



The powers granted under the Constitution, being derived from the People of the United States may be resumed by them whenever perceived to their injury or oppression—Madison.

VOLUME 4.

CHARLOTTE, NORTH-CAROLINA, APRIL 18, 1845.

NUMBER 205.

Mecklenburg Jeffersonian, EDITED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY JOSEPH W. HAMPTON.

TERMS.

The Jeffersonian will be furnished to subscribers at TWO DOLLARS a year, if paid in advance...

Candidates for office. We are authorized to announce CHARLES T. ALEXANDER, Jr., a candidate at the next August election...

We are authorized to announce BRALEY OATES as a candidate at the next August election for the office of Clerk of Mecklenburg County Court.

We are authorized to announce ALEXANDER GRAHAM, Esq., a candidate at the next August election for the office of Clerk of Mecklenburg County Court.

We are authorized to announce HUGH F. MCKNIGHT, Esq., a candidate at the next August election for the office of Clerk of Mecklenburg County Court.

We are authorized to announce W. KERR REID, a candidate at the next August election for the office of Clerk of Mecklenburg County Court.

We are authorized to announce WM. H. SIMPSON, Esq., a candidate at the next August election for the office of Clerk of Mecklenburg County Court.

We are authorized to announce MILAS M. LEM, Esq., a candidate for the Office of clerk of the Superior Court of Union county, at the next August election.

We are authorized to announce JOSEPH T. DRAFFIN, Esq., a candidate at the next August election, for the office of Clerk of Union Superior Court.

Removal.

DR. D. T. CALDWELL has removed his shop to the house lately occupied by Mr. Watson, on second square south of the courthouse.

REMOVAL.

DR. THOMAS C. CALDWELL has removed his residence to Mr. William Morris's, 19 miles east of Charlotte, where he will be found at all times, unless absent on professional business.

List of Letters,

REMAINING in the Post Office at Charlotte, on the 1st day of April, 1845.

- Miss Jane C. Arny, Azariah Alexander, M. B. Abernathy, E. H. Andrews, Robt. G. Allison, B. A. G. Bennett, D. W. B. B. Brown, Rev. W. G. Brownlow, F. F. Fletcher Barber, Miss Jane Berry, C. C. J. Cochran, J. D. Conolly, Mrs. Margaret Cannon, W. T. Carter, Saml. Crawford, C. B. Cross, Alan W. Davis, John Dameron, Mrs. Winifred Darnall, Miss Eliza V. Davidson, Mrs. Sarah Downing, Caleb Erwin, Mrs. Matilda Edwards, John N. Fuller, R. G. Flannagan, Mrs. Ann Frew, Solomon Pitt, Miss Cornelia Gillespie, Wm. H. Gilliland, Miss Rachael Gould, Eli Griffith, Alexander Gibson, Miss Mary A. Halbrooks, Henry A. Hunter, David Henderson, Mrs. R. H. Hulton, T. J. Holton, W. A. Harris, James T. Holt, D. C. Haynes, Thomas Harris, Isabella Henderson, Mrs. Sarah A. Happoldt, Andrew Jamison, Margaret M. Johnson, Richard Jordan, Jesse B. Johnston, John B. Kerr, Andrew King, John Kirk, John M. Kerr, James J. Lawing, John Lawson, Mrs. Clarissa McCurver, Miss Elenor McCracken, Adam McCahan, Charles McGinnis, Geo. W. McDonald, Mrs. Violet Monteith, James McCoy, Wm. P. Moore, Alex. Nelson, John W. Neal, Rev. M. Osborne, Miss Eliz. Owens, Messrs. R. & W. G. Pierce, Mrs. Eliza W. Parks, Mrs. Sarah Parks, Mrs. Prizm, Jennie Peal, Mrs. Pennman, Miss Mary Pehel, Col. J. W. Potts, Geo. Reynolds 2, Miss E. C. Read, John P. Ross, Dr. J. W. Ross, Rufus Shelby, John Simpson, Elizabeth Sample, Thomas A. Sharpe, Margaret Shaw, B. Franklin Shaeffer, Wm. L. Torrence, Miss S. J. Talmon, M. J. Tatam, Nicholas Tredennick, Calvin Weir, John W. Walker, Rev. J. G. Witherspoon 2, AMZI MCGINN P. M. 203-3w.

Notice.

ALL persons indebted to Samuel C. Crawford, on account of newspaper subscription or otherwise, are informed that the Trustee has placed the accounts in the hands of Mr. John S. Means...

March 7, 1845

T. F. HAMPTON.

FACTS FOR THE PEOPLE.

The taxing power in all Governments is most apt to be improperly exercised, and, therefore, should be most sedulously guarded. Whenever government has to substitute the indirect or impost system of taxation in lieu of direct taxes...

The doctrine of protecting American manufactures is urged upon various pretexts. Some of the champions of what is termed the "American system," say we must protect our American labor against the cheap pauper labor of Europe...

wealth to the manufacturers. With great propriety, this whole system of indirect bounties has been characterized as nothing more or less than a measure of legalized plunder.

In illustration of what has been stated, the annexed tabular statements are referred to; and as they have been carefully prepared at the Treasury Department, they may be relied upon as being correct. The facts which they present are clear and convincing, and the baneful influence of the high tariff policy upon the value of our great staples, Flour, Tobacco, and Cotton, deserve the most serious consideration of all those interested in farming and planting.

This being the object and the effect of protective duties, the agricultural interests and the consumers generally, are most deeply interested in knowing, not only the extent of the tribute levied upon them for the enjoyment of the manufacturers, but also in knowing the depressing influence which the high tariff policy exerts upon the value of agricultural staples. However much inclined our protective tariff advocates may be, after the passage of their exorbitant bill of 1842, to promulgate the absurdity that "high duties make cheap goods," yet experience and history both prove conclusively, that high duties augment the value of goods above the foreign market prices, while they reduce the value of our great agricultural staples, impede our commerce, and diminish the wages of labor.

Suppose a farmer, when sending his flour to market, needs for his family a given quantity of cotton cloth. He meets with a European merchant, and observes: "Sir, I want to purchase one hundred yards of cotton cloth, and have but one barrel of flour which I can spend in that way; will you take my barrel of flour, and furnish me one hundred yards of cotton cloth?" The merchant accepts his offer, and both parties are mutually pleased and benefited. But a Yankee standing by, and observing what is passing, calculates he could make money faster by appealing to Congress to pass a law taxing the imported cottons one hundred per cent, which is about the present duty on cheap cotton cloth. The next season comes around, and the farmer takes another barrel of flour to market to get his supply of cotton cloth. But his European merchant informs him that Congress has, at the solicitation of the Yankee, passed a law taxing foreign cotton cloth one hundred per cent, so therefore, he has to add that tax to the cost of cotton cloth; he, therefore, cannot afford to sell him one hundred yards, under the change of facts, for less than two barrels of flour. Thus, under the high tariff system, the farmer gets only fifty yards of cotton cloth for his barrel of flour. He complains of this to the Yankee, who gravely answers that the tariff opens to him a home market for his bread-stuffs. The old farmer retorts, "that by your tariff, you force the farmers to pay you one hundred per cent, upon the foreign market price for your American cotton cloth, but you manufacturers do not give them in return one cent more, but, indeed, less, for their bread-stuffs, than they got for them before the passage of the tariff. Now your tariff, to be just, should require the consumers of our bread-stuffs to pay the farmers exactly the same rate per cent above the foreign market prices, as the consumers of manufactured goods are made to pay above the foreign rates. For all producers should be protected alike, and all consumers should be taxed alike."

"Ah, my dear sir, I see you are somewhat of an abstractionist, for you first confer a benefit on the manufacturers, and then propose, by protecting your bread-stuffs, to take it away." The old farmer replies "that every honest man should do as he would be done by, and if the farmers first help the manufacturers to get high prices, why should not the latter in return, be equally bound to aid the farmers in getting high prices, and then both would be protected alike."

In the great staple States, the mechanics of all descriptions are oppressed even more than the farmers and planters by this unjust tariff policy. For when agriculture is profitable, they share its riches; and when prices fall, they are thrown out of employment. The mechanics suffer, then, in a double capacity: for they are made to pay extravagant prices as consumers, while the system itself destroys the value of agricultural products, which alone afford them rich harvests, by presenting them full employment in their respective trades.

All departments of industry are benefited by receiving ample rewards for their labor. The working man wants high wages—the mechanic full employment at fair rates, and the farmer and planter good prices. But the general effect of high duties on imported goods, is a reduction of the wages of labor, as well as the value of our great agricultural staples.

All departments of industry are benefited by receiving ample rewards for their labor. The working man wants high wages—the mechanic full employment at fair rates, and the farmer and planter good prices. But the general effect of high duties on imported goods, is a reduction of the wages of labor, as well as the value of our great agricultural staples. If the converse of this were true, the protective tariff policy would, by elevating the wages of labor and the price of the raw materials, induce our citizens to abandon manufactures. But the tariff policy does, in fact, diminish the wages of labor and reduce the value of our agricultural staples, by depriving us, to a great extent, of our foreign commerce, and cutting us off from the best markets, and thus by robbing others of their just profits by its insidious operations, it accumulates

It will be found, on examining the following table relating to flour, that, notwithstanding the boasted demands of a home market for bread-stuffs, which the advocates of protection allege will be created by the operation of high duties, we exported during their existence, annually on an average, a greater number of barrels of flour, and at reduced prices, than we did during the period of low duties. The following are substantial facts, as the tables prove: our exports of flour averaged, per annum, from 1821 to 1824 inclusive, 909,370 barrels, at an average price per barrel, during that period, of \$5 53. But from 1825 to 1832 inclusive, our exports of flour averaged per annum 1,017,152 barrels, at an average price per barrel, during that period, of \$5 38. Here it is seen that, in the latter period, under the high tariff policy, we shipped more flour, and at less prices, than in the first. But we will hasten on to the next case in point. From 1833 to 1842 we exported an annual average of 946,287 barrels of flour, at an average price per barrel of \$6 01 for the entire period. But though we exported, from 1825 to 1832, on an average per annum, 1,017,152 barrels of flour, and, from 1833 to 1842, only on an average per annum of 946,287 barrels; yet, strange as it may seem, our exports of flour, in the latter period brought annually into the country \$222,141 more money than in the former. So, under a reducing scale of duties, the farmers received better prices for their flour, both at home and abroad. But from 1843 to 1844 we exported, on an average per annum, 1,140,024 barrels of flour, at an average annual price per barrel of only \$4 60. Notwithstanding the great increase in the average quantity per annum, from 1843 to 1844 inclusive, over the former period, from 1833 to 1842; yet the flour exported in the latter, during low duties, brought annually into the country \$441,773 more money than the larger quantity exported since the passage of the present tariff law. The tables prove that, under both periods of high tariffs the number of barrels of flour exported greatly increased over the quantity exported under the low tariffs, while the facts, as to the prices of the respective periods, were exactly reversed. For though we exported fewer barrels under the low tariffs, yet the farmers obtained much better prices for their flour, and a much larger sum of money annually on that account, came into the country.

FLOUR. A statement exhibiting the quantity and value of flour, exported annually from 1821 to 1844 inclusive.

Table with columns: Years, Barrels, Value, Average price per barrel. Rows include Exports in 4 years, Low duties (1821-1832), High duties (1833-1842), Exports in 8 years, Exports in 10 years, Exports in 15 years, Exports in 1843 and 1844, Annual average.

TOBACCO. A statement exhibiting the quantity of Tobacco, in hogsheads, exported annually from 1821 to 1844.

Table with columns: Years, Hhds., Value, Average price per hhd. Rows include Exports in 4 years, Exports in 8 years, Exports in 10 years, Exports in 1843 and 1844, Annual average.

In turning to the tables explanatory of the tobacco trade, we find a most extraordinary coincidence in nearly all the facts just explained in relation to the effect of high and low duties upon the exports as well as the price of flour, and that the same results attended the tobacco trade. A close examination of these tables presents to the mind a variety of important views. We find in the year 1843 a most tremendous falling off, both in the number of hogsheads as well as in the value of the tobacco exported. Indeed, in 1842, 1843, and 1844, the annual average value per hogshead was less than at any three preceding years since 1821, and the aggregate value of the entire exportation, for those three years, was greatly under that of the entire exportation for the next preceding three years. The annual average value, per hogshead, of tobacco exported from 1821 to 1824, was \$70; from 1825 to 1832 it fell to \$65 per hogshead; from 1833 to 1842 it again rose up to \$79 per hogshead; and from 1843 to 1844 it again fell down to \$51 per hogshead. Some may suppose the quality of the crop may explain this; but in our calculations we have embraced long periods during the existence of low and high tariffs, and it is fair to infer that casualties would as frequently affect the estimates on one side as the other. The price per hogshead, the aggregate value, and the number of hogsheads exported in each year since 1821, stand out boldly in the tables, and demonstrate how oppressively the tariff policy acted upon this great staple of the planters.

COTTON. Quantity and value of Cotton exported annually from 1821 to 1844.

Table with columns: Years, Pounds, Value, Average price. Rows include Exports in 4 years, Low duties (1821-1832), High duties (1833-1842), Exports in 8 years, Exports in 10 years, Exports in 15 years, Exports in 1843 and 1844, Annual average.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT. Register's Office, Jan. 30, 1845.

The tables setting forth the exports and value of cotton, annually, from 1821 to 1844, equally with those just examined, prove the singular exactness with which all of our great agricultural staples rise or fall as the duties upon imports go up or down. The present very low prices should induce the farmers and planters to inquire into the causes that produce such injurious results. It cannot be ascribed to over production, for that has been progressing since 1821; and by casting the eye over the table it will be plainly seen that, though the tariff policy vibrated from high to low duties, the price of our agricultural products also vibrated, in exact unison, from high to low. Look at the increased supplies of cotton from 1825 to 1832, and the fall in prices during that time, and then look at the increased supplies from 1832 to 1842 and mark the rise in prices in the latter period. But as soon as Congress passed the high tariff bill of 1842, behold how the price