EASTERN-SHORE WHIG AND PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE.

VOL. IV.—NO. 28. EASTON, MD.—TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 20, 1832. WHOLE NO. 184.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED
EVERY TUESDAY MORNING,
EDWARD MULLIKIN,
PUBLISHER OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION.

THE TERMS
Are Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per Annum payable half yearly in advance. Advertisements are inserted three times for One Dollar; and continued weekly for twenty-five cents per square.

SPEECH OF HENRY CLAY,
IN DEFENCE OF THE AMERICAN SYSTEM,
Against the British Colonial System:
Delivered in the Senate of the U. S. February 2d, 3d and 6th.

[CONTINUED.]

"I should, therefore, think it worthy the care of the government to endeavor, by all possible means, to encourage them in raising of silk, hemp, flax, iron, [☞only pig to be hammered in England] pot ash, &c. by giving them competent bounties in the beginning, and sending over judicious and skilful persons, at the public charge, to assist and instruct them in the most proper methods of management, which, in my apprehension, would lay a foundation for establishing the most profitable trade of any we have. And considering the commanding situation of our colonies along the sea coast; the great convenience of navigable rivers in all of them; the cheapness of land; and the easiness of raising provisions; great numbers of People would transports themselves thither to settle upon such improvements. Now, as People have been filled with fears that the colonies, if encouraged to raise rough materials, would set up for themselves, a *little regulation* would remove all those jealousies out of the way.—They have never thrown or wove any silk as yet that we have heard of. Therefore, if a law was made to prohibit the use of every throwster's mill, or doubling or horsling silk with any machine whatever, they would then *send it us raw:* And, as they will have the providing rough materials to themselves, so shall we have the manufacturing of them. If encouragement be given for raising hemp, flax, &c. doubtless they will soon begin to manufacture, if not *prevented:* Therefore, to stop the progsess of any such manufacture, it is proposed that no weaver there shall have *liberty* to set up any looms without first registering at an office kept for that purpose, and the name and place of abode of any journeyman that shall work with him. But if any *particular inhabitant* shall be inclined to have any linen or woollen made of their own spinning, they should not be abridged of the same liberty that they now make use of, viz. to carry to a weaver (who shall be *licensed* by the Governor) and have it wrought up for the use of the family, but not to be sold to any person in a private manner, nor exposed to any market or fair, upon pain of forfeiture.

"And, inasmuch as they have been supplied with all their iron manufactures from hence except what is used in the building of ships and other country work, one half of our exports being supposed to be in NAILS—a manufacture which they allow has never hitherto been carried on among them—it is proposed they shall, for time to come, never erect the manufacture of any under the size of a two shilling nail, horse nails excepted; that all slitting nails and engines, for drawing wire or weaving stockings, *be put down*, and that every smith who keeps a common forge or shop, shall register his name and place of abode, and the name of every *servant* which he shall employ, which licence shall be renewed once every year, and pay for the liberty of working at such trade. That all negroes shall be prohibited from weaving either linen or woollen, or spinning or combing of wool, or working at any manufacture of iron, further than making it into pig or bar iron. That they also be prohibited from manufacturing hats, stockings, or leather, of any kind, this limitation will not abridge the planters of any privilege they now enjoy. On the contrary, it will turn their industry to promoting and raising these rough materials."

The author then proposes that the Board of Trade and Plantations should be furnished with statistical accounts of the various permitted manufactures, to enable them to encourage or depress the industry of the colonists and prevent the danger of interference with British industry.

"It is hoped that this method would allay the heat that some people would have shown, for destroying the iron works on the plantations, and pulling down all their forges—taking away, in a violent manner, their estates and properties—preventing the husbandmen from getting their ploughshares, carts, and other utensils, mended; destroying the manufacture of ship building, by depriving them of the liberty of making bolts, spikes, and other things proper for carrying on that work, by which article returns are made for purchasing our woollen manufactures.—Pages 87,88,89."

Such is the picture of colonists dependent upon the mother country for their neccessary supplies, drawn by a writer who was not among the number of those who desired to debar them the means of building a vessel, erecting a forge, or mending a ploughshare, but who was willing to promote their growth and property, as far as was consistent with the paramount interests of the manufacturing or parent State.

"2. The advantages to Great Britain from keeping the colonists dependent on her for their essential supplies.

"If we examine into the circumstances of the inhabitants of our plantations and of our own, it will appear that not *one-fourth* part of their product redounds to their *own profit*, for, out of all that comes here, they only carry back clothing and other accommodations for their families; all of which is of the merchandise and manufacture of this kingdom."

After showing how this system tends to concentrate all the surplus of acquisition over absolute expenditure, in England, he says:

"All these advantages we receive by the plantations, besides the mortgages on the planters' estates, and the high interest they pay us, which is very considerable; and therefore very great care ought to be taken, in regulating all affairs of the colonists, that the planters be not put under *too many difficulties*, but encouraged to go on cheerfully.

"New England, and the northern colonies, have not commodities and products enough to send us in return for purchasing their necessary clothing, but are under very great difficulties; and therefore any ordinary sort will sell with them. And when they have grown out of fashion with us, they are new fashioned *enough* there."

Sir, I cannot go on with this disgusting detail.* Their refuse goods; their old shopkeepers; their cast off clothes, good enough for us! Was there ever a scheme more artfully devised by which the energies and faculties of one People should be kept down and rendered subservient to the pride, and the pomp, and the power, of another! The system then proposed differs only from that which is now recommended, in one particular; that was intended to be enforced by power, this would not be less effectually executed by the force of circumstances. A gentleman in Boston, (Mr. Lee) the agent of the Free Trade Convention, from whose exhaustless mint there is a constant issue of reports, seems to envy the blessed condition of dependent Canada, when compared to the oppressed state of this Union; and it is a fair inference from the view which he presents, that he would have us to hasten back to the golden days of that colonial bondage, which is so well depicted in the work from which I have been quoting. Mr. Lee exhibits two tabular statements, in one of which he presents the high duties which he represents to be paid in the ports of the United States, and in the other, those which are paid in Canada, generally about two per cent. ad valorem. But did it not occur to him that the duties levied in Canada are paid chiefly on British manufactures, or on articles passing from one to another part of a common empire; and that, to present a parallel case, in the United States, he ought to have shown that importations made into one State from another, which are now free, are subject to the same or higher duties than are paid in Canada?

I will now, Mr. President, proceed to a more particular consideration of the arguments urged against the protective system, and an inquiry into its practical operation, especially on the cotton growing country. And, as I wish to state and meet the argument fairly, I invite correction of my statement of it, if necessary. It is alleged that the system operates prejudicially to the cotton planter, by diminishing the foreign demand for his staple; that we cannot sell to Great Britain, unless we buy from her; that the import duty is equivalent to an export duty, and falls upon the cotton grower, that South Carolina pays a disproportionate quota of the public revenue: that an abandonment of the protective policy would lead to an augmentation of our exports of an amount not less than one hundred and fifty millions of dollars; and finally, that the South cannot partake of the advantages of manufacturing, if there be any. Let us examine these various propositions, in detail. 1. That the foreign demand for cotton is diminished; and that we cannot sell to Great Britain unless we buy from her. The demand of both our great foreign customers is constantly and annually increasing. It is true, that the ratio of the increase may not be equal to that of production; but this is owing to the fact that the power of producing the raw material is much greater, and is therefore constantly in advance of the power of consumption. A single fact will illustrate. The average produce of laborers engaged in the cultivation of cotton may be estimated at five bales, or fifteen hundred weight to the hand. Supposing the annual average consumption of each individual who uses cotton cloth to be five pounds, one hand can produce enough of the raw material to clothe three hundred.

The argument comprehends two errors, one of fact and the other of principle. It assumes that we do not in fact purchase of Great Britain. What is the true state of the case?—There are certain, but very few articles which it is thought sound policy requires that we should manufacture at home, and on these the tariff operates. But, with respect to all the rest, and much the larger number of articles of taste, fashion, or utility, they are subject to no other than revenue duties and are freely introduced. I have before me from the treasury a statement of our imports from England, Scotland and Ireland, including ten years, preceding the last, and three quarters of the last year, from which it will appear that, although there are some fluctuations in the amount of the different years, the largest amount imported in any one year has been since the tariff of 1824, and that the last year's importation, when the returns of the fourth quarter shall be received, will probably be the greatest in the whole term of eleven years.

Now, if it be admitted that there is a less amount of the protected articles imported from Great Britain, she may be, and probably is, compensated for the deficiency, by the increased consumption in America of the articles of her industry not falling within the scope of the policy of our protection. The establishment of manufactures among us excites the creation of wealth, and this gives new powers of consumption, which are gratified by the purchase of foreign objects. A poor nation can never be a great consuming nation. Its poverty will limit its consumption to bare subsistence.

The erroneous principle which the argument includes, is, that it devolves on us the duty of taking care that Great Britain shall be enabled to purchase from us without exacting from Great Britain the corresponding duty.—If it be true, on one side, that nations are bound to shape their policy in reference to the ability of foreign Powers, it must be true on both sides of the Atlantic. And this reciprocal obligation ought to be emphatically regarded towards the nation supplying the raw material, by the manufacturing nation, because the industry of the latter gives four or five values to what had been produced by the industry of the former.

But, does Great Britain practise towards us upon the principles which we are now required to observe in regard to her? The exports to the United kingdom, as appears from the same treasury statement just adverted to, during eleven years, from 1821 to 1831, and exclusive of the fourth quarter of the last year, fall short of the amount of imports by upwards of forty-six millions of dollars, and the total amount, when the returns of that quarter are received, will exceed fifty millions of dollars! It is surprising how we have been able to sustain, for so long a time, a trade so very unequal. We must have been absolutely ruined by it, if the unfavorable balance had not been neutralized by more profitable commerce with other parts of the world. Of all nations Great Britain has the least cause to complain of the trade between the two countries. Our imports from that single Power are nearly one third of the entire amount of our importations from all foreign countries together. Great Britain constantly acts on the maxim of buying only what she wants and cannot produce, and selling to foreign nations the utmost amount she can. In conformity with this maxim she excludes articles of prime necessity produced by us—equally if not more necessary than any of her industry which we tax, although the admission of those articles would increase our ability to purchase from her, according to the argument of gentlemen.

If we purchased still less from Great Britain than we do, and our conditions were reversed, so that the value of her imports from this country exceeded that of her exports to it, she would only then be compelled to do what we have so long done, and what South Carolina does, in her trade with Kentucky, make up for the unfavorable balance by trade with other places and countries. How does she now dispose of the one hundred and sixty millions of dollars' worth of cotton fabrics, which she annually sells? Of that amount the United States do not purchase five per cent.—What becomes of the other ninety-five per cent? Is it not sold to other Powers, and would not their markets remain if ours were totally shut? Would she not continue, as she now finds it her interest, to purchase the raw material from us, to supply those markets?—Would she be guilty of the folly of depriving herself of markets to the amount of upwards of $150,000,000, because we refused her a market for some eight or ten millions?

But if there were a diminution of the British demand for cotton equal to the loss of a market for the few British fabrics which are within the scope of our protective policy, the question would still remain, whether the cotton planter is not amply indemnified by the creation of additional demand elsewhere?—With respect to the cotton grower it is the *totality* of the demand, and not its *distribution*, which affects his interests. If any system of policy will augment the aggregate of the demand, that system is favorable to his interests, although its tendency may be to vary the theatre of the demand. It could not, for example, be injurious to him, if, instead of Great Britain continuing to receive the entire quantity of cotton which she now does, two or three hundred thousand bales of it were taken to the other side of the channel, and increased, to that extent, the French demand. It would be better for him, because it is always better to have several markets than one. Now, if, instead of a transfer to the opposite side of the channel, of those two or three hundred thousand bales, they are transported to the Northern States, can that be injurious to the cotton grower? Is it not better for him? Is it not better to have a market at home, unaffected by war or other foreign causes, for that amount of his staple?

If the establishment of American manufactures, therefore, had the sole effect of creating a new, and an American demand for cotton *exactly* to the same extent in which it lessened the British demand, there would be no just cause of complaint against the tariff. The gain in one place would precisely equal the loss in the other. But the true state of the matter is much more favorable to the cotton grower. It is calculated that the cotton manufactories of the United States absorb at least 200,000 bales of cotton annually. I believe it to be more. The two Carolinas, received, during the last year, near 110,000 bales. The amount is annually increasing. The raw material of that two hundred thousand bales is worth six millions, and there is an additional value conferred by the manufacturer, of eighteen millions; it being generally calculated that, in such cotton fabrics as we are in the habit of making, the manufacture constitutes three fourths of the value of the article. If, therefore, these twenty-four millions worth of cotton fabrics were not made in the United States, but were manufactured in Great Britain, in order to obtain them we should have to add to the already enormous disproportion between the amount of our imports and exports, in the trade with Great Britain, the further sum of twenty four millions, or, deducting the price of the raw material, eighteen millions! And will gentlemen tell me how it would be possible for this country to sustain such a ruinous trade.—From all that portion of the United States lying north and east of James river, and west of the mountains, Great Britain receives comparatively nothing. How would it be possible for the inhabitants of that largest portion of our territory, to supply themselves with cotton fabrics, if they were brought from England exclusively? They could not do it. But for the existence of the American manufacture, they would be compelled greatly to curtail their supplies, if not absolutely to suffer in their comforts. By its existence at home, the circle of those exchanges is created which reciprocally diffuses among all, who are embraced within it, the productions of their respective industry. The cotton grower sells the raw material to the manufacturer; he buys the iron, the bread, the meal, the coal, and the countless number of objects of his consumption, from his fellow citizens, and they, in turn, purchase his fabrics. Putting it upon the ground merely of supplying those with necessary articles, who could not otherwise obtain them, ought there to be, from any quarter, an objection to the only system by which that object can be accomplished? But can there be any doubt, with those who will reflect, that the actual amount of cotton consumed is increased by the home manufacture? The main argument of gentlemen is founded upon the idea of mutual ability resulting from mutual exchanges. They would furnish an ability to foreign nations by purchasing from them, and, to our own people, by exchanges at home. If the American manufacture were discontinued, and that of England were to take its place, how would she sell the additional quantity of twenty four millions of cotton goods, which we now make? To us? That has been shown to be impracticable. To other foreign nations? She has already pushed her supplies to them to the utmost extent. The ultimate consequence would, then, be to diminish the total consumption of cotton, to say nothing now of the reduction of price that would take place by throwing into the ports of Great Britain the two hundred thousand bales which, no longer being manufactured in the U. States, would go thither.

2. That the import duty is equivalent to an export duty, and falls on the producer of cotton.

[Here General Hayne explained, and said that he never contended that an import duty was equivalent to an export duty, under all circumstances; he had explained in his speech his ideas of the precise operation of the existing system. To which Mr. Clay replied that he had seen the argument so stated in some of the ingenious essays from the South Carolina press, and would therefore answer it.]

The framers of our constitution, by granting the power to Congress to lay imports, and prohibiting that of laying an export duty, manifested that they did not regard them as equivalent. Nor does the common sense of mankind. An export duty fastens upon, and incorporates itself with, the article on which it is laid. The article cannot escape from it—it pursues and follows it wherever the article goes; and if, in the foreign market, the supply is above or just equal to the demand, the amount of the export duty will be a clear deduction to the exporter from the price of the article. But an import duty on a foreign article leaves the exporter of the domestic article free, 1st. to import specie; 2dly goods which are free from the protecting duty; or, 3dly such goods, as, being chargeable with the protecting duty, he can sell at home and throw the duty on the consumer.

But, it is confidently argued that the import duty falls upon the grower of cotton; and the case has been put in debate, and again and again, in conversation, of the South Carolina planter, who exports 100 bales of cotton to Liverpool, exchanges them for 100 bales of merchandise; and, when he brings them home, being compelled to leave, at the custom house, forty bales in the form of duties. The argument is founded on the assumption that a duty of forty per cent. amounts to a subtraction of forty from the 100 bales of merchandise.—The first objection to it is, that it supposes a case of barter, which never occurs. If it be relied that it, nevertheless, occurs in the operations of commerce, the answer would be that, since the export of Carolina cotton is chiefly made by New York or foreign merchants, the loss stated, if it really accrued, would fall upon them and not upon the planter. But, to test the correctness of the hypothetical case, let us suppose that the duty, instead of forty per cent. should be 150, which is asserted to be the duty in some cases. Then, the planter would not only lose the whole hundred bales of merchandise, which he had gotten for his hundred bales of cotton, but he would have to purchase, with other means, an additional fifty bales in order to enable him to pay the duties accruing on the proceeds of the cotton.—Another answer is, that, if the *producer* of cotton in America, exchanged against English fabrics, pays the duty, the *producer* of those fabrics also pays it, and then it is twice paid. Such must be the consequence, unless the principle is true on one side of the Atlantic, and false on the other. The true answer is, that the exporter of an article, if he invests its proceeds in a foreign market, takes care to make the investment in such merchandise as, when brought home, he can sell with a fair profit; and consequently, the consumer would pay the original cost and charges and profit.

3. The next objection to the American System is, that it subjects South Carolina to the payment of an undue portion of the public revenue. The basis of this objection is the assumption, shown to have been erroneous that the producer of the exports from this country pays the duty on its imports instead of the consumer of those imports. The amount which South Carolina really contributes to the public revenue, no more than that of any other State, can be precisely ascertained. It depends upon her consumption an approximation sufficient for all practical purposes. The cotton planters of the valley of the Mississippi, with which I am acquainted, generally expend about one third of their income in the support of their families and plantations. On this subject, I hold in my hands a statement from a friend, of mine, of great accuracy, and a member of the Senate. According to this statement, in a crop of ten thousand dollars, the expenses may fluctuate between two thousand eight hundred dollars and 3 thousand 2 hundred dollars. Of this sum, about one fourth, from 7 to eight hundred dollars, may be laid out in articles paying the protecting duty, the residue is disbursed for provisions, mules, horses, oxen, wages of overseer, &c. Estimating the exports of South Carolina at eight millions, one third is two millions six hundred and sixty six thousand six hundred and sixty-six dollars; of which, one fourth will be six hundred and sixty six thousand six hundred and sixty six and two-thirds dollars. Now, supposing the protecting duty to be fifty per cent, and that it all enters into the price of the article, the amount paid by South Carolina would only be three hundred and thirty three thousad three hundred and thirty-three and one third dollars. But the total revenue of the U. States may be stated at twenty-five millions, of which the proportion of South Carolina, whatever standard whether of wealth or population, be adopted, would be about one million. Of course, on this view of the subject, she actually pays only about one third of her fair and legitimate share. I repeat, that I have no personal knowledge of the habits of actual expenditure in South Carolina; they may be greater than I have stated, in respect to other parts of the cotton country; but if they are, that fact does not arise from any defect in the system of public policy.

4. An abandonment of the American System, it is urged, would lead to an addition to our exports of one hundred and fifty millions of dollars. The amount of one hundred and fifty millions of cotton, in the raw state, would produce four hundred and fifty millions in the manufactured state, supposing no greater measure of value to be communicated, in the manufactured form, than that which our industry imparts. Now, sir, where would markets be found for this vast addition to the supply? Not in the United States, certainly, nor in any other quarter of the globe, England having already every where pressed her cotton manufactures to the utmost point of repletion. We must look out for new worlds, seek for new and unknown races of mortals to consume this immense increase of cotton fabrics.

[General Hayne said that he did not mean that the increase of one hundred and fifty millions to the amount of our exports, would be of cotton alone, but of other articles.]

What other articles? Agricultural produce, bread stuffs, beef and pork? &c. Where shall we find markets for them? Whither shall we go? To what country, whose ports have not been hermetically sealed against their admission? Break down the home market, and you are without resource. Destroy all other interests in the country, for the imaginary purpose of advancing the cotton planting interest, and you inflict a positive injury without the smallest practical benefit of the cotton planter. Could Charleston, or the whole South, when all other markets are prostrated, or shut against the reception of the surplus of our farmers, receive that surplus? Would they buy more than they might want for their own consumption. Could they find markets which other parts of the Union could not? Would gentlemen force the freemen of all, North of James river, East and West, like the miserable slave, on the Sabbath day, to repair to Charleston, with a turky under his arm, or a pack upon his back, and beg the clerk of some English or Scotch merchant, living in his gorgeous palace, or rolling in his splendid coach in the streets, to exchange his "TRUCK" for a bit of flannel to cover his naked wife and children! No! I am sure that I do no more than justice to their hearts, when I believe that that they would reject, when I believe to be, the inevitable effects of their policy.

5. But, it is contended, in the last place, that the South cannot, from physical, and other causes, engage in the manufacturing arts. I deny the premises, and I deny the conclusion. I deny the fact of inability, and, if it existed, I deny the conclusion that we must, therefore, break down our manufactures, and nourish those of foreign countries. The South possess, in an extraordinary degree, two of the most important elements of manufacturing industry—water power, and labor. The former gives to our whole country a most decided advantage over Great Britain. But a single experiment, stated by the gentleman from South Carolina, in which a faithless slave put the torch to a manufacturing establishment, has discouraged similar enterprises. We have, in Kentucty, the same description of population, and we employ them, and, almost exclusively, employ them in many of our hemp manufactories. A neighbor of mine, one of our most opulent and respectable citizens, has had one, two, if not three, manufactories burnt by incendiaries; but he persevered, and his preservance has been rewarded with wealth. We found that it was less expensive to keep night watches, than to pay premiums for insurance, and we employed them.

Let it be supposed, however, that the South cannot manufacture; must those parts of the Union which *can*, be therefore prevented? Must we support those of foreign countries? I am sure that injustice would be done to the generous and patriotic nature of South Carolina, if it were believed that she envied or repined at the success of other portions of the Union in branches of industry to which she might happen not to be adapted. Throughout her whole career she has been, liberal, national, high minded.

The friends of the American System have been reminded, by the honorable gentleman from Maryland, (General Smith) that they are the majority, and he has admonished them to exercise their power in moderation. The *majority* ought never to trample upon the feelings, or violate the just rights of the minority.—They ought never to triumph over the fallen, nor to make any but a temperate and equitable use of their power. But these counsels come with an ill grace from the gentleman from Maryland. He, too, is a member of a *majority*, a political majority. And how has the administration of that majority exercised their power in this country? Recall to your recollection the fourth of March, 1829, when the lank, lean, famished forms, from fen and forest, and the four quarters of the Union, gathered together, in the halls of patronage; or stealing, by evening's twilight, into the apartments [illegible] ghastly faces, and in sepulchral tones: Give us bread! Give us treasury pap! Give us our reward! England's bard was mistaken; ghosts will sometimes come, called or uncalled. Go to the families who were driven from the employments on which they were dependent for subsistence; in consequence of their exercise of the dearest right of freemen Go to the mothers, whilst hugging to their bosoms their starving children. Go to fathers, who, after being disqualified, by long public service, for any other buisiness, were stripped of their humble places, and then sought, by the minions of authority, to be stript of all that was left them—their good names—and ask, what mercy was shown to them! As for myself, born in the midst of the Revolution, the first air that I ever breathed on my native soil of Virginia, having been that of liberty and independence, I never expected justice, nor desired mercy at their hands: and scorn the wrath, and defy the oppresson of power!

I regret, Mr. President, that one topic has, I think, unnecessarily been introduced into this debate. I allude to the charge brought against the manufacturing system, as favoring the growth of aristocracy. If it were true, would gentlemen prefer supporting foreign accumulations of wealth, by that description of industry rather than in their own country? But is it correct? The joint stock companies of the North, as I understand them, are nothing more than associations, sometimes of hundreds, by means of which the small earnings of many are brought into a common stock, and the associates, obtaining corporate privileges, are enabled to prosecute, under one superintending head, their business to better advantage. Nothing can be more essentially democratic or better devised to counterpoise the influence of individual wealth. In Kentucky, almost every manufactory known to me, is in the hands of enterprising and self made men, who have acquired whatever wealth they possess by patient and diligent labor. Comparisons are odious, and, but in defence, would not be made by me.—But is there more tendency to aristocracy, in a manufactory, supporting hundreds of freemen, or in a cotton plantation, with its not less numerous slaves, sustaining, perhaps, only two white families—that of the master and the overseer?

I pass, with pleasure, from this disagreeable topic, to two general propositions which cover the entire ground of debate. The first is that, under the operation of the American System, the objects which it protects and fosters are brought to the consumer at cheaper prices than they commanded prior to its introduction, or than they would command if it did not exist. If that be true, ought not the country to be contented and satisfied with the System, unless the second proposition, which I mean presently also to consider, is unfounded? And that is, that the tendency of the System, is to sustain, and that it has upheld, the prices of all our agricultural and other produce, including cotton.

And is the fact not indisputable, that all essential objects of consumption, effected by the tariff, are cheaper and better, since the act of 1824, than they were for several years prior to that law? I appeal, for its truth, to common observation and to all practical men. I appeal to the farmer of the country, whether he does not purchase, on better terms, his iron, salt, brown sugar, cotton goods, and woollens, for his laboring people? And I ask the cotton planter if he has not been better and more cheaply supplied with his cotton bagging? In regard to this latter article, the gentleman from South Carolina was mistaken in supposing that I complained that, under the existing duty, the Kentucky manufacturer could not compete with the Scotch.—The Kentuckian furnishes a more substantial and a cheaper article and at a more uniform and regular price. But it was the frauds, the violations of law, of which I did complain:—Not smuggling, in the common sense of that practice, which has something bold, daring, and enterprising in it, but mean, bare-faced cheating by fraudulent invoices and false denomination.

I plant myself upon this FACT, of cheapness and superiority, as upon impregnable ground. Gentlemen may tax their ingenuity and produce a thousand speculative solutions of the fact, but the fact itself will remain undisturbed. Let us look into some particulars. The total consumption of bar iron, in the United States, is supposed to be about 146,000 tons, of which, 112,866 tons are made within the country, and the residue imported. The number of men employed in the manufacture is estimated at 29,254, and the total number of persons subsisted by it, at 146,273. The measure of protection extended to this necessary article, was never fully adequate until the passage of the act of 1828; and what has been the consequence? The annual increase of quantity, since that period, has been in a ratio of near twenty five per cent. and the wholesale price of bar iron in the Northern cities, was, in 1828, $105 per ton, in 1829, $100, in 1830, $90, and in 1831, from $85 to $75—constantly diminishing. We import very little English iron, and that which we do, is very inferior, and only adapted to a few purposes. In instituting a comparison between that inferior article and our superior iron, subjects, entirely different, are compared. They are made by different processes. The English cannot make iron of equal quality to ours, at a less price than we do. They have three classes, best, second best, and ordinary. It is the latter which is imported.—Of the whole amount imported, there is only about 4,000 tons of foreign iron that pays the high duty; the residue paying only a duty of about thirty per cent. estimated on the prices of the importation of 1829. Our iron ore is superior to that of Great Britain, yielding often from sixty to eighty per cent. whilst theirs produces only about twenty five. This fact is so well known, that I have heard of recent exportations of iron ore to England

It has been alleged, that bar iron, being a raw material, ought to be admitted free, or with low duties, for the sake of the manufacturers themselves. But I take this to be the true principle, that, if our country is producing a raw material of prime necessity, and, with reasonable protection, can produce it in sufficient quantity to supply our wants, the raw material ought to be protected, although it may be proper to protect the article also out of which it is manufactured. The tailor will ask protection for himself, but wishes it denied to the grower of wool and the manufacturer of broad cloth. The cotton planter enjoys protection for the raw material, but does not desire it to be extended to the cotton manufacturer. The ship builder will ask protection for the navigation, but does not wish it extended to the essential articles which enter into the construction of his ship. Each, in his proper vocation, solicits protection, but would have it denied to all other interests which are supposed to come into collision with his.—Now, the duty of the statesman is, to elevate himself above these petty conflicts; calmly to survey all the various interests, and deliberately to proportion the measure of protection to each, according to its nature and to the general wants of society. It is quite possible that, in the degree of protection which has been afforded to the workers in iron, there may be some error committed, although I have lately read an argument of much ability, proving that no injustice has really been done to them. If there be, it ought to be remedied.

The next article to which I call the attention of the Senate, is that of cotton fabrics. The success of our manufacture of coarse cottons is generally admitted. It is demonstrated by the fact that they meet the cotton fabrics of other countries, in foreign markets, and maintain a successful competition with them. There has been a gradual increase of the export of this article, which is sent to Mexico and the South American Republics, to the Mediterranean and even to Asia. The remarkable fact was lately communicated to me, that the *same* individual who, twenty five years ago, was engaged in the importation of cotton cloth from Asia, for American consumption, is now engaged in the exportation of coarse American cottons to Asia, for Asiatic consumption!—And my honorable friend from Massachusetts, now in my eye, (Mr. Silsbee) informed me, that on his departure from home, among the last orders that he gave, one was for the exportation of coarse cottons to Sumatra, in the vicinity of Calcutta! I hold in my hand a statement, derived from the most authentic source, showing that the *indentical* description of cotton cloth, which sold, in 1817, at 29 cents per yard, was sold, in 1819, at twenty one cents; in 1821, at nineteen and a half cents; in 1823, at seventeen cents; in 1825, at fourteen and a half cents; in 1827, at thirteen cents; in 1829, at nine cents; in 1830, at nine and a half cents; and in 1831, at from ten and a half to eleven. Such is the wonderful effect of protection, competition and improvement in skill, combined! The year of 1829 was one of some suffering to this branch of industry, probably owing the principle of competition being pushed too far; and hence we observe a small rise in the article the next two years. The introduction of calico printing in the United States, constitutes an important era in our manufacturing industry. It commenced about the year 1825, and has since made such astonishing advances, that the whole quantity own annually printed is but little short of forty millions of yards—about two thirds of our whole consumption. It is a beautiful manufacture, combining great mechanical skill with scientific discoveries in chemistry. The engraved cylinders for making the impression require much taste, and put in requisition the genius of the fine arts of design and engraving.—Are the graceful forms of our fair country women less lovely when enveloped in the chintzes and calicoes produced by *native* industry, than when clothed in the tinsel of foreign drapery?

Gentlemen are, no doubt, surprised at these facts. They should not underrate the energies, the enterprise, and the skill, of our fellow citizens. I have no doubt they are every way competent to accomplish whatever can be effected by any other People, if encouraged and protected by the fostering care of our government. Will gentlemen believe the fact, which I am authorized now to state, that the

---

*See Appendix, D, for the residue of the quotation which was intended to be made.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13073-0341.jpg