requisitions for troops, he nevertheless communicated to the Governor the facts of the case and invited him, in anticipation of such requisition being made, to accept the services of troops which were accordingly mustered into service.

"Gen. C. further remarked, that he ever felt a strong desire to pass over all such matters as did not strictly come properly under the notice of the Court, but discovering certain documents communicated by the President of the United States to Congress before the Court, he felt bound to notice such documents only in so far as they contained references unfavorable to his character and reputation—his honor impelled him to notice them in connection with the subjects of investigation now before the Court. If he were a public prosecutor, or disposed to enter the field of bitter acrimony, he might devote days and months to the Herculean task to cleanse the Bureau at Washington—but fortunately for him, the task was saved him—the documents emanating from the Bureau were a sufficient exposure of their own rottenness, &c. He made no complaint, he came here to complain of no one—he wished to do wrong to no one, only desired that right should be done to him. He craved no indulgence; he asked no greater glory than to be restored to his proper station—in war, to conquer our foes, and in peace to prepare for war. That was the only glory he now or ever craved. He desired no distinction except such as belonged to his profession. He desired to remain in the service no longer than he was able to perform promptly his duty—he claimed every privilege due to his grade now and to the last; no power should trample on his rights.

He was old, and grown grey in the service of his country—if that country could be benefitted by treating old soldiers as savages, who treat their warriors with neglect, he was willing to submit to such treatment—but she virtuous, the patriotic, the brave, surely never thus repay the services of those who have grown grey in the service of their country. I belong to my country, born one year after her birth day. Her declaration of Independence was 4th of July, 1776; and my birth day 10th March, 1777; I have grown with her growth and with fervent hopes for her prosperity; I have strengthened with her strength. Though old and grey, in the service of my country, I have been advertised in the newspapers—in one called the Union, I have been stigmatized as an offender—and as a matter of course advertised in the Federal Union. By them I have been accused as a violater of the laws of my country. For you, my old brother soldiers, it is to say, whether these things are true or false. Whether or no I am to be arraigned before a General Court Martial, or to be returned to my command. If the latter, I shall be grateful—but if your sense of propriety will not allow you thus to deal with me—and you decide that I am to be arraigned, I sincerely trust that upon the banks of the Rio Grande, where the witnesses all are now actively engaged in defence of our common country's liberties, said General Court Martial may be convened."

I have given you the substance of the General's address and his language, as far as my recollections have enabled me to do so. That I have not attained perfect accuracy, need not surprise you, who know how little I am accustomed to reporting speeches, &c. After the delivery of the address the court was cleared.

Speech Of Mr. Barringer,

OF NORTH CAROLINA,

On the Bill to Modify the Duties on Imports.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 4, 1846.

Mr. Barringer said that he was at all times very averse to enter upon the arena of regular debate in this House. His experience here had satisfied him that those who were most frequently desirous of occupying the floor were not regarded as the most useful or influential members of this body. He was especially reluctant to address the committee at this stage of an exhausted debate. But the subject was one of the gravest importance; it was called by some the *great question* of the day. He had some views on this subject, which is regarded as so deeply interesting to every section of the Union, and every class of the people of this nation, which he desired to present to this committee and to the public. He was not in the unfortunate position of the gentleman who had just addressed the committee, (Mr. STANTON, of Tennessee,) and who seemed so greatly embarrassed in the effort to reconcile the differences of his Democratic friends in this House. He had nothing to say to their quarrels, which seem to threaten such serious collisions in their ranks, but which he was satisfied would be healed by the proper efforts and appliances, if it be necessary to pass this bill. He was well aware of the facilities his Democratic friends always possessed in reconciling their apparent and sometimes real differences; and he counted nothing as to the fate of the bill before the committee from the exciting collisions of opinion which, on the surface only, indicate such violent disruption among the members of the party on the final vote on this great measure. He had no such unpleasant task to perform, on his side of the House. He had no conflicts of opinion to reconcile. On this side we shall present very nearly an unbroken phalanx on the final vote. But he did not mean to make a party speech, and though his views on this question differed materially from those held by a majority of the Democratic party in this House, as now organized, (he was glad to say not by *all* of that party,) he freely accorded to gentlemen advocating the other side quite as much honesty in their convictions and purposes as he claimed for himself.

The two bills now before the committee, Mr. Chairman, as well that commonly called Mr. McKay's bill, as the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York, (Mr. HANGERFORD,) proposed entire changes in the whole fiscal policy of the Government from its earliest organization to the present time—changes not gradual, but immediate, sweeping, radical. For, although in some slight degree, they both recognise the principle of protection to American industry, (and this, too, wherever it is done, in its most odious form,) yet coming to us as they do under the sanction of the Executive message of December last, and the official report of the Secretary of the Treasury, and based as they are on the doctrines of that famous report, which has received such consideration both in this country and England, especially in the House of Lords; from which it received the greatest compliment of being praised for doing, with these measures, especially the former from the Committee of Ways and Means, amount to a virtual and total abandonment of the whole protective policy. I believe, sir, that objection distinctly avowed on this floor. I assert, without the fear of successful contradiction, that the policy which is now supported by the supporters of this bill to repeal the act of 1842, has been maintained since the foundation of our Government to the present time. We should always hesitate long to disturb a policy which has received the constant approbation of the nation. To the principles and practice of our Revolutionary statesmen, who were conversant with the early wants of our country, and established the Constitutional forms of free Government under which we have so long lived and prospered, do we owe an especial deference and respect. The most imperative reasons, founded on considerations of absolute national independence, demonstrate the necessity of an early adoption of the principle of a fair and reasonable encouragement to domestic industry. The preamble of the second act passed by the first Congress, declared that "whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the U. S. and the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported," &c. This act was approved and signed on the 4th of July, 1789, by George Washington, the Father of his Country, and voted for by James Madison, the ablest and best expounder of our constitution. On the 8th of January, 1790, Gen. Washington used the following language in his first annual address to Congress: "The safety and interest of the people require that they should promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essentials, especially military supplies."—And in his last address on the 7th of December, 1796, Gen. Washington, in continuation of the same policy he had always supported and urged before Congress, used the following language: "Congress has repeatedly, and not without success, directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactures—The object is of too much consequence not to ensure a continuance of their efforts in every way which shall appear eligible."

The following is an extract of the message of Mr. Jefferson to Congress on the 15th December, 1802:

"To cultivate peace, maintain commerce and navigation in their lawful enterprises; to foster our fisheries as nurseries for navigation, and for the nurture of man, and to *protect the manufactures* adapted to our circumstances; to preserve the faith of the nation by an exact discharge of its debts and contracts; expend the public money with the same care and economy we practise with our own, and impose on our citizens no unnecessary burdens; to keep in all things, within our constitutional powers, and cherish the Federal Union as the only rock of safety: these, fellow-citizens, are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings."

In his message of the 5th November, 1811, Mr. Madison says:

"Although other objects will press more immediately on your deliberations, a portion of them cannot but be well bestowed on the just and sound policy of *securing* to our manufactures the success they have attained, and still are attaining, under the impulse of causes not permanent, and to our navigation, the fair extent of which is at present abridged by the unequal regulations of foreign Governments. Beside the reasonableness of *saving our manufactures* from sacrifices which a change of circumstances might bring upon them, the national interest requires that, with respect to such materials as at least as belong to our defence and primary wants, we should not be left in state of unnecessary *dependence on external supplies*."

Mr. Madison never failed to enforce similar sentiments on the consideration of Congress and the country whenever fit opportunity presented itself. I shall not detain the committee by further extracts from that distinguished source. Mr. Monroe, distinguished for his devotion to the best interests of his country, in his inaugural address expresses himself thus:

"Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of Government. Possessing, as we do, all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend, in the degree we have done, on supplies from other countries; while we are thus dependent, the sudden event of war, long sought and unexpected, cannot fail to plunge us into the most serious difficulties. It is important, too, that the capital which nourishes our manufactures should be *domestic* in its influence, as in that case, instead of exhausting, as it may do in *foreign* hands, would be felt advantageously in agriculture and every other branch of industry."

On the 3d December, 1817, in his message to Congress, Mr. Monroe said:

"Our manufactures will require the constant attention of Congress. The capital employed in them is considerable, and the knowledge required in the machinery and fabric of all the most useful manufactures, is of great value. Their *preservation*, which depends *on due encouragement*, is connected with the *high interests* of the nation."

In his second annual message he uses this language:

"It cannot be doubted that the more complete our internal resources, and the least dependant we are on foreign Powers for every national as well as domestic purpose, the greater and more stable will be our public plenty. By the increase of our domestic manufactures will the demand for the rude materials be increased; and thus will the dependence of the several parts of the Union on each other, and the strength of the Union itself, be proportionably augmented."

Again, in his message on the 3d December, 1822, he says:

"Satisfied I am, whatever may be the abstract doctrines in favor of unrestricted commerce, (provided all nations would concur in it, and it was not likely to be interrupted by war, which has never occurred, and *cannot be expected*,) there are other strong reasons applicable to our situation and relations with other countries which impose on us the obligation to *cherish our manufactures*."

Gen Jackson repeatedly recognised and enforced the same suggestions of public policy. In his message of the 7th December, 1830, he employs the following emphatic and unanswerable argument:

"The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust these duties, with a view to the *encouragement of domestic industry*, is so completely incidental to that power, that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government, *without limitation or restriction*, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relative to the inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and, consequently, if it be not possessed by the General Government, it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of their right to protect their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely cannot be the case.—This indispensable power, thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of the authority, on the subject, expressly delegated to Congress. In this conclusion I am *confirmed* as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the constitution, as by the *uniform practice* of Congress the *continued acquiescence* of the States, and the *general understanding of the people*."

I will not refer to the votes of Gen. Jackson and other of the leading statesmen of the opposite party in favor of the act of 1824; nor to his remarkable letter of April 23, 1814, on this subject, to Dr. Coleman, of my own native State. I could cite line upon line, and extract upon extract, from the solemnly recorded and expressed opinions of the great statesmen of all parties in our country, and at all times in our history, to show both the *right* and *duty* of Congress, in proper cases, to give a fair and reasonable encouragement to American labor. The sentiments I have quoted are the opinions of those who have had the fullest confidence of the country, and especially of the South.—The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that no president of party, Whig or Democratic, Federal or Republican, had omitted when in power to maintain both the constitutionality and expediency of the doctrine contended for by our side of the House. It was a chief element of success in the election of Gen. Jackson. It had never been disputed in a Presidential message until the annual communication of the president in December last. Even Mr. Polk admitted it, or at least desired it to be understood that he was in favor of the doctrine up to that period. You all remember, sir, his celebrated Kane letter, which was made to assume all the hues of the chameleon, and which has been so severely commented on in this debate. Every gentleman from the great Democratic State of Pennsylvania who has yet taken part in this discussion has admitted that Mr. Polk could not have gotten the vote of that State but for the belief produced by that letter that he was in favor of the tariff, and was even a "better tariff man than Mr. Clay." I will not allude, sir, to the bitter fruits which I fear that great State is destined to reap from the deception which has been so skilfully practised upon her confiding people.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. TIBBATTS) has here publicly admitted that Mr. Polk could not have received the votes of the Western States except for the belief that he recognised the constitutionality and expediency of incidental protection within the revenue range, and of discrimination to protect all the great interests of the country.—Even in the inaugural address of the President of the 4th of March, 1845, we have the strongest recognition of the power to legislate with a view to the encouragement of the great industrial pursuit of the country. He said:

"The power [to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises] was an indispensable one to be conferred on the Federal Government, which, without it, would possess no means of providing for its own support. In executing this power, by levying a tariff of duties for the support of Government, the raising of *revenue* should be the object, and *protection* the incident. To reverse this principle, and make protection the object and revenue the incident, would be to inflict manifest injustice upon all other than the protected interests. In levying duties for revenue, it is doubtless proper to make such discriminations, within the revenue principle, as will afford incidental protection to our home interests. Within the revenue limit there is a discretion to discriminate, beyond that limit the rightful exercise of the power is not conceded."

Mr. Chairman I shall not multiply, as I could, authorities on this subject. It would be an anomaly, if the Government did not have this indispensable power. It would be suicidal. Without its just exercise, we should not be an independent people. It was one of the chief objects of our seperation from the mother country, whose policy had been so inimical to the development of our resources, and who desired to restrain us from the power to manufacture even a hobnail in the colonies. It was incorporated in our federal constitution, and has been sanctioned by the practice of every Administration, under every diversity of party. Even now a large portion of the ascendant party in this House will not admit that it is, in any sense, the test of party allegiance, and even express their amazement at the theories of those who hold political communion with them on other subjects. And yet, Mr. Chairman, after all this weight of argument and precedent and practice, gentlemen throughout this debate, on the other side, have been horrified and startled at the idea of the least discrimination, even within the revenue range, in favor of the essential interests of the nation. It is represented, especially by some of our opponents from Virginia and Alabama, as a modern violation of the plainest provisions of the constitution.—It is no new thing, sir, to legislate for the protection of particular interests, when their preservation and advancement are connected with the general welfare of the nation. By what authority have our navigation laws been passed? What right had we to give a preference, in the whole coasting trade, to *American* shipping, without regard to the rates of transportation offered by foreign vessels?—The constitutionality or wisdom of these laws has never been questioned. Is not this a violation of the principles so zealously urged by gentlemen here? Is this "buying where we could buy cheapest?" Or is it not, on your principles, an "Odious grinding monopoly," in favor of a set of bloated purse-proud Americans, manufacturers?

Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be misunderstood. *I am not in favor of a high protective tariff.* I am not for a tariff for "protection merely." I do not contend for that system of "legalized plunder and robbery" that gentlemen so eloquently declaim against in this hall. What I insist upon, and what I think the highest interests of the country demand, is such a tariff as has been the subject of good sound Whig doctrine from the beginning; sanctioned by the principles and practice of the fathers of true republican faith; such a tariff as has been recommended over and over again, in the messages of our best Presidents, and advocated and virtually promised in the inaugural address of Mr. Polk himself, viz: a tariff which, while it imposes duties on foreign imports for the necessary revenue to support an economical administration of the Government as its *prime object*, shall be so arranged & adjusted in its details as to favor a just and reasonable encouragement in favor of all the great interests of agriculture, commerce, manufactures, and the mechanic arts. While revenue should be the object, discrimination should be the incident. Sir, you never will conduct the affairs of this great nation successfully on any contrary doctrine.—This is the well established revolutionary principle for which our forefathers contended; this is necessary for the prosperity of the great interests of the people, and indispensable to us as a free and independent nation. A tariff of some sort we must have. The Government must be supported. No influential American statesman has ever seriously declared himself in favor of direct taxes as a *permanent system of finance in time of peace*. We cannot rely on loans or Treasury notes for a permanent revenue. The objections to these are obvious. A tariff on duties of foreign imports must therefore be laid. Such duties have been laid from 1789 to this day; and, sir, I predict that whatever may be the fate of this bill, proposing a revolution in the whole financial system of our country, experience will continue to point out the beaten track of our fathers as the best course for us to pursue. We shall soon get tired of this untried experiment. I am not for any hot-house stimulus to industry, and I admit that true policy requires that legislative protection should be confined, in a wise discrimination, to such productions as our situation, capital, and resources enable us to make successfully to supply the wants of the country.

On the 30th of August, 1842, Congress passed the tariff law now in force. This bill proposes to repeal it. Is this proposed change right? Nothing can be more pernicious to the labor and capital of the country than this vacillating policy—this constant fluctuation both in the trade of the country and the revenues of the Government. I do not pretend to say that the act of 1842 is perfect; or that it should be, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable. If it be imperfect, as it doubtless is, let it be amended in such particulars as experience may have indicated as necessary. Let it be amended in a proper way and on thorough examination, and not at the instance and upon the statements of British importers and their agents. The regulation of a Tariff of duties is necessarily complicated and one of great difficulty. It is a question of *facts* and *details*, ramifying themselves through every interest of society. We never have, and in a country like ours, of such diversified pursuits and interests, we never can pass any general tariff law which will give satisfaction to *all*. The thing is impossible. Our true course is to come as near this end as possible. I have freely admitted that the existing law might be wisely amended. I should like to see that indispensable necessary of life, *salt*, made duty free. The duties and minimums on coarse domestics might be lowered, if not entirely abolished; and on raw cotton, the duty, which was once important but now useless, might well be abolished altogether. By this course we should wrest from the hands of demagogues instruments by which they are constantly trying to deceive the people. There are other instances in which the act of 1842 may well be amended and the free list might be increased. But in the main, that law had operated well; and, after all, experience was the best teacher; it is worth all your theories. The act of 1842 had completely refuted the predictions of its enemies and fully realized the best hope of its friends. Under its operation the country was prosperous. Under what circumstances had that act been passed? I need not dwell on what all must so well remember. The object of that law was to raise a sinking revenue; to restore the public credit; to pay the public debts and liabilities; and last, though not least, to give incidental protection to interests essential to our national welfare and independence. Towards the close of the operation of the celebrated compromise act of 1833, the expenditures constantly exceeded our income. Even before the reduction had reached the lowest point of twenty per cent, it had utterly failed to produce the necessary revenue. This fact is admitted by the most ultra free trade men. Yet gentlemen are for returning, not *gradually*, but *suddenly* to the same system. Who can believe that the bill before us will raise sufficient revenue for the wants of the Government? Curtail your expenses; abandon your magnificent scheme of Internal Improvements, passed by this Democratic House, under the name of the harbor and river bill; reduce your annual expenditure to seventeen millions, and perhaps then an average of twenty five to thirty per cent. ad valorem may prove sufficient. But, sir, does any one here believe that this reduction will be brought about? We must legislate for an existing state of things. The expenditures of the Government, instead of being restricted by economy to seventeen millions a year, amounted on an average to near twenty six millions.—It has stood at that rate for years past. It will be increased. The acquisition of Texas and the establishment of new territorial Governments, the most expensive appendages of your Government, and the necessary enlargement of your army and navy, will enhance your expenditures. They will be from twenty eight to thirty millions per annum. I do not speak of a state of war, but of a peace establishment. The gentleman from New York (Mr. HANGERFORD) has demonstrated, by a most searching analysis, that this bill will not produce more than seventeen millions nett revenue in time of peace, and less in time of war. How shall we supply the deficit? Shall we resort to loans and Treasury notes? I fear they will soon again become fashionable. With the aid of the "Little Tariff Bill," as it is called, passed in 1841, which my colleague, now before me, (Mr. GRANGER,) will remember the compromise act still failed to raise the necessary income. It gave no less than three millions a year. The Treasury was empty—the Government bankrupt—and general ruin stared us in the face. Experience spoke with a voice that could not be mistaken. The compromise act emptied the Treasury; the tariff of 1842 filled it. The compromise act prostrated the credit of the Government; and then the act of 1842 restored it. What does not remember how with a blush of patriotic shame the low point to which our credit had been brought! How your Government stocks were hawked and peddled about in every money market in the world without a bidder! The Congress of 1842 had of necessity to revise the whole revenue system. But gentlemen say the rates of that law are too high, because they are above the revenue standard. "*The revenue standard!*" What do gentlemen mean by these *cabalistic phrases?* Is it the amount needed for revenue—a *fixed quality?* Or does it not fluctuate with the state of the nation and the necessities of our public affairs? It must necessarily depend on the state of trade and the public exigencies. We want one amount in peace, another in time of war. There is, therefore, no such thing as a fixed revenue standard. Mr. Secretary Walker asserts that it is twenty per cent. We have found that, or at least we had approached it, at a time too when our importations were very large, and our experiment had proved that when we got down in the scale as far as twenty five per cent. the revenue failed, and the Government was placed in the most perilous crisis. Under the act of 1842 the annual average nett revenue is from twenty six to twenty seven millions of dollars—about sufficient to answer the wants of the Government in ordinary times. But, Mr. Chairman, it is objected to the existing law that its operation is most injurious to the consuming portion of the community, especially to the farming and planting interests; that it raises the price of all the people have to buy and lowers the price of all they have to sell; that it is a system of plunder and injustice; and that it puts into the pockets of the manufacturers two dollars for every one in the Treasury—fifty four millions to enrich them and only twenty seven millions in the national coffers. This representation, which in truth is mere declamation opposed to the facts of the case, is based on the idea that every tariff of duties is necessarily a tax, and that in all cases this tax is paid by the consumer. Now, sir, I utterly deny this position. It may be true as a general rule, but it not only has many exceptions, but there are many cases where it is decidedly opposed to the truth. On those articles from which we derived the greatest part of our revenue the duty did not raise the price and was not a tax to the consumer; because nearly enough of the articles were produced to meet the demands of consumption without resort to the foreign supply. Domestic competition was induced and lowered the price. When the article is not made at home in sufficient quantities to answer our demands, the duty was often divided between the consumer and producer or importer, in which case the foreign importer pays a part of the tax for the privilege of selling to our market. Where we do not make the article at all, the whole duty was strictly a tax, and paid by the consumer. Prices depend upon the great laws of supply and demand, and on the ability of the people to consume. But, sir, I will not enlarge on this subject. Every body knows that the prices of the leading articles of consumption are lower than they were at and before the passage of the act of 1842. It is an admitted fact. But, gentlemen say this is owing to improved machinery and other causes.—What has improved machinery and given new impulse to manufacturing skill but the policy we advocate?

In regard to the prices of agricultural produce, especially of that great staple cotton, it was well known that there was a great overproduction.

[Mr. BURT said he thought not.]

My honorable friend from South Carolina is mistaken. This fact was so well known, and so fully admitted, that a convention had been called in the South to take into consideration the means of diverting labor from the culture of cotton into some other channel, that a better price might be obtained on the residue which was raised. It has been said that if we would consent to reduce the tariff we should find a market for our surplus agricultural productions. I wish, sir, that the hopes which are so fondly indulged on this subject could be realized. Much has been promised from the abolition of the British corn laws. It is possible that the new system of British legislation may so work as to afford us a market for a small portion of that surplus; but, sir, even this I greatly doubt. The aggregate agricultural products of the country amounted in value to between eight and nine hundred millions of dollars per annum. Of this vast amount about one-half was consumed by the producers, our own population; the other half sought a market. And where was that market to be found? Undoubtedly the chief market was at home, in the consumption by non-producers of agricultural produce who are engaged in other pursuits. The whole amount of our exports last year was about ninety-nine millions of dollars. This is about the average per annum. Of these, the staple articles of cotton, tobacco, and rice constitute more than sixty millions of dollars and manufactured articles make up another sum of thirteen millions. The balance of little more than twenty-five millions is made up of every other article exported. The fact is, sir, we do not export to all foreign markets for sale *one twentieth* part of the surplus productions of our farmers. We import almost as much as we export, notwithstanding our vast surplus. We import even cotton, as well as beef, hams, wool, potatoes, &c.—But, sir, this small amount of imports is the mere incident of trade and commerce, as is our export of the produce of our farms, except of the three great articles which I have mentioned. The foreign has never yet been, and I fear never will be, our true market for breadstuffs and provisions. It is preposterous to suppose that foreign countries situated as they are, can ever furnish an outlet for the four hundred millions surplus of our agricultural productions. We must legislate in reference to the world as it is, and not as we would have it to be. There is no such thing as free trade, and never will be, as long as mankind remain selfish and Governments require to be supported by money. Free trade, sir, is a mere bubble; it is not to be found on earth, except among our own sovereign States of this Union, in that beautiful but combined and complicated system of "many in one" which is so much the admiration of the world.

But, Mr. Chairman supposing our surplus produce went into the English ports, had held up as our great and best markets, was it sure of finding purchasers there? Does Great Britain, so much shaped heretofore for our purposes and looked by the same person for others, does she look to the United States for her wheat and flour and grain of every description? Is no wheat grown in Germany? None in Prussia? None in the Russian dominions? None in the provinces of Turkey? Will not the wheat from the Baltic and the Black Sea meet our wheat in that market, and would they not undersell us? To say nothing of the distance and cost of freight, until our labor in this free and happy Republic shall be brought down to a level with the labor of Russian serfs, it was impossible to compete with them in the English markets. Until our people were as poorly fed, clothed, and paid as the starving millions of the monarchies of Europe, living on a bare subsistence, we could not expect this boon, so much desired by some gentlemen, of selling the products of our American labor in foreign markets on equal terms of competition with them. What does it cost to make a bushel of wheat in Illinois, for instance.

[Mr. DOUGLAS said about thirty cents.]

That is a low price; but, even then, it will take at least twenty-five cents to get it to New York, and fifteen cents for transportation to Liverpool. When deposited on the wharf at Liverpool it costs the shipper at least seventy cents. And now, sir, every body knows that a bushel of wheat from the great grain-growing country of the Baltic can be laid down on that same wharf at Liverpool for forty cents. Wheat was now selling in the Liverpool market, at a time when great scarcity created a demand, at fifty cents per bushel. Are gentlemen so demented as to hope to compete in the British or any other foreign market with men who were compelled, from the necessities of their position, to labor for sixpence per day? It is absurd, so obviously so, that I can scarcely bring myself to believe that gentlemen are serious in the declaration of their hopes about these foreign markets for our farming productions. However this may be, I hope never to see the day when wages in this free country shall come down to that level. We are a totally different people from those who inhabit the shores of the Baltic and Black Seas.—*Our* policy is to *elevate* the laboring classes. Here we have perfect political equality.—The men who toil in our field and workshops are not debased and ignorant slaves, but well-informed and high spirited freemen, who constitute each man for himself, a portion of the sovereignty of the land. God forbid that their industry should be placed on the same level by any force of circumstances, with the pauper-labor of men, who work barely to live, and live but to be degraded! The contact would be destructive to American industry, and fatal to the spirit of liberty itself.

Mr. Chairman, it is argued that we must reduce *our* tariff because England is reducing hers. It is true that on some articles she is lowering and on some taking off her duties. But, sir, is any fair reciprocity proposed by England to us? And with what view has her recent policy been dictated? Why has her duty been taken off of cotton? Only for the purpose of benefitting her manufactures.—There was a time when England struggled with an abiding hope to supply herself with raw cotton, independently of our aid. She had made a strenuous effort to grow cotton in her own East India possessions, and entertained sanguine hopes of getting it in Egypt. Both projects failed. For a long time she imposed high duties on the raw material and prohibitory duties on the manufactured article from this country. But she has discovered that she cannot do without American cotton, that instead of being subsidiary and dependant for the manufacture of our own raw material, we had become wholly independent of her; and from the subordinate of a colonial dependent we have risen into the rank of a competitor, and have in fact become her most formidable rival.—In the manufacture of coarse cottons, built up under the policy we have pursued, we can compete with her in the markets of the world. By the abolition of the duty she has extended protection to her own manufactures in this contest.—And so as to her reduction of the duty on breadstuffs and provisions. Is any man so simple as to suppose England has done this merely to *benefit us*, or in consequence of any wild theories of free trade? Let us not cherish so great and fatal a delusion. All nations are essentially selfish, and of all nations in the world England is and always has been the most so. She has taken off her duties on provisions only, because she was compelled to do it by the necessities of her starving population, and that her manufactures might continue to draw the health of life. The same policy will induce her to put them on again whenever *her interest* requires it. Besides all these considerations of self-interest, England is in most respects much in advance of other nations in manufacturing skill and capital, and she is in the fortunate position of being able to invite others into rivalry with her, without injury to her interests. Her policy has always heretofore been restrictive, but she would be willing to-morrow to enter the list in the impracticable schemes of free trade with the world, if other nations would consent, simply because her past policy has *prepared* her for it without the fear of detriment from others.

And again, sir, the financial system of Great Britain is essentially different from and inapplicable to ours. We derive our income chiefly, if not almost entirely, from customs: she obtains but one half of hers from that source. The average annual revenue of England is about £50,000,000: of this sum, she derived, in 1842, from *excises* £14,500,000, from *stamp duties* £7,000,000, and from *land tax* £4,700,000, making a fraction more than half of the whole sum.—Are we to imitate her example in these odious taxes. From tea and coffee, which we admit free, she exacts about £5,000,000; from sugar alone £5,100,000; and from manufactured goods, the whole amount of the customs due in England does not amount to a half per cent., while we collect the largest part of our revenue from that source. Let gentlemen look into the facts before they call on us to follow in the footsteps of a nation that always legislates, not to benefit others, but to promote and secure her own selfish policy and interests.

As to the importance of the home market, of which so much has been said in this debate, I do not attach so much value to it