EASTON GAZETTE.

WHERE THE PRESS IS FREE--"Literature well or ill-conducted, is the Great Engine by which all Popular States must ultimately be supported or overthrown." RELIGION purifies the Heart and teaches us our Duty--Morality refines the Manners--Agriculture makes us Rich and Politics provides for the enjoyment of all.

VOL. XIV. EASTON, MD. SATURDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 29, 1831. NO. 44.

PRINTED & PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY EVENING

BY

ALEXANDER GRAHAM.

TERMS

TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS Per Annum, payable half yearly in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS

Not exceeding a square inserted three times for ONE DOLLAR; and TWENTY FIVE CENTS to every subsequent insertion.

[BY REQUEST.]

From the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser.

ANTI-TARIFF CONVENTION.

A convention composed of citizens from various portions of our country, favorable to the advancement of national industry in all its departments, is about to meet in this city, (on the 26th instant.) It is probable this convention will enter at large into a discussion and consideration of the present tariff, and will strive to point out whatever defects it may contain, (and which all parties agree are numerous) and respectfully suggest some changes and remedies which cannot fail to meet the concurrency of all good citizens.

The question that now most seriously agitates the public mind, is the policy of protection;—some disputing its expediency and advantages, and some its constitutionality; the latter contending also, that a tariff yielding revenue beyond the actual wants of the government, is not only unauthorised by the constitution, but oppressive in its results on one portion of the community, to the aggrandizement of another. If the argument is, that revenue beyond the requirements or expenditures of government is unjust or unconstitutional, then to show how far the present effect of the tariff is unlawful, it must be ascertained what is the actual expenditure of government. Is this expenditure now at its *maximum*; and is it never to be increased by the increasing developments of the country? But let us admit that the revenue collected under the present tariff far exceeds the expenditure of government, and must continue to increase, after the national debt is paid [illegible] necessary to propose changes in the tariff tending to reduce the amount of revenue.

This course would no doubt be approved by all parties; and the question now turns upon the best course to be adopted in effecting this object—*a reduction of the tariff rates with a view to limiting the amount of revenue.* As this subject involves the highest interest of the country, it becomes the duty of every one calmly and dispassionately to consider it in all its bearings, and whatever light can be thrown upon it should not be rejected, because that light may be feeble, or may not shine exclusively on some favorite or peculiar interest.

The doctrine of "*free trade.*" as also the doctrine that we, as a nation, should not regard the policy of other nations, but act on the principles of free trade, regardless of their restrictions, is all very fine theory, and sounds very *liberal*, but in practice is totally destructive in its results. It scarcely requires an illustration to show its glaring futility. But suppose we test it by a few plain and easily understood illustrations.

Suppose we adopt the "free trade" policy, and say to all nations, "your ships may come to us, bringing the productions of every clime, and take ours to any quarter; and you shall not be subject to tonnage duty." And suppose any one or all of the maritime nations should impose in their ports, on all foreign vessels a high tonnage duty—how long would our free trade policy sustain *our flag* afloat? And does not this suffice to show that a retaliatory system of protection is not only expedient but absolutely necessary? And does not the same argument hold when applied to any and every department of intercourse among nations? If one protects its own industry & guards its productions from competition of others, is it not absolutely necessary that corresponding protection should be applied by others? As an American, I say unequivocally I am in favor of free trade —free and unrestricted intercourse—but it must be general, and those who set the example of *protecting*, should at least be the first to abandon it, if they want *free trade.*

Let England, for example, who has increased herself by a long period of strict protection of her industry and skill in all its departments, whilst she has counselled other nations to keep "open House," and be liberal, let her open her ports to the productions of our industry, and take our Corn, our Flour, our Beef and Pork, our Rice, our Tobacco, our Lumber and our Naval Stores, and any and every article we choose to offer her, and I for one will vote for the free reception of her Calicoes and Hardware, and any thing she may choose to send us, and our people choose to pay for. If she on the score of requiring revenue, imposes a duty on our productions of say 10 per cent we can do the same on hers; if she should require extraordinary resources and find herself compelled to exact more duty, we should keep pace, and charge the same on hers; and though we might not want it for the same purposes, we can give it back to our people, either in general improvements for the benefit of all, or, as the people represented in Congress may direct; the first point not being lost sight of, that is in no case is our industry or the productions of our industry, to be taxed abroad higher than the tax imposed by us on the productions of foreign industry, else the doctrine of free trade and unrestricted intercourse is abandoned, and injury to the liberal party must result.

Thus then it appears as clear as the simplest problem, that free trade cannot be sustained by one nation exclusively, and that nation escape destruction.

If our country produced any article exclusively required by the manufacturing nations of Europe, or let us suppose that the only article produced in our country was Cotton, (which happens to be an article not produced by the manufacturing nations of Europe, and which they require) then no doubt it might be expedient for us to be cultivators of the raw material exclusively, and take in exchange all we required of foreign manufactures; but it happens that we cant all be cotton growers. A large portion of our country produces other articles, which must find a market, or the production must be abandoned. The question then is, where is this market to be found? Shall we take a cargo of Comestables, Tobacco and Lumber to England to exchange for her manufactured articles? She tells us she cant take our flour unless she is threatened with famine, or imposes a duty of enormous severity in accordance with their corn law; because they must protect the landed interest. She cant take our tobacco unless at an enormous duty; something like 1500 per cent on its value here, because it is a great luxury and they want revenue. She cant take our beef and pork for reasons similar to those which compel her to reject our flour—nor will she take our lumber, short of a duty amounting to entire pro- [illegible] supply it. But she'll take cotton at a moderate duty, because she cant produce it herself—and because she wants it for her factories; taking from us what she would pay us 1s. for and sells it back to us in a manufactured state for a guinea—and how are we to pay this difference? Why when we have given her all our cotton, we must pay the difference in metalic money, or in productions gleaned by us elsewhere in exchange for our productions of soil in round about circuitous voyages, taking the risk of profit and losses as we can; whilst she carefully protecting every branch of her industry, and thereby cherishing and progressing skill in all departments is rapidly laying all nations under contribution to the same and controling and perpetuating power which is felt in every part of the creation; preaching free trade to all nations, but practising herself the most exclusive system of protection.

What course then is left us? what course does common sense point out to us? to find at home if we can, what is denied us abroad—A market for the mutual interchange of our commodities.—Let us suppose two manufacturing nations abroad offering to furnish us all the manufactured articles we require, at same rates. One however, agrees to take all the productions of our soil we choose to give it in pay, and the other rejects a large portion, and asks its value in metalic money. Which nation should we select to hold intercourse with? and to which would our intercourse most naturally tend? Most assuredly with that nation receiving the productions of our industry, without imposing ruinous duties or taxes on it; for it would be a mutual interchange of industry. Then why should we deny to ourselves at home this preference to a portion of our own people who are ready and willing to furnish to the other portion of our people the same facilities. The manufacturing portion of our people say to the cultivators of the soil, give us your produce, and we will you ours—and let the merchant be our mutual agent and carrier. We cant all be manufacturers, or farmers, or merchants. We must divide the labor among us, and let us all seek and secure at home, what is denied us abroad.

All nations have long since adopted this course—they protect themselves—& so long as uninterrupted peace continues, they will become more and more independent of us. We are no longer the carriers and feeders of beligerent powers —they are all at peace, and at work among themselves, and strictly protecting their industry, allowing no free and unrestricted competition. We must do the same.

But a portion of our citizens—a small though respectable, minority say, "let trade find its own level"—"don't force affairs through, or by restrictive measures," —"let us alone, and let every man take his own course,"—"don't tax one portion to benefit another portion, but let all alone." This is the language of cotton growers, and a portion of our commercial circle, particularly that class exclusively confined to foreign agencies. Is it necessary to furnish a better answer to them than to submit to their calm consideration, as men, as patriots, as Americans, some reflections like the foregoing? The writer of this is neither a manufacturer, nor a farmer—he is a merchant, almost exclusively engaged in foreign commerce—his own *personal interest* would council him to urge a widely different policy from that he now urges on the consideration of his fellow citizens. He is firmly convinced that the true policy of this nation is to *protect its industry.* So long as the leading members of the family of nations pursue a similar policy, there is no other course, if we should escape national ruin. There is no parallel to the prosperity this nation, at present, enjoys. Some interests may not be as much favored as others, by the nation as a whole, is evidently on the high road of "successful experiment." It is the result of protected industry, securing at home a market for at least a large portion of our productions which is denied us abroad. Look at the condition now of every nation whose peculiar situation arising from unstable governments, or the influence of other causus disables them from adopting a course similar to ours.

Are they not all impoverished, and verging to utter dependence on the great "machine shop" of Europe? Even India herself, trusting to her native industry, work and redundant population, and cheapness of living, is now pouring her metalic wealth to England, by millions, to pay her for the productions of improved steam power looms, and other inventions of late years, which push into all portions of the East, articles which but a few years ago were exported thence; and what will be the result? A few years more will tell it. Let them however look to it—but to recur to our own [illegible] It has been said and admitted, that [illegible] revenue is greater than our expenditure, hence it is argued that the tariff is unconstitutional; and must be so reduced that revenue and expenditure should about balance accounts. But there are two leading methods of reducing a revenue: one is, by advancing a duty tending toward prohibition; and the other, by graduating it on a low scale, which admits foreign productions. The former is urged by the "Free Traders" as oppressive in its results, and the latter is urged by the manufacturer as tending to destroy his infant efforts, which require at first great protection, to enable him to perfect his work, to compete with the long practised skill of foreigners, who have attained to their perfection by a strict and long continued prohibition on the part of their government. He asks this protection only for a certain period. He already tells you, as an earnest of his motives and intention, that in many articles, he has already reached that perfection; that he dares to meet the most skillful without government protection. He tells his government and his fellow citizens that he is willing and ready to enter into a free consideration of the present tariff; to correct its errors and modify its oppressions, which he admits are many, but are not of his creating. He will go over the tariff, article by article, and point out such as pay duties which result in no benefit to any interest, but are in reality a tax upon the consumer, for which he derives no equivalent—and this is an important consideration. If a consumer feels that he is paying a higher price, in consequence of the tariff, for an article manufactured at home by his neighbor, than he would have to pay for it if he bought it abroad, let him first inquire (if a farmer) how he pays for it; if the foreigner would take what he has to sell on as good terms as his neighbor pays, then the tariff operates oppressively on him as a consumer but if on the contrary the foreigner will not take any thing but *money*, then the farmer must first get the money or go without the manufacture required, or patronise his neighbor's workshop.

Every article that can be made or produced at home among ourselves, though it nominally costs the consumer more than it costs him abroad, may yet be cheaper to him than if purchased abroad, the purchase of an article is only a small part of the negociation. The most important part is the mode of paying for it. The whole business of life is an exchange of industry and skill. If a family or a nation cannot give in exchange the productions of its industry for that of others, there can be no negociation or mutual advantage; and happy may that nation or family deem itself that can find at home, and within its own circle, that interchange of its industry which is denied it elsewhere.

With the foregoing desultory remarks let us proceed to the consideration of that adjustment and modification of the tariff, which is now humbly conceived to be called for, and which is respectfully suggested to those who are now about to convene in this city, to discuss this matter.

The tariff might be taken up, and divided off into three classes.

The 1st class to embrace all the leading articles of the manufactures, which experience has proved can be made or produced in the United States, by a protecting duty, calculated to sustain said productions, (and let the duty be clearly and plainly specified) and to operate to the exclusion of frauds of every description.

The 2d class to embrace all articles, which though capable of being made here only by excessive protecting duties experience teaches, furnishes no equivalent to the consumer, by taking from him an adequate quantity of what he may have to furnish the operative—the latter being few in number, and the manufactured article being peculiarly of a local character—also, all articles of bulky or fragile character, subject to heavy expenses and risk in transportation, which would of itself be a protection to interior and local manufacturers. On all such let the duty be graduated, more with a view to revenue than protection; and lastly, let

The 3d class embrace every article that can neither be made nor produced in our country—teas, coffee, spices; wines, drugs—all articles raw or manufactured, required in the arts, which cannot be produced at home. Let all these come into the country as free as water from the clouds. With a few exceptions these articles will be found coming to us from countries that would be ready and willing to receive the productions of our country in exchange and our skillful diplomatist abroad could turn it to favorable account, by securing such equivalents and modifications as would amply compensate for the loss of revenue.

If something like this arrangement of the Tariff were adopted, the result would be, that the industry of the country would be protected—the consumer would pay no tax for which he would not receive an ample equivalent, and the fear of a redundant revenue would be dissipated.

It may not be out of place before closing this article, to pass a few words on the proceedings of what is termed the Free Trade Convention, late in session in Philadelphia.

If it be the object of that convention, by passing a vote upon the constitutionality of the tariff, and thus attempting to sway public sentiment by an impression that said vote is the free and spontaneous expression of the nation, it is a false hope, and reflects little credit on either the judgment or the integrity of the majority of the convention. But let that pass—*the people* will not fail to fully understand that said expression is entirely and to all intents ex parte, and no more an expression of national sentiment, than a vote here at a ward meeting, or an anti-Jackson, or anti-masonic, would express the national will. The report read by Mr. Berrien, though no doubt an honest expression of the sentiments of the majority of the committee who produced it, scarcely contains an argument or expression not already fully refuted, and that is not capable of being entirely prostrated by *facts* calmly considered. Arguments, or facts to sustain arguments, it scarcely can be said to contain any. It is replete with assertions & well-turned periods, and goes fully to show that the cotton growers perhaps don't get as good prices, nominally, as they would if no duty on imported cottons manufactured existed—that is, that the manufacturing nations of Europe could afford to pay the cotton growers a better price for the raw material, provided they met no obstruction to the supplying the consumers of the manufactured article in our country. It is admitted by us that England and other countries abroad, supply us with just so much less of such manufactured articles as they formerly supplied us with—as we manufacture ourselves — But what does this prove? Simply, that we are enabled to furnish at home, to pay for the amount of home manufactures, just so much of other productions of the soil, which would otherwise have found no market elsewhere—for, as has been said above, the purchase of an article is but one and a small part of the negotiation—*the most important part is to pay for it.*

And after all, what has been the destructive effect of our tariff law as it is? Are our foreign imports injuriously lessened? The custom-house returns tell us imports are very heavy, and every day tells us more than we can pay for, in what productions Europe chooses to take from us—without sending off by every packet millions of our precious metals —the basis of an extended and convenient paper currency—causing a compulsory limitation of the latter to the great inconvenience of our active operators over our extended country—thus reducing our monied capital. Does it oppress our people, or a majority of them, leaving any portion of them idle? *We have no evidence of it here*—all are busy—ship, plough and spindle. And is the profit of the latter confined to "*the few*" as indicated by the *report?* There are very few manufactories in our country—not incorporated, and thereby possessed of an extended range of stockholders by transferable scrip—capable of being held and owned by any person, whether north or south of the Potomac—and *cui bono?*

Let this question, simple in itself, as all others put above are intended to be, be calmly weighed and considered by men by patriots, by Americans—and for one I am willing to abide the answer.

A MERCHANT.

From the National Journal.

GEN. JACKSON AND MR. DAVIDSON.

Having seen occasional allusions in our exchange papers, to a transaction between *Gen. Jackson* and *Mr. Nelson Davidson*, a respectable and intelligent mechanic of this city, we were induced to make some enquiries on the subject, of Mr. Davidson himself. The result of them is a request to insert the following statement, which Mr D. is ready to verify in the most solemn manner.

On or about the last of March in the present year, Gen. Jackson sent his coach to Mr Davidson's shop, with orders delivered through the coachman, to put the carriage in complete repair.—While the repairs were in progress, the choachman repeatedly called on Mr. D. to enquire if they were done, and was as often informed that all practicable expedition was used in doing the work. At length, early in May, when the coach was in a state of finish the coachman informed Mr. D. that the President was very angry at the delay, and had declared that he must have his carriage, or that he would take it away to Baltimore. On the 22d or 23d of that month, Mr. D. addressed a note to Gen. Jackson, stating that the coachman had represented to Mr. D. that the repairs had exceeded Gen. Jackson's expectation, and expressing Mr. D's regret at having in the way of his business given any dissatisfaction to Gen. Jackson. On the same day Mr. D. received a note from Gen. Jackson, of which the following is a copy:

"The President, with his respects to Mr. Davidson, coachmaker, informs him that it is impossible that the bill furnished can be for his carriage, as he sent his to get the wheels new rimed and new tire, and nothing more, as Mr. Davidson had repaired the body, &c. &c. shortly before. Therefore the President cannot pay for other repairs, which he neither ordered, nor his carrige wanted—the President would like to see Mr. Davidson, as he wishes his carriage with repairs ordered. May 23d, 1831."

Mr. Davidson was not less surprised at the official and diplomatic style of this communication, than he felt aggrieved by the insulting attack on his character, involved in Gen. Jackson's declaration 'that it was *impossible* that the bill furnished can be for his carriage.' Gen. Jackson's disclaimer of his having ordered the repairs, could not fail also to surprise Mr. D. as he had previously done work for Gen. Jackson, on verbal orders transmitted through his servants, and obtained payment for it without any objection on the part of the Gen. If he could have entertained any doubts as to the authority for the repairs in the present instance on account of the channel through which they were ordered, that doubt would have been removed by the recollection that General Jackson had previously in person apprised Mr. D of his intention to have the coach put in complete order.

In compliance with the intimation conveyed in the President's note, of his desire to see Mr. Davidson, Mr. D. waited on him. He was apparently waiting for Mr. D. as he had Mr. D's. note in his hand. Mr. Donelson was in company with the President, and Mr. Van Buren, as Mr Davidson has learned was in the adjoining room. Mr. Davidson politely and respectfully approached the president, who rose from his seat, evidently in a rage, and violently upbraided Mr. Davidson for having done so much work to his carriage. Mr. Davidson requested him to pause for a moment and to reflect, that the repairs made were such as had been ordered through his coachman. The President's passion increased: He rung the bell for the coachman and another servant. They obeyed the summons. He began to abuse them saying to the coachman "you durn'd infernal scoundrel, did you dare to order this work?" The coachman answered, "yes master, I understood you to order the coach to be put in complete repair.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc2940_scm11030-0148.jpg