

The tendency of the tax, or duty, on the imported article is, not only to raise its price, but also, in the same proportion, that of the domestic article of the same kind, for which purpose, when intended for protection, it is in fact laid; and of course, in determining where the system ultimately places the burden in reality, this effect also, must be taken into the estimate. If one of the sections exclusively produces such domestic articles, and the other purchases them from it, then it is clear that to the amount of such increased prices, the tax or duty on the consumption of the foreign articles, would be transferred from the section producing the domestic articles to the one that purchased and consumed them, unless the latter in turn, be indemnified by the increased price of the objects of its industry, which none will venture to assert to be the case with the great staples of the country, which form the basis of our exports, the price of which is regulated by the foreign and not the domestic market. To those who grow them, the increased price of the foreign and domestic articles both, in consequence of the duty on the former, is in reality, and in the strictest sense, a tax, while it is clear that the increased price of the latter acts as a bounty to the section producing them, and that as the amount of such increased prices, on what it sells to the other section, is greater or less, than the duty it pays on the imported articles, the system will in fact operate as a bounty or tax; if greater the difference would be a bounty; if less a tax.

Again, the operation may be equal in every other respect, and yet the pressure of the system, relatively, on the two sections, be rendered very unequal by the appropriations, or distribution. If each section receives back less, and the other proportionally more than it paid, then the difference in relation to the sections will be to the former a loss, and to the latter a gain; and the system in this aspect would operate to the amount of the difference, as a contribution from the one receiving less than it paid, to the other that receives more. Such would be incontestably its general effects, taken in all its different aspects, even on the theory supposed to be most favourable to prove the equal action of the system, that the consumer pays in the first instance the whole amount of the tax.

To show how, on this supposition, the burden and advantages of the system would actually distribute themselves between the sections, would carry me too far into details; but I feel assured, after a full and careful examination, that they are such as to explain, what otherwise would seem inexplicable, that one section should consider its repeal a calamity and the other a blessing; and that such opposite views should be taken by them, as to place them in a state of determined conflict, in relation to the great fiscal and commercial interests of the country. Indeed were there no satisfactory explanation, the opposite views that prevail, in the two sections, as to the effects of the system, ought to satisfy all of its unequal action. There can be no safer, or more certain rule, than to suppose each portion of the country equally capable of understanding their respective interests; and that each is a much better judge of the effects of any system of measures or its peculiar interest, than the other can possibly be.

But whether the opinion, of its unequal action, be correct, or erroneous, nothing can be more certain than that the impression is widely extending itself, that the system, under all its modifications, is essentially unequal; and if to that be added, a conviction still deeper, and more universal, that every duty imposed for the purpose of protection is not only unequal, but also unconstitutional, it would be a fatal error to suppose, that any remedy, short of that which I have stated, can heal our political disorders.

In order to understand, more fully, the difficulty of adjusting this unhappy contest, on any other ground, it may not be improper to present a general view of the constitutional objection, that it may be clearly seen, how hopeless it is to expect that it can be yielded, by those who have embraced it.

They believe that all the powers, vested by the Constitution in Congress, are not only restricted by the limitations expressly imposed, but also by the nature and object of the powers themselves. Thus though the

power to impose duties on imports be granted in general terms, without any other express limitations, but that they shall be equal, and no preference shall be given to the ports of one state over those of another, yet as being a portion of the taxing power, given with the view of raising revenue, it is from its nature restricted to that object, as much as is if the Convention had expressly so limited it; and that to use it to effect any other purpose, not specified in the Constitution, is an infraction of the instrument, in its most dangerous form; an infraction by perversion, more easily made, and more difficult to resist, than any other. The same view is believed to be applicable to the power of regulating commerce, as well as all the other powers. To surrender this important principle, it is conceived, would be to surrender all power, and to render the government unlimited and despotic; and to yield it up, in relation to the particular power in question, would be in fact to surrender the control of the whole industry and capital of the country to the General Government; and would end in placing the weaker section, in a colonial relation with the stronger. For nothing are more dissimilar in their nature, or may be more unequally affected by the same laws, than different descriptions of labour and property; and if taxes, by increasing the amount and changing the intent only, may be perverted, in fact, into a system of penalties and rewards, it would give all the power that could be desired, to subject the labour and property of the minority to the will of the majority to be regulated without regarding the interest of the former, in subservience to the will of the latter. Thus thinking, it would seem unreasonable to expect, that any adjustment, based on the recognition of the correctness of a construction of the Constitution, which would admit the exercise of such a power, would satisfy the weaker of the two sections, particularly with its peculiar industry and property, which experience has shown may be so injuriously effected by its exercise. Thus much for one side.

The just claims of the other ought to be equally respected. Whatever excitement, the system has justly caused, in certain portions of our country. I hope, and believe, all will conceive that the change, should be made with the least possible detriment to the interests of those, who may be liable to be affected by it, consistently with what is justly due to others and the principles of the Constitution. To effect this, will require the kindest spirit of conciliation, and the utmost skill; but, even with these, it will be impossible to make the transition, without a shock greater or less; though I trust, if judiciously effected, it will not be without many compensating advantages. That there will be some such, cannot be doubted. It will, at least, be followed by greater stability, and will tend to harmonize the manufacturing with all of the other great interests of the country, and bind the whole in mutual affection. But these are not all. Another advantage, of essential importance to the ultimate prosperity of our manufacturing industry. It will cheapen production; and, in that view, the loss of any one branch, will be nothing like in proportion to the reduction of duty on that particular branch. Every reduction will, in fact, operate as a bounty to every other branch, except the one reduced, and thus the effect of a general reduction will be to cheapen, universally, the price of production, by cheapening living, wages and materials; so as to give, if not equal profits after the reduction, profits by no means reduced proportionally to the duties; an effect, which, as it regards the foreign market, is of the utmost importance. It must be apparent on reflection, that the means adopted to secure the home market, for our manufactures are precisely the opposite of those necessary to obtain the foreign. In the former, the increased expense of production in consequence of a system of protection may be more than compensated by the increased price at home of the article protected; but, in the latter, this advantage is lost, and as there is no other corresponding compensation, the increased cost of production must be a dead loss in the foreign market. But whether these advantages and many others, that might be mentioned, will ultimately compensate to the full extent, or not, the loss to the manufacturer on the reduction of the duties, certainly is, that

we have approached a point, at which a great change cannot be much longer delayed; and that the more promptly it may be met, the less excitement there will be, and the greater leisure and calmness for a cautious and skillful operation in making the transition; and which it becomes those more immediately interested duly to consider. Nor ought they to overlook, in considering the question, the different character of the claims of the two sides. The one asks from the Government no advantage, but simply to be let alone in the undisturbed possession of their natural advantages, and to secure which, as far as was consistent with the other objects of the Constitution, was one of their leading motives in entering into the Union; while the other side claims, for the advancement of their prosperity the positive interference of the Government. In such cases, on every principle of fairness and justice, such interference ought to be restrained within limits strictly compatible with the natural advantages of the other. He who, looking to all of the causes in operation; the near approach of the final payment of the public debt, the growing disaffection and resistance to the system, in so large a section of the which opposition to it is gradually turning, the deeper principles on which, must be, indeed, infatuated not to see a great change is unavoidable; and that the attempt to elude or much longer delay it, must finally, but increase the shock, and disastrous consequences which may follow.

In forming the opinions, I have expressed, I have not been actuated by an unkind feeling towards our manufacturing interest. I now am, and ever have been decidedly friendly to them, though I cannot concur in all of the measures which have been adopted to advance them. I believe, considerations higher, than any question of mere pecuniary interest, forbids their use. But subordinate to these higher views of policy, I regard the advancement of mechanical and chemical improvements in the arts with feelings little short of enthusiasm; not only, as the prolific source of national and individual wealth, but, as the great means of enlarging the domain of man over the material world; and, thereby, of laying the solid foundation of a highly improved condition of society, morally and politically. I fear not, that we shall extend our power too far over the great agents of nature; but, on the contrary, I consider such enlargement of our power, as tending, more certainly and powerfully, to better the condition of our race, than any one of the many powerful causes, now operating to that result. With these impressions, I not only rejoice at the general progress of the arts in the world, but in their advancement in our own country; and, as far as protection can be incidentally afforded, in the fair and honest exercise of our constitutional powers, I think now, as I have always done, that sound policy connected with the security, independence and peace of the country, requires them to be protected, but, that we cannot go a single step beyond, without jeopardizing our peace, our harmony and our liberty; considerations of infinitely more importance to us than any measure of mere policy, can possibly be.

In thus placing my opinions before the public, I have not been actuated by the expectation of changing the public sentiment. Such a motive, on a question so long agitated, and so beset with feelings of prejudice and interest would argue, on my part, an insufferable vanity, and a profound ignorance of the human heart. To avoid, as far as possible, the imputation of either, I have confined my statement on the many and important points, on which I have been compelled to touch, to a simple declaration of my opinion, without advancing any other reasons to sustain them, than what, appeared to me, to be indispensable to the full understanding of my views; and, if they should, on any point, be thought to be not clearly and explicitly developed, it will, I trust, be attributed to my solicitude to avoid the imputations to which I have alluded; and not from any desire to disguise my sentiments; nor the want of arguments and illustrations to maintain positions, which so abound in both, that it would require a volume to do them any thing like justice. I can only hope, that truths, I feel assured, are essentially connected with all that we ought to hold most dear,

may not be weakened in the public estimation by the imperfect manner, in which I have been, by the object in view, compelled to present them.

With every caution on my part, I dare not hope, in taking the step I have, to escape the imputation of improper motives; though I have with proper reserve, freely expressed my opinions, not regarding whether they might, or might not, be popular. I have no reason to believe, that they are such, as will conciliate public favour, but the opposite; which I greatly regret, as I have ever placed a high estimate on the good opinion of my fellow citizens. But be that as it may, I shall, at least, be sustained by feelings of conscious rectitude. I have formed my opinions after the most careful and deliberate examination, with all of the aids, which, my reason and experience could furnish; I have expressed them honestly and fearlessly, regardless of their effects personally; which however interesting to me individually, are of too little importance, to be taken into the estimate, where the liberty and happiness of our country are so vitally involved.

JOHN C. CALHOUN.
Fort Hill, July 26th, 1831.

ERRATA.
At the bottom of the first page of our paper of to-day after its reading blessings to the remotest generations; but if

MR. CALHOUN.
In our last we promised to give our readers Mr. Calhoun's views upon the relation which the States bear to the general government;— We now to the exclusion of almost every thing else fulfil that promise. The interest which has been felt upon the subject, the masterly production itself and the garbled statements which have been made upon the subject by the interested and selfish, all urged us to this course and we trust no one will regret it. We say to every man look, read, think. Let every man form his own opinion. Let no man listen to the interested and perverted statements of others. Let the piece be abstracted from passing events. Let it be considered by itself and we doubt not but the sentiments, contained in it, will be responded to by every friend of the constitution and democracy. It is useless for us to cite authorities in support of the doctrines contained in the publication;—This Mr. Calhoun has done himself;—this has been done by our correspondent "A democratic Republican," for whose piece we now ask an attentive perusal.

Like all great men who have aspired to distinction Mr. Calhoun has his enemies. It is the policy of those to misrepresent his opinions; they are a stumbling block in the way of many political aspirants;—those who during the last war were plotting the dismemberment of the Union;— who were building bonfires and rejoicing at every defeat of our gallant soldiers; they are the men who hate Mr. Calhoun;— he opposed their unholy attempts;—he crushed them; his gigantic mind carried through happily and gloriously our second struggle for political existence; he labored in the cabinet;— on the floor of Congress; Gen. JACKSON labored in the field. Their combined efforts saved the republic. Those very men who then had well nigh destroyed the only hope of the lover of freedom and who were only prevented from doing so by Mr. Calhoun, and his Co-laborers, in the great cause of political freedom, now charge Mr. Calhoun with nullification. Mr. Calhoun a nullifier? The charge is false. He is no nullifier;—he is no disunionist;—he is as pure a patriot as the world ever saw. Look to his long and well spent life!—Look at his piece, Do you see any nullification there? Do you see any disunion and "grim visaged war"? No, you see a plain and ungarbled statement of the democratic Republican doctrine. You see that doctrine upon which Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams and other distinguished patriots acted, when they opposed the wording of the constitution "We the people" and wish'd in its stead, "We the states," and whose opposition only ceased upon the understanding that "We the people" meant the people of the states respectively, and not the people of the United States as a component whole. For these those men, the very men who put the ball of the revolution in motion were called demagogues, and disorganizers, by the enemies of freedom and equality.

You see the doctrine upon which Mr. Jefferson and others acted, when they opposed the arbitrary forms of Government, which were attempted to be introduced into this country by Alexander Hamilton. You see the doctrine upon which Mason, Madison, Jefferson, Nicholas, and others acted, when they opposed the arbitrary enactments of old John Adams and for which they were called emissaries of France, disorganizers and other hard names.

which he received the blessings and thanks of every friend of his country, and the taunts and gibes of the enemies of free government.

You see the doctrine which brought General Jackson into power in 1828 and which has sustained his administration thus far.

You see the doctrine, in fine, upon the prevalence of which rests the permanency of our institutions, the perpetuation of the union and the freedom and independence of the whole human race. May the mists which the interested time server,—the cur of party, the dastard and coward have thrown around them be soon dissipated and may they stand confessed the only principles upon which freedom and equality can be secured to all mankind. When this day arrives the shackles of ignorance will be thrown off, the time-server will sink into the contempt and insignificance which he deserves, the minion of power will be scratched from the light of human beings and the patriot will walk forth in his own majesty which will consist in his having well served his God and his Country, with nothing to boast of, save his frailty.

We give our readers, to day, such additional election returns, as have come to hand; For Congress, the following gentlemen have been elected without opposition: In the Burke district, Samuel P. Carson; In the Salisbury district, A. menchen; In the Caswell district, A. H. Shepherd; In the Wilkes district, Lewis Williams; In the Wake district Danl. L. Barringer; In the Granville district, Robert Porter; In the Halifax district, Hon. Jas. Branch; In the Wilmington district, Gen. McCoy. In the following districts, the election of the old members was opposed: In the Lincoln district Henry W. Conner was opposed by Bartlett Shipp but was elected by a majority of 800 votes; In the Fayetteville district, Mr. Deberry has been elected by a majority of two or three hundred votes over his opponent Mr. Bethune; In the Edgecomb district Mr. Hill has been elected over his opponent Mr. Floyd; In the Craven district Mr. Sheppard was opposed by Mr. Wheeler;—we have not yet complete returns from this district. For the State Legislature the following are the additional returns:

- Davidson.—S. Charles Hoover; C. John Hogan, Esq. and John M. Thomas.
- Jones.—For Congress Deberry 938, Bethune 291; S. Clement Marshall; C. Wm. A. Morris and Alexander Little.
- Lincoln.—S. Daniel Hoke; C. Miles W. Abernathy and Henry Canale; State of the P. Hoke 666, Moore 263; Abernathy 1874, Carter 1401, Perreine Roberts 1292. For Congress, Conner 1676, Shipp 966.
- Salisbury.—S. Christopher Melcher, no opposition; C. Danl. M. Barringer and Wm. McLear, State of the Poll, Barringer 797, McLear 370, George Ury 317, J. W. Hamilton 278. For Congress, Shipp 393, Conner 532.
- Mecklenburg.—S. Henry Massie, Sen. of C. John Hart and James Deberry, State of the Poll, Massie 526, Davison 280, Maxwell 227; Dougherty 1996, Hart 798, Kirkpatrick 745, Poll 169. For Congress, Conner 1033, Shipp 524.
- Robeson.—S. Binchey Caldwell, no opposition; C. George F. Davidson and Joseph M. Bogle.
- Swain.—S. Wm. P. Deason, without opposition; C. Danl. W. Courts and Col. Geo. Zachary.
- Wayne.—S. John Hill, no opposition; C. Col. Leonard Zieglar and Col. Jacob Winston.
- Yamoube.—S. J. Allen; C. J. Brevard and J. Clayton, State of the Poll, J. Allen 66, P. Hightower 217; J. Brown 903; J. Clayton 836, H. Rubin 664, A. Jarvis 611.
- Montgomery.—S. Reuben Kendall; C. G. W. McCain and P. Mosk, State of the Poll, Kendall 409, Lilly 371; McCain 797, Mosk 761, Thomas Dunn 186.
- Watauga.—S. Henry Sewell; C. W. H. Hayward and ———— Row.
- Warren.—S. J. H. Hawkins; C. Jas. Bragg and Thomas H. Jenkins.
- Currituck.—S. Jonathan Lindsay; C. Geo. B. Jones and Benjamin Simmons.
- Nash.—S. Willis Bodie; C. Gen. J. Arrington and G. Bodie.
- Franklin.—S. Wm. P. Williams; C. Gideon Glenn and James Davis.
- Beaufort.—S. Wm. S. Rowland, C. R. H. Estner and David C. Freeman.

An argument has been urged and re-urged in favor of the present high rate of duties at which we are surprised;— It is really the greatest presumption upon the weakness of human nature which we have ever seen. The advocates of the Tariff still maintain notwithstanding the many able refutations of the anomaly that two and three make one, or that the low price of goods is owing to the high rate of duties which are laid upon them. They find goods cheaper than they once were and they ascribe it to the Tariff. How then are the low prices of those articles upon which, no duties are laid accounted for? This they cannot answer. But we will answer it for them: The low prices of goods, upon which there is none, are owing to competition and an increased facility in their production. This they attempt to ridicule. They know its force and they are afraid that it will be found out. It is needless to take an example of the effect of competition upon the prices of goods; this every one has seen. It will be too tedious to mention many examples of the effect of an increased facility in the production of an article in reducing its price. We will take the example of common domestic shirting: Before the invention of the complicated labor saving machinery we