

THOS. W. ATKIN & CO.

THE DISTANCE AND FIRST CLASS PER ANNUM IN... OF THE PUBLISHERS, UNTIL ALL ARRANGEMENTS ARE MADE...

SPEECH OF MR. STEWART, OF PA., IN DEFENCE OF THE TARIFF AND DISTRIBUTION.

Delivered in the House of Representatives of the U. S., March 13, 1844. Mr. STEWART said: However unprepared, I am nevertheless glad, sir, of the opportunity...

The proceeds of the sales of the public lands of this country belonged to the states of this Union. It is a fund which this Government holds in trust for the people of the states...

Are we to sit here calmly and see the states and the people of the Union crushed under the weight of direct taxation, see the character of the country disgraced, see repudiation stalking forth throughout the land...

Sir, you will have a surplus in the Treasury, at the end of the year derived from the existing tariff, if let alone. And what will you do with it? Why not give the proceeds of the land to the states, to which it justly and fairly belongs?

GENERAL JACKSON IN FAVOR OF DISTRIBUTION.

This policy was strongly recommended and urged by Gen. Jackson, not in one, but in three of his annual messages, and it had been adopted in Congress by a majority of more than four to one, 155 to 38 in the House, and 24 to 6 in the Senate. Yet gentlemen now contend that this measure is not only highly inexpedient, but unconstitutional...

them ought to be abandoned; that they would endanger the "harmony and union of the states;" and he expressly declares, what is unquestionably true, that those lands were pledged to the General Government to pay the revolutionary war debt, and that debt being now discharged, the lands were released from the pledge, and it is in the discretion of Congress, he says, "to dispose of them in such way as may seem to them best."

These, sir, are perhaps some of the developments which gentlemen intended to suppress by the previous question. Why not give the land proceeds to the states? We are now receiving under the tariff of '42 more revenue than we want; during the last month we have received more than two millions of dollars in the single port of New York. Suppose we receive in all the other ports in the Union no more than is received in New York, and it will amount to four millions per month, equal to forty-eight millions per year. Still gentlemen are not satisfied, and a bill has been reported by the Ways and Means to repeal the tariff of '42, because it has destroyed the revenue, and they have substituted one which they say will increase the revenue. Yes, sir, the Globe also, in an editorial article of the 10th of last month, stated that the last Whig Congress had "doubled the expenditures of the Government, and reduced the revenue one-half."

From present prospects, am I not justified, sir, in saying that we shall have a large surplus over and above the current expenditures? Why not then give the proceeds of the lands to the states to relieve the people of the indebted states from the loads of taxation by which they are now ground down to the earth? This fund justly belongs to the states—in the language of Gen. Jackson, this Government now holds it in trust for the states after the paying of the revolutionary debt for which it was pledged, and a court of chancery, upon a bill filed, would decree this fund to the states on proof of the payment of the debt for which it was pledged. You have no use for this fund, then why I repeat, sir, not give it to the state to which it rightfully belongs? What better use can you make of it?

EFFECTS ON FARMERS AND MECHANICS.

But our present amount of foreign imports, viz., one hundred millions, is sufficient to supply the demand; how then are you to make room for fifty millions more? This can only be done by destroying fifty millions of dollars of our own domestic productions, to make way for that amount of the productions of foreign industry. We must, according to this financial scheme, not only destroy fifty millions of dollars worth annually of our productive industry, but we must send fifty millions of dollars of hard cash to foreign countries, to purchase what we now do produce, can produce, and ought to produce at home; and for what? To raise five millions of revenue by taxation, which is not wanted! Now, sir, I submit, is this a wise, is it an American policy? Is it not rather a British policy, a plan to reduce the duties and open our ports to the importation of British goods, to the sacrifice and destruction of our own mechanics, farmers, and manufacturers? Yes, sir, and this is to be done by an American Congress, and by the representatives of the American people! Can such an anti-American—such a British system as this, stand for a moment before this free and enlightened people! Pass this bill, sir, take five dollars off bar iron, and still more off iron in all its other forms, and, sir, you will go far to extinguish the fires of every furnace and of every forge in Pennsylvania. By this bill you will strike down your own mechanics—your hatters, your shoemakers, your blacksmiths, your tailors, your saddlers; in short, all your mechanics; you will paralyze and prostrate your glass works, paper mills, tanneries, silk works, collieries, lead mines—your woolen and cotton factories;

but above all, you aim a death blow at the American farmer, not only by destroying the home markets, almost the only market they now have, but what is still worse, you will convert the mechanics and manufacturers thus thrown out of employment into agriculturists, into producers instead of consumers of agricultural products. When you double production and diminish consumption one-half, do you not ruin and destroy the farmers of this country? And, sir, allow me to say, that in a country like this, where seven-eighths of the entire population is engaged in agriculture, when agriculture is destroyed, the country itself is destroyed. Agriculture is the great basis and foundation on which every thing else depends; when the farmer prospers, when he sinks, all the rest, professional men, mechanics, and all go down with him. It is the great object therefore to take care of agriculture, make this prosperous and the whole country will prosper; and how is agriculture to be made prosperous but by building up and sustaining home markets. It is therefore not for the manufacturers, but for the mechanics and farmers, yes, sir, for the farmers, that I advocate the protective policy. There is one important fact which lies deep at the foundation of the whole subject, to which I am anxious to attract the attention of the farmers and politicians of this country, and it is this that half, and more than half, of the entire price of the hundred millions of dollars a year of foreign goods imported into this country is agricultural produce raised on a foreign soil, worked up and manufactured into goods, and then sent here for sale; and that the farmers and people of this country send in this way fifty millions of dollars a year to purchase foreign agricultural produce, in the shape of goods, while the foreigners take little or nothing from us; our whole agricultural exports to all the world (excepting cotton and tobacco) do not amount to ten millions of dollars a year; thus sir, we purchase five dollars' worth of foreign agricultural produce to every dollar's worth we sell; this may seem strange, but it is strictly true; I defy contradiction—I challenge investigation. Let gentlemen disposed to contest it select an article of foreign goods, a yard of cloth, a ton of iron, a hat, a coat, a pair of shoes, any thing, "from a needle to an anchor," examine its constituent parts, the raw material, the clothing and the subsistence of the labor employed in its manufacture, and it would be discovered that more than half, often three-fourths, of the value is made up of agricultural produce. It is a well known fact that farmers often make hundreds of dollars worth of domestic goods, cloths, &c., without using a dollar's worth of any thing not produced on their own farms; goods and cloth thus made are there fore entirely agricultural; and are not the same materials used in the manufacture of goods, whether made on a farm or in a factory?

Mr. S. said he had ascertained the fact from his own books kept at a furnace, that more than three-fourths of the price of every ton of iron sold, was paid to the neighboring farmers for their domestic goods, their meat and flour, that clothed and fed his hands; for their hay, corn, oats, &c., that sustained his horses, mules, and oxen, employed about his works. In England, iron is made of the same materials that constitute it here; well, we now import, manufactured and unmanufactured, eight millions of dollars worth of iron and steel; say only half its value is agricultural produce, thus then we send four millions of dollars a year to purchase foreign agricultural produce, converted into iron, and sent here for sale, while our own country is filled with ore and coal, buried and useless, and the produce of our farmers left without markets. Will the farmers of this country submit to such a system as this—openly advocated and adopted to favor foreign industry at the expense of our own? Will they tamely and silently agree thus to be crushed and sacrificed? No, sir, they will not, they will speak out against this unjust and ruinous measure; your tables will soon groan under the weight of their remonstrances against it. I call on them to do so; I call on them to come to the rescue before it is too late.

BRITISH BILL.

The avowed object of this bill is to open our ports to the importation of British goods to favor foreign farmers and mechanics, and destroy our own. Sir, give the people time to be heard, and this bill cannot pass; let it be discussed, and it can never pass an American Congress. There is one way in which it can pass—send it to the British Parliament, and it will be passed by acclamation. England would give millions to secure its passage. It had recently been stated in an official report, read in the House of Commons, that unless the American Tariff of 1842 was modified and reduced, Great Britain would have to pay the United States cash for their cotton, instead of paying in goods as she formerly had done; and this bill accordingly modifies and reduces the tariff of 1842 to suit the wishes of the British Chancellor, who, while he recommends free trade and low duties to us, takes special care to adhere to his own prohibitory system. While this bill proposes greatly to reduce the duties on foreign distilled spirits, England exacts a duty of

2,700 per cent. on ours; and this is reciprocity! The bill reduces the duties on tobacco and its manufactures, while England demands 2,300 per cent. on ours, and actually collects 22 millions of dollars of revenue annually from our tobacco, equal to the whole revenue of this Government—such is British reciprocity and free trade. Since the tariff of 1842, the tables with England have been turned; last year the balance of trade with Great Britain exceeded \$13,000,000 in our favor, instead of being about that amount against us, as in former years. The imports of specie had in the last year reached the unprecedented amount, as appears by official reports, of more than 23 millions of dollars, most of it from Great Britain. No wonder England and her statesmen were anxious for the reduction of the American Whig Tariff of '42. No wonder her Chancellor exclaims against the Tariff, and says it will oblige them to send us specie instead of goods hereafter to pay for cotton. No wonder our country is rapidly recovering from its late depression—that its course is again onward and upward—that its former prosperity is returning; a prosperity it always had and always would have under an efficient protective system, but which it never had and never would have without it. No wonder specie had become abundant; that the banks had resumed; that exchanges had become equalized and interest reduced; that manufactures had revived; that agriculture was recovering; that the mechanic and every other branch of the national industry was fully and profitably employed. All these were the necessary and undeniable fruits of the existing tariff policy—results seen, felt, and acknowledged throughout the land; yet, in the face of all these facts, shutting their eyes to these great lights blazing up before them, the Committee of Ways and Means have reported a bill to repeal this beneficial act of 1842, and bring us back to the low duties and the low condition of 1840. They have struck a death-blow at this policy; a policy which had vindicated its adoption by all its fruits, which had fulfilled all the hopes of its friends, and falsified all the predictions of its enemies; but shall this blow be unavailing? No, sir, it will recoil and overwhelm its authors. The people who have experienced the benefits and the blessings of this measure, will not abandon it. Even its enemies are now disposed to give it a fair and full trial, and condemn it only when it fails. Then why not, sir, wait till the people have an opportunity of expressing their views on the approaching elections? They will then settle it one way or the other. If the enemies of the tariff policy prevail, they can and will repeal it; but if you repeal it now, and its friends are successful, it will be immediately restored. Then why not let it abide this result? Let it go to the people, let them decide it, and, for one, sir, I am prepared to acquiesce in their decision. The committee deprecate agitation; why not, then, let the matter rest. Let the experiment be tried, and if it fails, put it down. Whence the urgent necessity of a change; what interest in the country calls for it; who has demanded it; who has petitioned for this or any other change? No one; but the Committee of Ways and Means say we must have more revenue—more revenue; and how do they propose to raise it? By reducing the duties; and this, my word for it, will result, as it always has resulted, in a reduction of revenue; it is the necessary and the natural consequence. This was once the opinion of the honorable Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means (Mr. McKay) himself, and as there is now every prospect of a redundant revenue, I should not be surprised if, before the bill is disposed of, it should be advocated as a measure to reduce the revenue, and this report be amended by striking out the words "a bill to increase the revenue," and inserting the words, "a bill to reduce the revenue." I affirm it as a fact, and here challenge contradiction, that the revenues of the country always have been increased or diminished, as we increased or diminished the duties on foreign goods; and why will this not be the result now? (Here Mr. McKay called Mr. Stewart to order, and said it would be time enough to discuss the tariff when that measure came up for discussion.)

Yes, said Mr. S., the gentleman has got a vote to print and circulate 25,000 copies of his report—his speech in favor of his bill—and no doubt he is anxious to suppress any reply; but, sir, I have accidentally got in between two previous questions, and I wish to say a little on the other side, and little it will be compared with the voluminous report of the Committee of Ways and Means, which report I assure the gentleman I will take great pleasure in sending to my constituents, who will readily comprehend and appreciate its destructive doctrines. But the gentleman tells me to wait till the tariff comes up for discussion; sir, this may never happen; may not the majority pass that bill, as they are passing this important bill, under the previous question? A majority may take the bill out of the committee and pass it under the gag without amendment or debate; and from the disposition evinced to suppress debate on this occasion, have we not a right to apprehend that the same course will be pursued on

the subject of the tariff, which is placed at all, must be passed under the gag—it will not bear debate. Sir, when I was interrupted by the honorable chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, I was about to say, that if this bill increases the revenue to meet the demands of the treasury, it can only fill the office by nearly doubling importations. It repudiates protection, and adopts the horizontal plan; with a few exceptions it brings every thing down to thirty per cent. till the 1st of September, 1845, when there is to be a general reduction of all ad valorem duties to twenty-five per cent. and under, resulting in a reduction of the duties imposed by the tariff of 1842 about one-third, say one-fourth; then it is manifest that you must import one-fourth more foreign goods to make good the loss of revenue by this reduction, and one-fourth more to raise the additional five millions required, making an increase of one-half, viz: fifty millions, which must of course destroy that amount of our own production; for instance, by this bill one-half the protection is taken off hats; two-fifths off ready-made clothing; two-thirds off shoes; one-half off manufactures of iron; so that the hatters, tailors, shoe-makers, and blacksmiths lose one-half of their protection, and the Treasury one-half the revenue; and to make up for this loss of revenue we must of course double the importation of hats, shoes, manufactures of iron, and ready-made clothing, destroying a corresponding amount of our own production, as the consumption will continue the same whether the supply be furnished at home or from abroad; three cents is taken off every pound of imported wool costing over seven cents; of course we must greatly increase the importation of wool to make good this loss of revenue. To understand the injurious operation of this bill upon every branch of the national industry, agricultural, manufacturing, and mechanical, I would suggest to the reader to turn to the table marked "C" in the appendix to the report of the Committee of Ways and Means, where they would see the precise extent to which every branch of industry would be affected by this measure. This report itself would thus furnish the best and most conclusive evidence of the destructive effect of the proposed measure upon American labor, and its beneficial effects upon foreign, and especially British industry; hence he had denominated this a "British Bill" because it was calculated to advance the interest of British manufacturers and farmers at the expense of our own. But, sir, if more revenue is wanted, why not increase the duties on luxuries consumed by the rich, rather than thus strike down the poor man's labor, and take the bread from the mouth of his children, to make room for the importation of fifty millions of dollars worth of foreign goods? Is this, sir, an American measure, can it receive the support of an American Congress, or the representatives of the American people? I call on the authors of this ruinous measure to come forth in its defence. I call on them to assign some reason for its adoption. I can readily discover reasons why England should desire its adoption, but they are the very reasons why we should reject it; just so far as it benefits them it injures us; this is a contest between foreign and American mechanics, farmers, and manufacturers for the American market, and the question is, which side shall we take? The tariff of 1842 shuts out the foreigner and gives the Americans the market; this bill proposes to repeal the tariff of 1842, and give it to the foreigner; to open our ports and again flood our country with foreign goods, and export money by ship loads to pay for them; and why? I again ask the committee upon what principle of national policy this measure is sustained?

THE TARIFF DEMOCRATIC—FREE TRADE MODERATE.

Mr. Dromgoole replied to enable bare-headed people to buy cheap hats! To enable bare-headed people to buy cheap hats! Sir, let me tell the gentleman if he carries this measure, the poor people of this country would not only go bare-headed but bare-backed; they would be doomed, like the paupers of Europe, to go half fed and half clad. The tariff, sir, is "the poor man's law;" it is this and this alone that gives him employment and wages. Just as the tariff goes down, the wages of labor will go down with it. Repeal the tariff—adopt the gentleman's favorite plan of "free trade," and you will bring down the labor here, in every department of industry, to the level of the labor of the serfs and paupers of Europe. This is certain—it is inevitable. As certain as the laws of gravitation—as inevitable as that the removal of an obstruction between two unequal bodies of water, will reduce the one to the level of the other. Repeal the tariff, and what is the result? We prevent our country from being inundated with the productions of the low priced labor of Europe. When—when, shoe-makers, blacksmiths, and all must come down and work as cheap, as they do, or give up the market. With the present facilities of intercourse by steamships, you might as well attempt to establish higher wages and higher prices on one side of a street than on the

the subject of the tariff, which is placed at all, must be passed under the gag—it will not bear debate. Sir, when I was interrupted by the honorable chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, I was about to say, that if this bill increases the revenue to meet the demands of the treasury, it can only fill the office by nearly doubling importations. It repudiates protection, and adopts the horizontal plan; with a few exceptions it brings every thing down to thirty per cent. till the 1st of September, 1845, when there is to be a general reduction of all ad valorem duties to twenty-five per cent. and under, resulting in a reduction of the duties imposed by the tariff of 1842 about one-third, say one-fourth; then it is manifest that you must import one-fourth more foreign goods to make good the loss of revenue by this reduction, and one-fourth more to raise the additional five millions required, making an increase of one-half, viz: fifty millions, which must of course destroy that amount of our own production; for instance, by this bill one-half the protection is taken off hats; two-fifths off ready-made clothing; two-thirds off shoes; one-half off manufactures of iron; so that the hatters, tailors, shoe-makers, and blacksmiths lose one-half of their protection, and the Treasury one-half the revenue; and to make up for this loss of revenue we must of course double the importation of hats, shoes, manufactures of iron, and ready-made clothing, destroying a corresponding amount of our own production, as the consumption will continue the same whether the supply be furnished at home or from abroad; three cents is taken off every pound of imported wool costing over seven cents; of course we must greatly increase the importation of wool to make good this loss of revenue. To understand the injurious operation of this bill upon every branch of the national industry, agricultural, manufacturing, and mechanical, I would suggest to the reader to turn to the table marked "C" in the appendix to the report of the Committee of Ways and Means, where they would see the precise extent to which every branch of industry would be affected by this measure. This report itself would thus furnish the best and most conclusive evidence of the destructive effect of the proposed measure upon American labor, and its beneficial effects upon foreign, and especially British industry; hence he had denominated this a "British Bill" because it was calculated to advance the interest of British manufacturers and farmers at the expense of our own. But, sir, if more revenue is wanted, why not increase the duties on luxuries consumed by the rich, rather than thus strike down the poor man's labor, and take the bread from the mouth of his children, to make room for the importation of fifty millions of dollars worth of foreign goods? Is this, sir, an American measure, can it receive the support of an American Congress, or the representatives of the American people? I call on the authors of this ruinous measure to come forth in its defence. I call on them to assign some reason for its adoption. I can readily discover reasons why England should desire its adoption, but they are the very reasons why we should reject it; just so far as it benefits them it injures us; this is a contest between foreign and American mechanics, farmers, and manufacturers for the American market, and the question is, which side shall we take? The tariff of 1842 shuts out the foreigner and gives the Americans the market; this bill proposes to repeal the tariff of 1842, and give it to the foreigner; to open our ports and again flood our country with foreign goods, and export money by ship loads to pay for them; and why? I again ask the committee upon what principle of national policy this measure is sustained?