, in the ridiculous notion, that the degraded state and miserable condition of the mass of the English nation, are to be ascribed to the "British protective system" as it has been. We know that while an abject state has resulted from the political structure of the government, the restricted right of suffrage, the unequal distribution of the soil, the institution of privileged orders, the continuance of a nobility, the right of primogeniture, and