

...the instrument of a... agricultural labor, to enhance the capital and profits of the manufacturing interest. But, sir, that an augmentation of the wealth of the nation is not the consequence of these protective duties, I beg leave to read a passage from a work of one of the most able, sagacious, and profound political economists...

A Government which acknowledges the principle, that no individual can be divested of his property for public purposes without indemnity, cannot claim the right to that indirectly, which it is forbidden to do directly. A system calculated to lay permanent burdens, greatly unequal and oppressive, on some classes of society, or on a particular section of the country, would be radically unjust, and altogether indefensible...

It is self-evident that the industry of a country is most profitably employed, or in other words, that a country acquires the greatest wealth, and its general prosperity is most advanced, in proportion as its capital and labour are most productive.

It is not less obvious that, if a given amount of capital and labour produces in the same time a less quantity of a certain commodity than could have been purchased with that quantity of another article, which might have been produced in the same time by the same amount of capital and labour, and a national loss equal to the difference between the quantity produced and that which might have been purchased with the proceeds of the same capital and labour otherwise applied.

With one thousand bushels of wheat worth one dollar a bushel, one thousand yards of cloth, of a certain quality, may be purchased. If the capital and labour employed, or which might be employed, in producing the thousand bushels of wheat, do, when applied to the production of similar cloth, produce in the same time one thousand yards, there is neither comparative gain or loss in that application of capital and labour. But if this applied, it produces only eight hundred yards, there is an actual national loss of two hundred yards, equal to two hundred dollars, or two hundred bushels of wheat, since the same labour and capital, if applied to the production of wheat, would have produced one thousand bushels, with which one thousand yards of the cloth might have been purchased.

To make this demonstration clearer, if that be possible, let us take a nearer view of the application of these principles to the actual state of things. It is desirable to have home establishments for the manufacture of coarse woollens. The manufacturer says he cannot go into it, as without protection, it will be a losing business; that he can make more money in other pursuits, than he can in the manufacture of coarse woollens. The Government, however, determines to have home establishments, and lays a tax of fifty per cent. on all imported coarse woollens. The manufacturer goes into the business, not because, if it stops, he could make as much money at it as in other employments, but because the Government, by increasing the price of the foreign article fifty per cent. enables him to sell the home article at fifty per cent. above the natural price. It is clear, therefore, that all who go into the business, have been induced, by the interference of the Government, to abandon a more profitable, for a pursuit, in the absence of such interference, less profitable. The National loss is exactly the original difference between the old and the new pursuit. But the Government makes up that difference to the manufacturer, and often much more than makes it up. How does the Government make it up? Why, by taxing all the consumers of the foreign article, and thereby enabling the manufacturer, by increasing his prices, to tax the consumers of his domestic article. The result of which operation is two-fold—first, a national loss, by substituting an unproductive for a productive pursuit;—secondly a loss imposed upon the great body of consumers, for the individual benefit of a few manufacturers, to enable them to pursue a business which not only impairs the national wealth, but which also enriches them.

But, sir, I am aware that this reasoning is too unambitious and too minute, to mingle itself with the magnificent conceptions of the Senator from Kentucky. He declines to push the powers of analysis to that high point, from which the eye may take in the very elements of these complex questions of political economy—unattended accuracy is beneath the aspirations of his ambitious genius.

That Senator opens his speech by advertising to the seven years next preceding the Tariff of 1824, as being the most disastrous, and the seven years succeeding as the most prosperous, in the history of this country. The distress of the former period is ascribed to the want of protection, and the prosperity of the latter is represented as the effect of the protective system.

Nothing can be more loose and inconclusive than this general statement. But, was the pecuniary distress, experienced in this country during the years 1819, '20, '21, and 1822, occasioned by the want of a high protective system? If so, why did not England escape, which was literally barricaded by restrictions and prohibitions? But, the causes of that distress lay much deeper; the effects were first developed in Europe, and were there experienced in all the gradations of depression—stagnation; and, finally, of universal, unexampled and overwhelming distress. These causes operated upon the whole commercial world; their influences reached this country, and combining here, with other causes peculiar to ourselves, produced general depression and much distress.

The wars of the French revolution had convulsed the continent of Europe for twenty-five years; the arts of peace and the pursuits of civil life were neglected or abandoned, and every country, in turn, became the theatre of war. The insular situation of England enabled her to occupy a commanding position—for while she, as one of belligerent powers, made prodigious efforts on land; her navy swept the ocean, her commerce pervaded every quarter of the globe, and her workshops supplied the whole of Europe. Notwithstanding her prodigious expenditures, it may be well questioned whether she had ever enjoyed in so eminent a degree all the appearances of prosperity. At the fall of Napoleon, France was covered with all the armies of Europe; the immense expenditures of public money created a demand for every thing, and prices went up to the very highest point. England participated most largely in this apparent prosperity. Her paper system—the government expenditures—the suspension of specie payments—the consequent depreciation of the circulating medium, together with the unexampled influx of wealth from the continent of Europe, as the rewards of manufacturing industry—all combined to give a highly artificial value to every species of property, and the appearance of the highest degree of general prosperity. Her stupendous resources, stimulating to preternatural efforts her commercial and manufacturing interests, gave her an energy—a momentum—which carried her forward for several years without much apparent diminution.

The armies of Europe were disbanded and became producers—every department of labour soon became overstocked; government expenditures ceased; specie payments were resumed; and a reaction ensued, every where exhibiting the most appalling distresses. This country felt the reaction, in the sudden depression of the price of every article of exportation. The paper system—the most fatal curse to the prosperity of this country, had pervaded every portion of this Union—every county, town, and parish, was inundated with bank notes, at a ruinous depreciation, and every species of property had risen to the highest prices. Deluded by false appearances, and the facility of procuring money, the spirit of speculation was excited—large debts incautiously contracted—when this sudden depression of prices came upon the country as a paralysis, and all those distresses of which the most of us retain a vivid and painful recollection. Among the causes of that distress, the paper system was undoubtedly the most effective and most pernicious, and where the system of banking was pushed to the greatest extent, the greatest distress was invariably found.

Sir, whatever of prosperity we have enjoyed since 1825, instead of being in consequence of the Tariff, has been in despite of it. We are yet a young and vigorous Republic, in the finest regions of the globe, with free institutions, and a hardy, industrious, honest, and enterprising people—without so many favoring circumstances, it is almost impossible to arrest our career—particular sections may be injured, but as a whole, our course must be onward. But our growth, our prosperity, and our greatness, are all ascribed to the Tariff of 1824, and the "bill of abominations" of 1828—that prohibitory system which has been alike the reproach and the curse of Spain, the country, of all others, in which, it has been most fondly cherished.

Sir, as well might the empiric, who had dosed and drugged a young giant, who grows apace in spite of the poisons, ascribe to the medicaments his expanding form, his gigantic dimensions, and his compactness and power of muscle.

Sir, the Senator from Kentucky has given you a rapid and vigorous sketch of the history of the Tariff system; he adverted to the act of 1789, as having "sanctified the principle;" he deplored the causes growing out of the French revolution, which obstructed this salutary policy; and remarked the singular coincidence of the recurrence of this subject at the interval of every four years, from 1816 to 1833. Sir, I was surprised that the plainest principles of association did not awaken his attention to a similar recurrence of another great question at similar intervals. I was surprised that it did not occur to the recollection of the Senator that the Tariff policy, now for the fifth time, is agitated, and discussed, immediately upon the eve of the Presidential election—that the tocsin is sounded and the banner unfurled at the precise moment when a rally is to be made for the great and final struggle.

Sir, this view of the subject calls up a train of melancholy reflections. It suggests the facility of a combination of pecuniary with great political interests, to seize upon the Government, and divide among themselves its patronage and its bounties. It suggests painful doubts, whether the President-making faculty is not a power so preponderating in our political machinery, that when violently excited it may not derange its harmonious action, or prove destructive of its organization.

The Senator from Kentucky defends the protective system upon the broad ground that it is the only policy effectual, by counteractive of an unfavorable balance of trade. Sir, I had not expected to hear this exploded doctrine introduced into this debate. I had supposed it would have been suffered to sleep with the statements of the Tutors and the Stewart. It finds no abiding place in Europe. It is the jest and the scorn of her practical statesmen, as well as her writers upon political economy—have only fallen, impoverished, and devoted Spain, where much may be found common to her and the defenders of the American System. What, Sir, is meant by the balance of trade? It is that commercial intercourse in which the transportation exceeds the exportation.

The Senator from Ky. states that in the last ten years and three quarters our exports to G. Britain were two hundred and seventy-three millions of dollars; that our imports, during the same time were three hundred and twenty millions—giving an excess of imports of fifty-seven millions, which he sets down as clear loss, and exclaims emphatically, "How can the United States sustain themselves under this ruinous trade?" Sir, the fallacy of this argument consists in supposing when the value of imports exceeds the value of exports, that a debt is contracted to the amount of the difference. Whereas, in a fair commerce, prosecuted by a country with a commercial marine of her own, the value of imports, for a series of years taken together, will be equal to the aggregate value of exports and freights.

In a single commercial operation, if the value of imports is just equal to the value of exports, it is clear that there is a loss to the whole amount of freight. Yet this, according to the doctrine of the balance of trade is neither a gainful nor a losing business. Again: If, in a single operation, the value of imports is less than the value of exports, this according to the balance of trade, is a gainful commerce, though he who receives a return cargo less valuable than the outward, feels sorely that it is a losing business. So, if instead of a single case, in all commercial operations of a country the value of imports shall be less than the value of exports, it is said the balance of trade is favorable—whereas nothing is more demonstrative than when the value of all the return cargoes is less than the value of all the outward, that it is a losing business.

On the other hand, if, in a single operation, the value of the return cargo is greater than that of the outward, and out of the return cargo the merchant pays for the outward, and all the expense of the voyage, still retaining in his hands a large residue, the balance of trade says he is growing poorer, while he feels that he is growing richer. So, while all the individuals of a nation, by like operations, are growing richer, the balance of trade says the nation is growing poorer.

Nothing can be more unfair and delusive than from a list of our exports to, and imports from, a given country, to pronounce upon that intercourse as being either gainful or losing. This is manifest when we consider the direct and indirect trade—the circuitous voyages, finding so many intermediate points, and complicating its concerns with so many new interests.

Permit me to illustrate this view, by reference to a case which actually happened a few years ago. Bear in mind that the fact to be ascertained is, whether our fur-trade to the North West coast of America is gainful or losing, according to this notion of the balance of trade.

A ship fitted out from New England, with a cargo worth about five thousand dollars, for the fur trade, on the Northwest coast of America, got a cargo of furs, proceeded on her voyage to China, exchanged them for teas, silks, &c. and brought home a cargo worth nearly two hundred thousand dollars. This, according to the balance of trade, was a most ruinous operation. The shrewd and enterprising Yankee, understanding the fact, but not comprehending this philosophy, was willing to pocket the money, and surrender the theory to the champions of the American System.

Sir, the whole of this doctrine proceeds upon the hypothesis that commercial intercourse is a species of gambling operation—that the gain of one is the loss of another. I shall not stop to examine this hypothesis, but barely remark that it was an illiberal notion entertained in the earlier ages of commerce, that it has long since been exploded, and is now universally denounced by an enlightened political philosophy.

The great object of contest between the respective parties to this tariff question is, whether the tariff States shall furnish the planting States with manufactures, or the planting States furnish the tariff States. It is with pain—yes, Sir, it is with grief, that I consider the question in this aspect. It presents a naked case of the reversal of the ordinations of benign Providence, by the tyrannical legislation of man. My proposition is, that in the absence of restrictions, the South would import and furnish (or could do it) the tariff States with the chief part of their supplies of manufactures.

Owing to the dense population of England, the abundance of fuel, the inexhaustible mines, the perfection of machinery, the cheapness of labour, and the invigorating climate in which the human animal can perform the greatest possible amount of labour, upon the least possible amount of subsistence, the cost of production of almost every species of manufacture is a great deal less than it is in this country. The South would exchange the raw material for the foreign article, which, ex-

changed in its price by the rate of exchange, storage, freight, commission, and every necessary charge, would come into the home market, (if free from import duty,) and drive from it all domestic competition. To truth, the foreign article could be sold in the home market at from fifteen to thirty per cent. less than the similar domestic article. This is obvious from the fact, that the manufacturer is now protected by duties averaging more than forty-five per cent., and insists that any material modification will destroy his business, and involve him in bankruptcy.

The duty of every Government is to extend equal protection to all the parts, the correlative obligation is, that all the parts shall contribute equally to the support of Government. But is it not tyranny, the most odious and detestable, to deprive one of the parts, without equivalent, of all its natural advantages, to bestow them on another?

Sir, it is an utter misconception of the true nature of Government, to suppose it is instituted to confer bounties, and do acts of munificence. Government has nothing of its own to give, and it can only give to one by taking from another—which, if done without equivalent, is naked, palpable, injustice. The South asks for nothing. The North is clamorous for protection, which, if it mean any thing, means that the Government shall give that which it has not, but that which it shall take from others.

The Senator from Ky. has said, that the doctrine of free trade is a mere revival of the British colonial system, forced upon us during our colonial vassalage. I must confess my utter astonishment at the introduction of such a topic, in support of this system of restrictions. I should be wholly unable to account for it, had I not seen the dignity of deliberation descend from the region of argument to a level with the passions. The Senator, upon the reflection of a moment, cannot fail to perceive the glaring error into which he has fallen. That the reverse of the proposition is precisely the fact—that success in this protective policy is but to substitute New England for Old England—so that the former may now burden a few people, as the latter formerly did her colonial vassals. Let me examine it a moment. What difference is there between England compelling her colonies to trade with her alone for their supplies of manufactures; and one section of the union, by virtue of high prohibitive duties, compelling another to trade to that one all supplies of manufactured articles? Is not this the effect of the system? Is it mitigated by the reflection, that it is the brother of my blood who compels me to yield up the fruits of my toils, to gratify his spirit of rapacity? Is it mitigated by the fact that the South is in effect cut off from the cheapest markets in the world, and is compelled to resort to the dearest? Sir, the adoption of a system of complete protection, is the adoption of a system, as regards our peculiar interests, incomparably worse than that of colonial vassalage. It is worse than colonial vassalage, precisely to the extent that the market of New England is worse than the market of G. Britain. Sir, what is the condition of the laboring classes, at this day in Canada, in respect to the taxes on the necessities of life, when compared with that of the laboring classes in this confederacy of freemen?

I have an authentic document before me, which exhibits the monstrous difference. [Here Mr. Mangum read the document, shewing that in Canada only 24 per cent. duties were paid on cotton goods, silks, woollens, linens, earthen, china and glass ware, hard red iron—while in the United States, the duties on the same articles, to be paid by the consumer, range from 22 per cent., the lowest, to 250 per cent. In Canada, salt is free; here it is taxed. In Canada sugar is almost free. Sir, it is true, that the colonial vassals of William the 4th are taxed less than the laboring classes of the United States. Sir, the merry ploughman that follows his team with buoyant spirits, and whistles as he goes in pure gladness of heart, little dreams of the invidious process by which he and his little ones are stripped of the fruits of his toils. When sitting by his evening fire, in the midst of all he loves most upon earth, amusing simple infancy with the tales of other times; when recounting to the little prattlers that climb upon his knees and press to his side, the exploits of his ancestors in the battles of liberty—his patriotick kindling and glowing as the narrative proceeds, little—little does he know that the miners and sappers are at work under the citadel of his liberties. But, sir, the consolation offered to the South is, that she too may engage in manufacturing and escape the evils of which she complains—may in that way throw off the thralldom of vassalage to the tariff monopolists. Those who offer that alternative know that it is but keeping the "word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope;" they know that it cannot be embraced without ruinous sacrifice. They know that it would involve a sacrifice of at least half the capital of the South, to withdraw it from planting and invest it in new pursuits. And, sir, it is but frank to say that they neither expect it or desire it. For though their philosophy might enable them to bear, with commendable fortitude, the loss of half our capital—for many things are more difficult than to bear with patience the misfortunes of others—yet what philosophy could bear the destruction of all its golden dreams? What mortgages could lock unmoved upon his mortgaged estates, abandoned, dilapidated, and rapidly verging to hopeless decay?

There are those in the South that indulge in the delusion that we are capable of becoming a manufacturing people. That we might succeed, in the interior, to a certain extent, cannot be doubted. But that it could become the predominant interest, or that we should ever be able to

compete with foreign rivals, is wholly impossible. We are destitute of all the great elements; slave labor is too careless—We are destitute of water power, on the sea-board; of navigation to water power in the interior. We want destitute of coal, and that salubrity of climate necessary to preserve health, in the humid atmosphere of densely crowded factories. And, above all, thank God! we are destitute of the cheap labour of a half-starved, beggared and dependent population, fit to be packed in factories to drag out a miserable, slavish existence for the paltry equivalent of the bread that they eat, and the raiment that they wear. Sir, are these establishments favorable to liberty, or to morals? In other countries these operatives are every way degraded. In this, these establishments are too new to afford a fair sample of their bitter fruits. Is there not an immeasurable difference in the scale of being, between him who plants his foot on his own soil, feeling a high and manly sense of his personal independence—the master of his own little domain—surrounded by a happy, industrious, and virtuous family; and the day-laborer, with a scattered family, toiling from sun to sun, in crowded factories, breathing its noxious and fetid air; dependant for his daily bread upon the master of the establishment; and cringing to his testy humors, or losing his place? Sir, I am told, that the dependance is so complete, that in the exercise of the highest franchise of a freeman, the will of the master is the law of the dependants—They vote the calico ticket.

The Senator from Kentucky drew a picture of a cotton factory, crowded with scores of delicate young females; he painted their "ruddy complexions," "happy countenances," and "clock-work regularity." Sir, if the genius of that gentleman could have thrown into his picture, the bold design and admirable grouping of Raphael, the delicate colouring of Titian, and the fascinating light and shadow of Rembrandt, it could not have been redeemed from revolting associations. I understand that more than twenty thousand little girls, from seven to fifteen years of age, are at this moment immersed in these factories in the United States. Who can contemplate, without pain, the hard fate of so many delicate young females, torn from a mother's love and a mother's care, immersed in these factories, drudging and laboring in every sort of contact, forced from the gambols of youthful innocence, and the gladness and sunshine of the heart overcast? Who ought not to denounce the accursed system that bribes the avarice of the parent to sacrifice the innocence of the child? I appeal to every parent, who ever felt the gush of tenderness for these little innocents; who has watched the first budgings of affection, putting forth its tiny tendrils, and clinging around his very heart-strings; whether he could find it in his heart to tear them from the scenes of their childhood—to from the consecrated circle of family affections—and immerse them in these laboratories, as the drudges, the slaves of capricious task-masters? Sir, it is not in the nature of things, that their minds and their affections should resist all taint.

Sir, I have already too much extended my remarks. I had designed to examine several other matters. I must refrain. I had determined to examine, and expose the fallacy of the position that prices have been reduced by the tariff; and to shew, that they have fallen, not in consequence of the tariff, but in spite of it. I had designed to examine the allegation, of an increased ability to consume, growing out of the protective system, by enhancing the price of bread stuffs; and to shew, as they may be clearly shewn, that the allegation is founded, 1st, in an error of fact; and 2d, in an error of reasoning. I had designed to show, that the most erroneous estimates have been made of the profits of the cotton producers. I had intended to show that the duties upon iron—the raw material—had put out of profitable employment more than an hundred thousand of our most useful artisans, and transferred the labour of Birmingham, Sheffield, and other manufacturing towns in England. I had designed to show this system, coupled with the paper system, is a close and servile imitation of the English— which is the most refined system of slavery in the world. The aristocracy holding the church and state, with the infinitely various complications of place and pension, extract 350 millions of dollars annually—equal to fifteen years' income of this government. Add to this the hundred of millions extracted by the corn laws and by banking and manufacturing establishments, and we have an appalling aggregate. When we reflect that these sums are drawn from labour, without obligation on the part of the master to feed or clothe the laborer, and without sympathy for his distresses, we must be convinced that it is the most refined slavery, and is infinitely more grievous and oppressive than the very worst condition of negro slavery in this country. I never saw a negro pauper without shelter, clothing and bread. This is an interesting topic; I regret that I have to pass it. I had designed to shew that this system has brought into existence a set of men, unknown in better days, denominated "Shavers."

For the information of our more fortunate brethren of the tariff states. I will endeavor to convey some idea of this non-descript. A shaver is a little wretch; he grows lean as others grow fat; he fattens as others become emaciated. To him, general prosperity is as the parching drought of summer. His happiness springs as lighthouse from the misery of others as the violet from the mud; that crosses

the path of a hero. To him, the sigh of distress is "Sighs and sighs," and "harrows" surrendering to him their patrimony, acres, and driven into the wide world, homeless, penniless, and friendless, as the refreshing and vivifying showers, poured from the clouds of heaven into the burning bosom of the earth. These, and others of kindred pursuits, are almost the only allies in respect to the tariff policy that our northern brethren can find in the South. In the early history of "shaving," men, with some claim to respect, engaged in the business. It is now become so odious that any one, of the least mark or respectability, stains the imputation, as it would the leprosy. It is fallen into other hands—the hands of Harpiss, compared with many of whom, Shylock, the Jew, was tender hearted. A man of honor, and a gentleman.

I had designed to show the palpable absurdities and abominable frauds of the whole system of minimums.

I had intended to shew the strong inducements held out by this policy to illicit trade, and the general corruption of morals consequent upon an extensive system of smuggling.—That smuggling is now carried on extensively on the Canada frontier is notorious.

I had intended to shew, that the great and patriotic West bear the burthen of this policy without equivalent.—That the taxes paid by them annually, in the shape of duties, are more than four-fold the whole amount of appropriations for internal improvements in every part of the Union.—That their hope for indemnity in that shape is wholly delusive.—That a part of the West has partially lost by the ravages of the system, their best market for living-tory than I could hope to do it.

Mr. President there is one other topic which sheer justice seems to require me to touch.—I mean the institution by the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Clay,) of the present Chief Magistrate, on the north side of Mason and Dixon's line, was understood to hold one opinion on the tariff, and on the south side, he was understood to hold another. As I suppose the honorable Senator well considered the delicate relation he bears to the Head of the Government, and settled in his mind all the proprieties of such a reference, I shall refrain from any animadversion upon that point. Sir, I regret to touch this topic. I am unwilling, in a discussion of the great principles of this stupendous system, to mingle with it more paltry, party interests. It looks above and beyond this administration or any other, and all that belong to it. It is rapidly becoming a naked question of Liberty. The sentiment is growing in the South, and I trust it will grow more and more, that we will wear in our hearts no love for any administration, that compels us to wear the chains of this system.

But, Sir, I think the Hon. Senator did the Chief Magistrate great injustice. I never understood, that but one opinion was entertained on the subject. We all understood him to be in favor of a system of protection.

Loving him as we did, admiring him as we must, revering him as we ought, and confiding in him as we still delight to do we nevertheless, always remembered his opinions on this subject, with deep regret. I will tell the Honorable Senator the opinion of the South, as far as I understand it. We have long known the president to be in favor of a protective system.—That opinion was first promulgated by him in North Carolina upon the eve of the Presidential election of 1824, at the time he was a candidate for the Presidency, and when the excitement in that state was high against the policy.—We have seen his recorded votes in this Senate, and his annual messages, all affirming the principles first laid before the public. But we believed he preferred his country to himself—that he would urge this policy no farther, than he believed the great interests of the country required, and that he was wholly incapable of abusing it either to acquire or to retain power. In a word all believed him to be an honest man—firm—patriotic and fearless. This is the fortress of his strength.—The hearts of the people is the citadel of his power.

But, sir, I dismiss this topic; the subject under consideration is of far more weighty, and far more durable importance, and I pray God, that every man who loves his country, may take it into grave and solemn consideration, that he may bring to it that spirit of candid and kindness that becomes the descendants of those who stood side by side, and bled out their blood like water in the achievement of our liberties. Sir, I feel a deep conviction, that this system, and this Union cannot exist permanently together—who can be insensible to the wisdom, the patriotism of mutual concession? Who can shut his eyes to the fearful signs of the times? Who is not ready to invoke the spirit of seventy-six—that devotion to liberty, sealed by the blood of so many patriots and martyrs? Where is it? I fear it is gone forever. Where is the sentiment of the Slaves once so dear to the enemy "Give me liberty, or give me death"? It is heard no more in the land.

It is money—money—Give me money or—

Sir, if I could coin my heart into gold, and it were lawful in the sight of Heaven, I would pray God to give me firmness to do it, to save this Union from the fearful and dreadful shock which I verily believe impends.

The Legislature of Virginia adjourned on the 21st March, having passed 83 acts, and been in session 123 days.

Mr. Calhoun