

# Washington Recorder.

UNION, THE CONSTITUTION AND THE LAWS—THE GUARDIANS OF OUR LIBERTY.

Vol. XXII.

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1842.

No. 1126.

## SAY YOUR PRAYERS IN FAIR WEATHER.

From the Church of England Magazine.  
Turning by the Belfast night mail to my distant parish in the North, from the Dublin clerical meetings of the year 1839, I found myself placed opposite to a gentleman whose appearance engaged, rather than attracted, my most profound attention.

His age, as he afterwards told me, was sixty; and perhaps I should have conjectured as much, though exposure to weather, cares, anxieties, and dangers, with a certain air of seriousness which seemed as if it were to provide over them all, spoke more than the effects of time, the progress of my fellow traveller's earthly pilgrimage.

In truth his countenance was such a one as no observant physiognomist would contemplate without interest, or mark its amiable and diversified expression without respect and love. The coach in which we sat had scarcely cleared the pavement, and was rolling along the comparatively still and high way, when my companion addressed me with great ease and politeness. A few minutes sufficed to show that the predominant sentiment of his heart was religion. His conversation was almost exclusively of that character; and, as he poured out the rich stores of the gospel truth and experience from the exhaustless treasury of a converted soul, the night insensibly wore away, and the sun was long risen as we changed horses at the last stage.

Little more than an hour remained, and I must probably part for ever from a man by whose conversation I had been so happily captivated. I felt, as may be easily conceived, a strong desire to learn his history, and thus to fix more permanently on my mind the impression he had made. Accordingly, I asked him whether the turning of his heart to God had been caused by any sudden danger, or merely connected with his sea-faring life (he had already told me that he commanded a vessel trading between Liverpool and America) or was of gradual growth. My question seemed to please him; at least he replied to it with the utmost courtesy, saying, that in the last year but one of the late war, he was waiting in port with a fleet of merchantmen till convoy should arrive, it being deemed unsafe to sail without such protection. His habits, he observed, had always been exceedingly irregular, but since no stronger term, and he passed the period of detention in practices he could not look back on without sorrow.

At length the signal to weigh anchor was made; his ship, as were also many others, was so short of hands, that he was glad to accept of any person who offered himself, however inexperienced he might be in navigation. At the very instant of departure, a boat came alongside, out of which a tall robust man climbed actively upon the deck, and gave himself in as a seaman, willing to engage for the voyage. The boat which brought him had returned to the shore, and the wind was blowing nearly a gale; but under every circumstance, my friend said, he was glad to get even the addition of one equal hand to his scanty crew. His pleasure, however, was of short duration, for the new comer was soon found to be of a most quarrelsome, untractable disposition, a furious blasphemer, and, when opportunity offered, a drunkard. Besides all these disqualifications, he was wholly ignorant of nautical affairs, or counterfeited ignorance to escape duty. In short, he was the bane and plague of the vessel, and refused obstinately to give any account of himself, or his family, or his past life.

At length a violent storm arose, all hands were piped upon deck, and all, as the captain thought, too few to save the ship. When the men were mustered to their quarters, the sturdy blasphemer was missing, and my friend went below to seek for him; great was his surprise at finding him on his knees repeating the Lord's prayer with wonderful rapidity, over and over again, as if he had bound himself to countless repetition. Vexed at what he deemed hypocrisy or cowardice, he shook him roughly by the collar, exclaiming, "Say your prayers in fair weather." The man rose up, observing in a low voice, "God grant I may ever see fair weather to say them."

In a few hours the storm happily abated, a week more brought them to harbour, and an incident so trivial passed quickly away from the memory of the captain—the more easily, as the man in question was paid off the day after landing, and appeared not again.

Four more years had elapsed, during which, though my friend had twice been shipwrecked, and was grievously hurt by the falling of a spar, he pursued without amendment a life of profligacy and contempt of God. At the end of this period he arrived in the port of New York, after a very tedious and dangerous voyage from England.

It was on a Sabbath morning, and the streets were thronged with persons proceeding to the several houses of worship with which that city abounds; but the

narrator, from whose lips I take this anecdote, was bent on far other occupation, designing to drown the recollection of petty and delirious in a celebrated tavern, which he had too long and too often frequented.

As he walked leisurely towards this goal, he encountered a very dear friend, the quondam associate of many a thoughtless hour. Salutations over, the captain seized him by the arm, declaring that he should accompany him to the hotel. I will do so, replied the other with great calmness, on condition that you come with me first for a single hour into this house (a church), and thank God for his mercies to you on the deep. The captain was ashamed to refuse, so the two friends entered the temple together. Already all the seats were occupied, and a dense crowd filled the aisle; but, by dint of personal exertion, they succeeded in reaching a position right in front of the pulpit, at about five yards distance. The preacher, one of the most popular of the day, riveted the attention of the entire congregation, including the captain himself, to whom his features and voice—though he could not assign any time or place of previous meeting—seemed not wholly unknown, particularly when he spoke with animation. At length the preacher's eyes fell upon the spot where the two friends stood. He suddenly paused—still gazing upon the captain, as if to make himself sure that he labored under no optical delusion—and after a silence of more than a minute, pronounced with a voice that shook the building, "Say your prayers in fair weather."

The audience were lost in amazement, nor was it until a considerable time had elapsed, that the preacher recovered sufficient self-possession to recount the incident with which the reader is already acquainted; adding, with deep emotion, that the words which his captain uttered in the storm had clung to him by day and by night after his landing, as if an angel had been charged with the duty of repeating them in his ear; that he felt the holy call as coming direct from above, to do the work of his crucified Master; that he had studied at college for the ministry, and was now, through grace, such as they saw and heard.

At the conclusion of this affecting address, he called on the audience to join in prayer with himself, that the same words might be blessed in turn to him who first had used them. But God had outstriven their petitions—my friend was already his child before his former shipmate had ceased to tell his story. The spirit had wrought effectually upon him, and subdued every lofty imagination. And so, when the people dispersed, he exchanged the hotel for the house of the preacher, with whom he tarried six weeks, and parted from him to pursue his profession, with a heart devoted to the service of his Saviour, and with holy and happy assurances, which (as he declared to me, and I confidently rely in his truth,) advancing years hallowed, strengthened, and sanctified.

From that companion of a night I then parted, probably not to meet again till we stand before the judgment seat of Christ. His history is too palpably instructive to require that I should add my own reflections. And with one only, I conclude—addressing those persons who seek God merely in the hours of danger and trouble—in the words of the captain, "Say your prayers in fair weather."

## Speech of Mr. Simmons, OF RHODE ISLAND, On Mr. Clay's Resolutions, and in reply to Messrs. Wright, Woodbury, and Calhoun, delivered in the Senate of the United States, Friday, March 11, 1842.

Concluded.  
This last point was elaborately argued the last summer by the honorable Senator from South Carolina, (Mr. Calhoun,) who attempted to prove that the distributive administration of the moneys of this Government was unequal and oppressive, and must be so; and that this inequality might be carried so far as to ruin the South. This was illustrated by supposing that two neighboring counties, Loudon and Fairfax, should unite and form a Republic under a form of government like ours; that Loudon had 100,000 people, and Fairfax ten more, so as to give it a majority; that their annual profits were three hundred thousand dollars each, making an aggregate of six hundred thousand, and the disbursements two hundred thousand a year—each alike contributing one hundred thousand; that Fairfax, from its majority of ten, should expend the whole sum contributed in that county; the result, he said, would be that, at the end of the year, Fairfax would have four, and Loudon two, of the six hundred thousand dollars; and by repeating this for three years, Fairfax would have the whole currency.

When he had concluded, a friend who sits near me remarked, "that's very clear. The honorable Senator has taken another method to illustrate it, and a shorter one. A committee of nine, five sitting on one side of the table, and four on the other—they each take five wafers representing the wealth of the community; one wafer each to be the annual contribution. The

five on one side the table, out-voting the other four, order this contribution to be laid out among themselves, for the expenses of the Government. To continue this for five years, would transfer the whole wealth among the five. Each mode of stating the process he thought conclusively proved the correctness of his theory.

All this may be very good abstract theory; but in practice there is no soundness in it. As a practical matter, its error is, in supposing that these minorities do nothing, while the majority earn the public money, by employment on the public works or in public offices.

In the case put by the Senator, of the two counties of Virginia, the profits would depend upon which class of citizens was employed at the best wages, or in the most productive labor; those of Fairfax by the Government, on public works and in the offices, or those of Loudon, in raising provisions and producing other supplies for their subsistence.

It is plain, if all things were equal, and the people of the two counties dealt with each other, as these two States do, that it would make very little difference, in point of wealth, which county had the public employment; but take into the account the dependent submission, and at the same time the extravagant habits of both body and mind, that gradually undermine those who feed at the public crib, and the condition of the people of Loudon, who raise the corn and potatoes for those of Fairfax to subsist upon, while at work for the public, is greatly to be preferred for its independence and eventual ascendancy in wealth.

[Here the Senator from South Carolina interposed and said: "The honorable Senator states my argument very fairly, but he does not take the same view of it that I took. I stated that such a course would draw all the money into Fairfax; they would command the currency."]

Mr. Simmons resumed. I am glad I have stated the Senator's argument correctly. I did not mean to take the same view of it which he took, but was trying to show the correct one in practice. And I thought it was made out pretty clearly that it depended upon which of the two classes of citizens, if equally industrious, was best paid for their services.

And here I will refer to a remark on this subject of public employment, made by the honorable Senator from Missouri (Mr. Branton) last summer, (and he utters some sensible ones as well as some very severe ones) that the South had enjoyed the offices and patronage of this Government for forty years, to their great disadvantage; he hoped for the next forty they might be rid of it, and that, while some other section had it, the South might do the work, and he had no doubt it would turn to more profit. [Mr. Calhoun again interposed, and said: "he meant that this not only gave the currency, but it gave employment to the people of Fairfax, and the employment was even more valuable than the currency."] Mr. S. resumed. I agree that both are very valuable. The currency has entered into almost all discussions in these times. A word only upon it in this connection.

I regard a good currency as "the tools of trade," and a good tariff as furnishing the people with employment. It is a hard case to have to do a job with poor tools; but it is still harder to have no work to do. The people want both, to prosper. But these free trade folks of the late administration, by their tampering with the currency, have been dulling the tools of trade for years, and its friends now propose free trade, to take away the work from our people and give it to foreigners; so that hereafter labor in this country is to have neither work nor tools!

Upon this subject of employment, I am glad the honorable Senator has such correct views. He says it is more valuable than money; and I agree with him. His argument is without practical soundness when applied, as he applies it, to a people who interchange labor, and when the aggregate employment is enjoyed by them alone. It is then a question merely as to which mode, public or private employment, is most profitable; but when it is connected with the subject now before us, it is a good argument for the protection of our labor against the cheap labor of Europe; for to buy of nations who will not, or do not, buy of you, no matter how cheap you buy, will eventually bring us to the condition which he tried to bring the people of Loudon into, by losing the offices and work, too; we shall lose all, and foreigners will get all the wealth. This is understood by those who teach free trade in England, if it be not by their friends who advocate it here. They put that doctrine forth for us to follow, but have too much good sense to follow it themselves.

[Mr. Calhoun again interposed and said, "that the expending of public money in one section, as in Fairfax, not only gave employment, which was better than money, but there was a great advantage to that county by the improvements made in it by the expenditures, such as roads, &c."]

Mr. S. resumed. This is very true, sir; and I am glad to find the honorable Senator returning to his former views

upon the subject of these roads, or internal improvements.

This is a part of the American system, which, when conducted judiciously, does operate very advantageously. The country so understands it, and knows, too, to what influences its destruction is attributable. But I must take leave of this part of the subject. I have fatigued the Senate and myself, too, by hobbling along in this kind of running fight.

[During the remarks upon this part of the subject, the honorable Senator from South Carolina replied to and commented upon some parts of the speech of the senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Clay,) who rose and said, he should decline answering, but thereafter should insist that the Senator from Rhode Island should be permitted to go on without interruption. Mr. Calhoun said he should not leave in interrupted so often, but the appeals and allusions were made to him personally.] Mr. Simmons. I have made no personal allusion in any offensive sense, I hope. The remarks applied to the arguments and observations of the Senator, and not to him; and I turned towards him that I might be understood, in order to convince even him, as well as the Senate, that if the distributive administration of the money of this Government should actually become as local and partial in its character as in the instance he has put of the two counties, it would furnish no ground for the nullification of a law made to raise supplies, or of serious complaint from those parts of the country whose people might not get employed.

I will now examine the other ground of complaint—which is the supposed inequality of the burdens imposed upon different parts of the country, by the proposed mode of levying duties.

The honorable Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Calhoun) has repeatedly called upon me (when memorials in favor of protection have been presented) to show why it was, that the people of the South regarded these duties as oppressive, and that at the North they were petitioning for them to be laid.

I confess it does seem strange that such a geographical distinction should exist, and appear to be influenced solely by climate. I cannot so well tell why the South complain so bitterly about paying duties, but will explain why the North do not make these complaints.

We of the North look at this matter of paying the expenses of Government as a necessary thing. We keep perfectly cool, and conclude they must be paid in some form or other. But in other parts of the country they would seem to think that, if they can get rid of, or lessen, the duty on a given article, they can avoid paying it altogether; whereas, if it is taken off of one article, it has surely to be put on to another. The amount must be paid in some way.

The controversy which created so much disquiet in the country from 1828 to 1833, had its origin in theoretical, rather than practical evils. The doctrine contended for at the South was, that a uniform rate of duty should be laid upon all articles—those that came in competition with our own products, and those which did not. I shall presently say something of its adjustment; but I am first to answer the questions repeatedly asked of me by the Senator from South Carolina, why it is that the North do not consider it a burden to have a high duty laid on some articles, and a low duty, or no duty at all, on others?

I have already said we know the expenses must be paid; and I will answer these questions as if the Senator were really correct in saying that the duty enhanced the price; which, however, is not the fact, in most if not all cases where an adequate supply, or nearly so, can be furnished by ourselves. I will take the sugar duty for an example, (that has been 21 cents per lb., equal to 50 per cent, at least on the foreign cost,) and the article of coffee, which is free. We of the North can raise neither; our climate is not adapted to their culture. The South raise sugar, and the duty is all laid on the foreign sugar. Why do we not insist that it should be laid half on each, according to the Southern doctrine? Simply because it makes no difference, in the cost of a cup of coffee, whether the duty is all put on the sugar, or laid-half and half on each. When we take up a cup of coffee to drink, it really is not always we think that we are paying a tax; and if that thought should glance across our mind, it would not spoil the sweetening; so suppose that our Southern friends were getting some encouragement and protection for their labor in raising sugar, by having the duty thus laid; it would make the dish even more palatable; and we should take it hot, and make a good breakfast; while our Southern friends, bent upon their theory, (that duties must be alike on all articles,) would go into their abstract reasoning to show how much they were oppressed by putting the duty on the sugar, instead of the sugar and coffee both; get into a passion about it, and at last make a poor breakfast on cold coffee and bad logic.

When we think of the taxes we pay on molasses, we satisfy ourselves by the fact that in every instance in our history, wherein the duty has been raised, the

price of the article has fallen. I have taken articles for the illustration which are of Southern growth, and which it might be supposed would produce disquiet with us, from a high duty, as the North cannot participate in the advantages which such a duty might confer, and I have shown not only why we do not complain, but I hope I have shown that we have no reason to complain.

The South, I presume, do not pretend that they have any cause of complaint, that this and all their productions are thus encouraged and protected by such duties. I will now take another kind of imports, and one which has been the subject of the most bitter complaints—to wit, woollens. It will seem, upon reflection, to be strange that a duty upon this article should be regarded with particular offence by those of the South, and especially that those of a warm climate should object to a tax upon woollens, (if the duty is really to be regarded as a tax,) and those of a cold one be satisfied with it; that it should be in their mouth as but such a tax imposed upon unequal burdens upon the inhabitants of the South, were woollens, from the nature of the climate, cannot, to a great extent, become a necessary of life, but rather a luxury; while, from the rigid coldness of ours, all, from infancy to old age, have to be clothed with it most parts of the year. Now I have no doubt that, of the duties collected on this article, four dollars per man are paid by those North of this, to one dollar by those of the South, if it were levied and collected like direct taxes according to the rule of the Constitution; and yet this tax upon woollens is the one relied upon by the Senator from South Carolina to make out his case of unequal burdens.

This very duty was the great cause of excitement at the South, and the very hot-bed that occasioned their most absurd doctrine of nullification.

Sir, it would not have been much more absurd for them to have nullified a law which should impose a duty on warm blankets; an article never seen at the South, because, like woollens, there is no necessity for them; but which from our cold and rigorous climate, can be found in every cottage and farm house in New England.

Sir, I have endeavored to show why the people of the North do not complain that duties are laid on articles which they do not raise—such as sugar—and also that there is no good reason for complaint from the South for other duties, which they regard as unequal and oppressive. And I have done this for the purpose of removing impressions and opinions of Southern friends, which I believe to be incorrect, and not to advocate exorbitant rates of duties upon any imports. I am not in favor of such, and do not mean to contend for them. My purpose, in what I have said on the subject of the rates of duties, has been to answer the inquiries so repeatedly pressed by the Senator from South Carolina, and to show that the South would have no particular reason to complain, if the rates of duties should not be reduced, as I expect they will be.

And I now desire to say a few words on the subject embraced in the resolutions, concerning the manner of raising the amount of revenue necessary to an economical administration of the Government. It appears plain to me, from all that has been said on the subject of reductions, that the amount for all purposes must be twenty six millions, including what is proper to be paid toward the existing debt. The resolutions propose that in raising this sum, the provisions of the compromise act shall be generally adhered to. To this general rule, as explained by the mover of the resolutions, there are to be such exceptions as may appear to be just; as, for instance, if any particular branch of industry should be in manifest danger of very great injury, or of absolute destruction by the application of the general rule, then good policy and justice might require that it should be treated as an exception from it. This was understood when the law was passed.

This law plainly declares that a sufficient amount of revenue shall be raised by duties on imports, for an economical administration of the Government. It neither refers to, nor relies upon any other means than duties for that object. But I have known no law to be more misapprehended than this has been, nor one on which public opinion appears to be so much divided.

This has resulted, no doubt, from the various and conflicting opinions expressed in regard to it at the time of its passage, and in some instances since, from a determination to misrepresent and condemn it. But I am bound to believe that a portion of the men of this last class, if correctly informed of its character and of its capacities to carry out the objects intended, would cease to condemn it. The objects of this law can be best understood by looking at its provisions in connection with the state of the treasury at the time of its passage. This will show its true spirit and intent. At that time it was estimated that the wants of the Government would not exceed five or six millions of dollars annually. The debt was paid, and the ordinary expenses had not exceeded thirteen millions

a year the previous eight years. Every plan presented at that session of Congress proposed to reduce the rates of duties, so that the revenue should not exceed the wants of the Government, and with more or less professed regard to the incidental encouragement of American labor. The free-trade, or what was regarded as a Southern doctrine was, that duties should be levied on all articles alike, whether coming in competition with products of our own or not, and at a rate no higher than was sufficient to raise the requisite sum, which was then estimated at twelve to thirteen per cent.

They contended for this, and it was at that time justly called a "horizontal tariff;" and I perceive by some memorials that the act which passed at that session has the same term applied to it—whether justly or not, a further examination will show.

The law referred to, instead of providing that the duties should be levied on all articles alike, declared that many upon which duties had before been laid, especially such articles as did not interfere with, but which were necessary to, our own productions, should afterwards be admitted free, and that where any reduction of the rates should be necessary, in order to diminish the amount of revenue, such reduction should be gradual, and reaching through a period of nine or ten years; should eventually come to a rate (20 per cent,) at which a sufficient amount of revenue could be raised, on that class of articles, for an economical administration of the Government.

It is therefore manifest that the law contemplated a discrimination between the articles which come in competition with those produced by American labor and those which did not, to the full extent of collecting the entire revenue by duties levied on the first, and permitting the last to be admitted entirely free. This is the very intent and spirit of the law, when viewed with reference to the state of the Public Treasury at the time the law was framed.

It is true, times have since changed, unexpectedly and unfavorably changed, in reference to the ability of the country to consume and pay for dutiable imports, as well as to the increased expenditures, and consequent necessities for increased revenues. This change, which is often adverted to by the advocates of free trade as if it were desired by the friends of American labor, because it creates a necessity for higher duties than was expected, is not, in fact, favorable to any kind of productive labor in this country, to my knowledge. It weighs down the prosperity of all, it destroys confidence, and, with it, the value of all kinds of property.

Neither does it furnish an opportunity to carry out peculiar doctrines of discrimination, in levying duties, between imports which do, and those which do not, compete with our labor. So far as the principle of protection is supposed to consist in discriminating duties, the necessity for an increase of duties has operated against the development of that peculiar feature of the law. But, if the capacity of the country to consume imports had continued as it was expected, and if the necessities of the Government had not become greater than when the law was passed, we should have had a discrimination between these two classes of importations equaling the entire duty, or twenty per cent; but, as it now stands, no such distinction between the two kinds of imports can be expected.

The free articles, or most of them, are already raised to that rate; and to enjoy the discrimination of twenty per cent, contemplated in the bill, the duties on the articles intended to be protected could not be reduced much below what they are seen to have been during the late administration, viz: a rate of duty of at least forty per cent. So high a rate I have no wish to see continued, especially as we have the most convincing proofs that so high duties are evaded in almost all cases; and we have reason to believe that, from their being so high, they occasion many of those numerous frauds which have driven almost all honest American merchants from the business of importing, as well as defeated both revenue and protection.

This leaves every American interest to become a victim either to the cupidity of the foreigner who imports, or to the necessities of the foreign producer abroad. At any rate, sir, I prefer that certainty which is secured by the provisions of that law, of collecting whatever rate of duty may be levied, by having the basis of it under the control of our officers, and our laws, through a home valuation, to any mere nominal rate of duties, however high. And there is abundant evidence before the country that all rates are but nominal, so long as you permit the foreigner to fix upon the basis by his invoices, although you should require them to be shingled over with oaths.

I have been induced to say this much of the provisions of the compromise act, because it has often been asserted that it surrendered the principle of protection. But we have seen that, when taken in connection with the wants of the Treasury, as estimated at the time of its passage, and with the prosperous condition of the