

# NORTH CAROLINA SENTINEL.

LIBERTY...THE CONSTITUTION...UNION.

VOL. XVI.

NEWBERN, FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1833.

NO. 835.

PUBLISHED  
BY THOMAS WATSON.

Three dollars per annum—payable in advance.  
No paper will be discontinued (but at the discretion of the Editor) until all arrears have been paid up.

## CONGRESS.

SPEECH OF  
WILLIAM B. SHEPARD,  
OF NORTH CAROLINA.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, Jan. 29th, 1833, on the motion of Mr. Huntington to strike out the 31st and 32d Sections of the Tariff Bill, imposing a duty on Tea and Coffee.

Mr. CHAIRMAN—I moved last night that the committee should not, not because I had anything to say, that could not be as well said then as now, or that I had not as lief say then as now, but because I had not the physical ability after a session of six hours, to give coherency to the few ideas, with which it is my intention to trouble the committee. I am well aware that every gentleman here is desirous of disposing of this tedious subject, without more debate; none can be more tired of it than I am.

Man has been denominated by some enthusiastic admirers of political economy, an animal that makes exchanges, he has been called a plundering animal; were I permitted to add one to the many definitions which have been given by philosophers of that singular creature, I should say, he is an animal that makes Tariff speeches. The definition would undoubtedly characterize him, as he is known in the United States, more particularly on this floor—here "docti inducique," we all speak on this subject; I shall, therefore, make no apology to the House for indulging a national propensity—"this no sin for a man to labour in his vocation." I am not, however, one of those gentlemen who believe that all knowledge on this subject is derived, like Fallstaff's knowledge of the true prince, from instinct; it is to me, viewed in any way I am capable of viewing it, a subject of great difficulty. It is peculiarly at this time a subject of national interest, and requiring for its adjustment, all this House possesses of intelligence, integrity, and patriotism. Sir, I most solemnly believe the times require each man should speak out candidly and freely, his real sentiments upon the subject of this protective policy, that a great responsibility rests upon the members of this House, a responsibility which, if we fail now to meet, we basely abandon the high trust committed to our care.

The United States exhibit, at this time, a spectacle hitherto unseen and unknown upon earth, one that for the credit of humanity, it is to be hoped will never occur again; a people endowed with all that Heaven or earth can bestow to make them happy and contented, abounding in every thing essential to prosperity, and even grandeur, among the nations of the world (if the term is not offensive to some around me) and yet amidst all these blessings, we daily hear it proclaimed in high places, we are on the eve of revolution. A revolution to put down what? Some usurper living on the vitals of the community?—Some conqueror reeling in the spoils of vanquished provinces, snatching from wealth its abundance, from poverty its outance, to swell the pride, the pomp and power of an individual? No, Sir! a revolution to put down the power of the majority of the people themselves—a revolution which I can prepare to nothing in the history of the madness and folly of mankind, but the infidel fury of the anarchists of France, who desecrated the temple of the only true God, to erect what they called the statue of reason in its stead. The nations of Europe are now contending for self-government; we seem to be getting tired of it; they are contending against the will and dominion of one man; some here complain of the domination of many. What, on the other side of the Atlantic, is called by an admiring world the beau ideal of liberty, I have heard on this floor pronounced the perfection of despotism. Such, alas, is the unhappy, the miserable condition of poor unhappy nature!

Whoever may be the final action of Congress upon the subject of the revenue, nothing should be done without caution and deliberation, and after a careful inspection of our commercial, agricultural and manufacturing situation, upon our decision of this question rests the prosperity of every man in the community. I look, Sir, upon the man who would discover these three great interests, indissoluble in their mutual relations, and essential to the prosperity of every great nation, as a mere empiric, a political quack whose nostrums may momentarily infuse vigor into the body politic, but eventually lead to bigger and deeper depression. And unless the fickle legislation of Congress is to be the reproach of our institutions, and the curse of the people of this country, we ought to place this matter on such a basis, that hereafter, every man may rest secure, himself and his property being under the protection of equal, just, and permanent laws. For, if there is a tyranny more peculiarly hard to bear, more harassing to the spirit, it is that of fluctuating legislation; its oppression is more severe from being unexpected, no industry can obviate it, no sagacity can foresee it.

When the tariff laws of 1824 and 1828 were under discussion, it was contended with great force and justice by the anti-tariff party, that all free governments should interfere as little as possible with the domestic arrangements and industry of its citizens, that all material changes in the policy of a nation, the object of which was the transferring capital from one occupation to another, should be made with great caution, and only on great emergencies. If these propositions are true, of such governments generally, they are still more worthy of attention in a government like ours, which is of strictly enumerated powers, and dependent for its stability on public opinion—in a government, where the fashion of to-day may be repudiated by to-morrow, and an investment of capital, made under the sanction of the national legislature, may be prostrated by a fickle legislation, influenced by the whim and caprice of the moment, or the varying policy and interest of rival political parties. It was upon such principles of general reasoning, that I am now, and always have been, opposed to the policy of the tariff laws.

I thought such a system ought not to be forced on the country, but that every man should be permitted to follow such pursuits as were most congenial to his habits and disposition. That if by this policy, the people advanced more slowly in the accumulation of property, they would be more virtuous, less exposed to the temptations of extraordinary wealth, a state of things but little congenial with plain republican institutions. I thought likewise, that if the policy of protective laws was less doubtful, the tariff of 1828 was ill-considered and inexpedient, it attempted too much, it embraced subjects of opposite characters, while with one hand it gave a bounty, with the other it imposed a tax upon the same thing, shewing, as has been correctly observed by the anti-tariff memorial, that where there was "an avowed want of information on the subject, it would have been a wiser course to wait until that information was obtained." In fact, Sir, the tariff of 1828 was not intended by

many of those who assisted in making it, to aid peculiarly any species of manufacture except that of a President, and we are now reaping the bitter fruits of such legislation.

The act, however, has passed; it was imposed on the country for weal, or for woe; it has disappointed in some measure the hopes of its friends and the predictions of its enemies; it is recorded among your laws, and no human power can place the country in the same situation it was in, prior to its passage.

The question now, however, is not one of laying on, but of taking off duties; we are enquiring how we shall provide for the present posture of affairs, our national debt is about to be paid off, we shall have upon our hands a large surplus revenue, how shall we relieve the country from the anticipated danger of this alarming plethora? We are told by some of our statesmen—I beg pardon of the shades of the illustrious men who once bore that name, I meant some of our politicians, that the national legislature cannot be trusted with one dollar more than the bare necessities, the stern exigencies of the government require. Bargain, intrigue, and corruption, we are told, will sink barefaced and uncovered throughout this hall, unless speedily prevented. I have not yet, Sir, lost all confidence in republican institutions; I do not believe the people of this country are yet sufficiently corrupted to send members to this House, base enough, either to barter away their liberty or squander their money; when I do believe it, I shall think representative governments a mere delusion. I have, however, no objection, that gentlemen should estimate their power of resisting temptation, by whatever standard they please.

It is impossible at this period to discuss this matter of the tariff exclusively on its own merits, it has become so intermingled with all the political questions of the times, has been the cause of so much excitement, that it is thrust into every question and relation in society. In the few discursive remarks which I intend making on this subject, I hope the committee will pardon me, if in following the examples of others I talk about that subject most interesting to myself. It may very properly be asked why this inordinate desire at this session of Congress, to hurry through the House a bill of such vast importance as this evidently is? The bill of July 1832 has not yet gone into operation, no man can tell its precise effect upon the revenue of the country, has that bill been found to deceive its friends in reducing the revenue? I will trouble the committee with a few words in relation to that measure; I am more inclined to do so, because I perceive it is about to be murdered in the womb, and before the final blow is struck, I will do it an act of passing justice. Having voted for that bill, in company with a large majority of my colleagues, and a majority of the Southern delegation, as a bill to reduce the revenue of the government, and to relieve the people from the pressure of the tariff system, I am surprised to find endeavorers very industriously made to circulate a belief, that so far from alleviating the burdens of the South, they are aggravated by that bill. I saw an article in the Telegraph, of this City, published a few days ago addressed to the people of Georgia, and bearing among others the signature of a gentleman on this floor, (Mr. Clayton) containing the following words:—"The character of the act of 1832 is distinctly marked. Its diminished credits, its requisition of cash payments, its increase of the value of the pound sterling, its discriminating duties will show, that the burdens imposed upon you are decidedly increased, yet you are told that this act is a concession—an effort to moderate the burdens of the South; that, like the travelled dove, it comes with the olive branch to give you future security. The treacherous kiss of Judas is not more deceptive; a concession with the odious principle of protection retained as the permanent policy of the government! No, it is no concession, its object is rather to lull you into a false security." This paper, although addressed to the people of Georgia, is evidently intended for the whole South, and conveys an imputation upon the intelligence or integrity of every Southern anti-tariff gentleman who voted for the bill of 1832. As one of those individuals, I am not disposed that the slightest taint of inconsistency shall be attached to any vote of mine to gratify any man, any set of men, or any party whatever. Upon the subject of this tariff, I have acted upon but one set of principles, and upon those same principles, I intend to continue to act.

This is a repetition of a charge contained in an address published by the North Carolina delegation shortly after the close of the last session, and circulated very generally throughout the southern country. These loving appeals to one's constituents are not generally fair subjects of criticism, they are intended for the partial eye of friendship, some of those names attached to these statements are, however, so notorious in connection with this tariff matter, that they carry great weight with them, among two-thirds of the people south of the Potomac, it therefore becomes necessary that even small errors, such as great minds inadvertently make, should at once be corrected. It is very idle to say, that the tariff bill of 1832, recognised the principle of protection; it recognized it no more, and no less, than every act for reducing revenue, or raising revenue has done since the organization of the government, the allegation is therefore merely gratuitous. As regards "diminished credits and cash payments," the impolicy of the existing law was satisfactorily shown, by the memorial of the anti-tariff convention, that I voted to repeat it, in compliance with the unanimous wish as expressed in the memorial of the southern people.

Another source of lamentation is "the increased value of the pound sterling." By the law of 1799 regulating the value of foreign coins, the pound sterling of England was estimated to be worth \$4.44 of our currency; owing to the fluctuation of the relative value of gold and silver its real value had become \$4.80. I voted to put it at its true and real value, because I like to call things by their right names; I had, however, a still better reason. When I vote for a bill laying a duty of 10, 15, or 25 per cent, when I assist in publishing to the world that such a duty has been laid, I am desirous of dealing candidly and fairly with the public. I would not assist in granting a boon in the first part of an instrument, and insert a condition in the latter part rendering the grant valueless. To have pursued a different course might have convinced more political cunning, but would not have added much to the reputation of the American Congress; as one of the humblest of its members, I am willing to share the odium of that measure.

The bill of July, however, it is said makes discriminating duties; it releases luxuries from taxation and throws the burden of supporting the government upon the necessities of life; it oppresses the poor. "This is pitiful, 'tis wondrous pitiful," and doubtless has been the foundation of many a moving address and eloquent harangue. It may have been said in the furious language of the day, that grinding, cruel, and unrelenting majority of Congress, pressed people, have had the unprecedented, enormous, and daring effrontery to grant a high toned luxurious people, their tea and coffee without tax. Horrible as this charge seems to be, and alarming as it is to a conscientious man, it is very easy to show that it comes with a very bad grace from the source

it does; and as applicable to the state of things in the south, has little or no foundation. It is difficult in a country so prosperous as every part of the United States is, to draw a distinction between luxuries and necessities; in every community, they are merely co-relative terms, in rude and savage states of society necessities are such articles as sustain existence, as society advances in refinement, what was formerly a luxury becomes a necessity. I would here remark that the argument of the honorable gentleman near me (Mr. Choate) that the southern people, in proportion to their wealth and population, are non-consumers, is literally true.

It is perfectly well known to every gentleman familiar with the domestic arrangements of the mass of the southern people, that two thirds of them are clad in their own domestic manufactures; I have known many planters, the owners of large families of slaves, who purchase nothing from the stores but iron, salt, tea, coffee, sugar, and a few other trifling articles of luxury or convenience. Now, is it not more important to these men that they should purchase such articles as tea and coffee cheaply, which are of daily and constant use, than the broad cloths of England; the latter surely are not so essential to their comfort, and the want of them is not depriving them of an article upon which they set much value? They prefer their own domestic manufactures, and I hope the day never will arrive when the loom and spindle are to be silent around the hearths of our fathers; to me there is no sight more cheering, than that of a family clad entirely by its own labour; it presents a spectacle of substantial comfort and sturdy independence, not surpassed in any quarter of the globe. I confess I never visit such scenes, without returning from them elevated and purified in feeling; I go back in imagination to other times, when the men of homespun were legislating in your halls of Congress and fighting the battles of the revolution. So long as the Federal Government's tax gatherer does not cross the doors of this worthy class of society, they are independent of its legislation; secure in the "noiseless tenor of their way," they are happy, unmolested by the visions of avarice, or the dreams of ambition. If this distinction between necessities and luxuries were substantially true, who has any right to complain? If luxuries tend to elevate man in the scale of social existence; if they follow in the march of civilization and make a part of a government of equals should not every thing that tends to refine our natures, to smooth the asperities of life and elevate man in the scale of animated beings, be placed within the reach of the poorest individual in society.

Having disposed of the morality of this matter, let us now look to its logic. I will now take up the tariff bill of 1832, and comparing it with the act of 1828, ask gentlemen if a reduction of the duties on iron, on cotton goods, on sugar, on woolen cloths, on negro clothing, on blankets, &c. was not a reduction of the duties on the necessities of life, this would be confuting them by the plain rules of logic, a species of argument utterly beneath gentlemen, who deal in the subtleties of metaphysics; I will take the rule they themselves have furnished.

The theory which has produced such excitement in one portion of the south against the tariff, and which I presume is believed by all those who condemn the act of 1832, if we include the ultra tariff men, who by their associations in that vote, illustrate the truth of the propositions "that the extremes are sometimes nearer together than the means," is thus expounded by one of its ablest supporters, (report committee of Ways and Means by Mr. McDuffie, February 8, 1832.) "As the restrictions imposed upon the productions of southern industry are affected by the agency of indirect taxes, the burdens imposed upon the planting states by the protecting system, are not very inaccurately measured by the amount of taxes levied upon their productions. And when the inequality of the government disbursements are added to the inequality of contributions exacted by import duties, it may be confidently affirmed that the burdens imposed upon the planting states by the taxation, prohibition and disbursements of the federal government are more than equal to the amount of taxes levied upon those imports which are obtained in exchange for the three great agricultural staples of cotton, tobacco and rice." That a duty upon an import is equivalent to the same amount of duty upon the export which has been exchanged for it, is a self-evident proposition to all who correctly comprehend its import. The planter is as injuriously affected by the one duty as he would be by the other, without any reference whatever to his own consumption.

Here is a direct and unequivocal admission that the consumer of an article, as such, has no interest at all in the duty paid by that article; it is therefore of no importance to him whether the duty is ten, fifteen or thirty per cent, nor from what article the revenue is collected. Now, if this proposition is true, and I admit its truth for the present occasion, the growers of rice, cotton and tobacco, which articles constitute two thirds of the American productions exchanged for foreign goods, pay two-thirds of the gross amount of duties charged on foreign imports, or as has been estimated forty per cent. somewhat below the true amount, let us apply this rule to the reduction of duties by the tariff of 1832, to ascertain the relief yielded to the rice, cotton and tobacco men; if the reduction of the revenue by the bill of July, 1832, amounted to \$5,187,070, as was estimated by the treasury department, the relief of those individuals exclusively, was \$2,074,831. Is this no relief to this class of society? They must know otherwise, if they honestly believe they bear so large a share of the burden; and if we take into consideration the small class of individuals even in the south, directly interested in the production of these articles, the relief to them, under this view of their case and by that bill, was of vast importance. But, sir, what becomes of this oppression to the poor? Are the poor the growers of rice, cotton and tobacco, or was it intended as a mere figure of speech, a pathetic appeal,

Spargere ambigua voces  
In vulgum.

Had I voted against the bill, believing this modern doctrine, I should have felt myself bound, as a consistent man, to have gone home and told my constituents that a proposition was made in Congress to relieve them from two millions of their burdens, which I had rejected with scorn, but that I had brought them the glorious remedy of nullification. I knew the temper of that people too well—I knew they are devotedly attached to the union of these states, as the last hope of liberty upon earth, and that they were not inclined to jeopard it, upon a doubtful point of political economy. Whenever, Sir, I persuade the people whom I represent to resist the laws of this government, it will be such resistance as freemen should make, with arms in their hands and not a petting dog chicanery, through the courts.

But, Sir, if the bill of 1832, was radically wrong, the same objections apply to the bill on your table, it has also the mark of the beast upon it. The bill does not restore the credit system, it does not restore the false valuation of the pound sterling; it has likewise discriminating duties, it only carries out the principle of the bill of 1828, on reduces the revenue nearer to the wants of the government. Its discriminating duties are of a more partial character than any bill ever presented to this House; it protects some species of iron, (the most oppressive part of the tariff,) by a duty of 76 per cent. while cotton goods, a manufacture

nearly acclimated, are protected by a duty of 20 per cent. When however, the contest is for principle, I will not do any one the injustice to suppose that money will answer, should it amount to thousands; and unless that principle is yielded, nothing has been gained. I do not know how gentlemen will vote on the final passage of this bill; all that I am anxious about is, that if hereafter, there should be any charge of inconsistency, it may rest precisely where truth and justice demand.

The act of 1832 was no favorite of mine; I was satisfied it would not answer the purpose for which it was intended, and that it did not extend its own principle sufficient for the occasion. During all the discussion on that subject, I watched the scene with a great deal of anxiety; I was desirous of seeing a deliberate expression of opinion between the two great antagonistic principles in the country, "protection and no protection," or if there were a third principle that would satisfy all parties. I listened, in vain, for the latter principle; I heard day after day speeches upon crude and ill digested theories, but heard nothing more practicable than the mode of concession proposed in the bill of 1832.

The principle of collecting the revenue of the government from one set of articles in order to give incidental protection to the manufactures of the country, establishes nothing new in our legislation, it is a doctrine as old as the constitution, and in 1816, when this matter of the tariff first began, it was distinctly admitted by the anti-tariff party. When the tariff of 1816 (the cause of all our woe,) was under discussion, Mr. Telfair, of Georgia, a strenuous opposer of that bill, said "he would not deny that in the imposition of duties, for the purpose of revenue, it is wise to select your objects; that while the original intent is secured, the interest of the manufacturer is regarded as an incidental consideration." It is not, however, necessary to go so far back in our history, for a legislative recognition of this principle. The present President of the United States in his message to this House, of December 8th, 1829, said "looking forward to the period not far distant, when a sinking fund will no longer be required, the duties on those articles of importation, which cannot come in competition with our productions are the first that should engage the attention of Congress in the modification of the tariff. Of these, tea and coffee are the most prominent; they enter largely into the consumption of the country, and have become articles of necessity to all classes. A reduction therefore of the existing duties will be felt as a common benefit, but like all other legislation connected with commerce, to be efficacious and not injurious, it should be gradual and certain." In compliance with this executive recommendation, the chairman of the committee of Ways and Means of that day, (Mr. McDuffie,) reported a bill to this House, reducing the duty on tea and coffee, which became a law, and which I voted for with great pleasure.

The address of the anti-tariff convention of Southern people, assembled in Philadelphia, in 1831, likewise admits the constitutionality of a tariff, for incidental protection. That address, said to have been written by one of the gentlemen who signs this Georgia manifesto against the act of July, 1832, (Mr. Berrien,) contains these words:—"They admit the power of Congress (speaking of the opinion in the South,) to lay and collect such duties as they may deem necessary for the purposes of revenue, and within these limits so to arrange these duties as incidentally and to that extent to give protection to the manufacturer."

It seems to me if we are to raise a revenue by imports, it is a matter of but little consequence to the community generally, upon what articles it is raised, take for example sugar and coffee. Can it make any difference to the consumer of these two articles, (I take it for granted he is the only person concerned,) whether he pays 2-1/2 cents a pound on sugar, and a half-cent on coffee, or three cents on sugar and nothing on coffee? I contend it does not; the drinker of a cup of coffee, neither feels or cares upon which of the two articles he pays the duty. It makes, however, a vast difference to a large and valuable interest in the nation, for by one process you injure the sugar planter, without communicating a benefit to any interest whatever. If it really makes any difference to the mass of the community, of such vast magnitude, upon what articles the revenue of the country is raised, I confess I cannot perceive it, and I presume it is only visible to our political metaphysicians.

Who have optics keen,  
Enabling them to see things not to be seen."

One assertion, I presume is as good as another in this matter, I have therefore no hesitation in saying that under all the circumstances of the case, and considering the situation of the country the act of 1832, was a great and valuable concession of the majority of this House, to the alleged grievances of the minority. For if there is a principle which should be held sacred in the legislation of this country, it is that an interest created by the law should not be wantonly destroyed by the law. If, moreover, the bill of July was not as beneficial to the South as it might have been, the bill as originally reported contained a clause giving partial relief to the shipping interest of the country, from the excessive burden laid on that interest by the tariff of 1828, this clause was struck out by Southern votes. It requires, I should suppose, no argument to prove, that a free trade people ought to encourage the shipping interest, and if the people of the South are, as we have been told industriously engaged in manufacturing British woollens out of Southern cotton, they ought as a reward for their ingenuity be permitted to carry these articles to market in an untaxed vessel.

Did I believe it essential to the prosperity and welfare of the Southern States, that the manufactures of the North should be levelled with the dust, it would be an unpleasant duty to vote a benefit to myself, which would be the entire ruin of another. A few summers ago, while flying from the demon of ill health, I visited New England. I found her towns and villages crowded with an industrious and enterprising population, her hills and valleys, redolent with health, prosperity and contentment; every mind seemed to be intent, every hand was occupied: the world does not contain a more flourishing community. There the advantages of education are extended to the poor individual in society and that society receives its remuneration in his sober, industrious and economical habits. If the divine Plato, were alive, he would no longer draw upon his imagination for a specimen of a perfect republic; he would there find a community, in which the humblest individual had the same voice with his more wealthy neighbor, in laying the public burdens for the public welfare. I asked myself if it were possible that the prosperity of this people could be the hot-bed production of an artificial system, or rather if it were not the result of long continued toil, of an industry that never tired, of an economy that never slept. I looked upon the scene around me with no feeling of murmuring discontent, I felt the more rejoiced that it was a part of my country.

"Homo sum humani a me aliorum puto," was said by a freed Roman slave. Those persons who say they study the mode of assessing taxes in New England for schools and other purposes, her town meetings, in fact the whole organization of society in that state, in fact the whole organization of society in that state, must have a strange misapprehension of community, must have a strange misapprehension of things, if they can discover any aristocratic principles. They will find, however, an elasticity of character, a facility of adapting their situation to the

times, great and moral emergencies which will enable them, should your legislation prostrate them to the earth, to rise, like Antæus, with new vigor from the fall.

It is contended by some of those persons who complain the most of the operation of the general government, (Mr. McDuffie's speech, May, 1832,) "that it could no longer be disguised that under the unjust legislation of Congress, and without any agency of Providence a radical hostility of interests existed between the two great sub-divisions of this confederacy." Now, Sir, I deny, that such hostility does exist, or that there is any fair reason for presuming, it can be made by any legislation of Congress to exist; the great father of our institutions, foreseeing this state of things has told us, that upon this rock we were likely to split; he implored us in his last advice to resist such an impression, to scout such an idea. We are daily becoming more and more the same people, in our habits, pursuits and interests, and travellers have already remarked the sameness of American life and manners. The constant and daily communication among our people is wearing away, by the friction of social intercourse the petty prejudices of situation. "Mountains interposed, no longer make enemies of nations." I knew that there was a party in this country, dating their origin from the adoption of the constitution, who have always been endeavoring to persuade the people of the different States, that they have contrariant interests—a party composed of restless, ambitious spirits, who had "rather be the first man of an Alpine village than the second man at Rome." I did, however, hope that this sect was gradually dwindling into insignificance. I firmly believe the interests of the different sections of country so dependent on each other, that it is impossible, for one part, permanently to flourish, without communicating its prosperity to those around it; this fact has been satisfactorily attested by the astonishing results of the Internal Improvement of the country. Who has not heard of a new World brought into existence in the western part of New York, by the genius of Clinton? With a mind soaring above the miserable economists of his day, he penetrated the mysteries of nature, dissipated the prejudices of the weak, the fears of the timid, and, like Columbus opened a new World to the enterprise of his countrymen. Why then should I, or any man, wish to cripple the prosperity of two-thirds of this union with the vain or illusory idea of benefitting the other third?

This question of the tariff has been discussed repeatedly, and very properly, as one peculiarly interesting to the south; I will consider it for a few moments, as it affects that portion of the country. In doing so, I shall consider it entirely as a question of compromise; I have not that contempt for compromise which some gentlemen seem to entertain. If we were legislating for a horde of savages who chased their daily food over the neighboring hills, and in case of accident depended upon plunder or the roots of the forest for subsistence, we might despise all compromise; but in legislating for a highly refined and civilized state of society, we should remember that civilization is the result of compromise. Our constitution is itself the result of compromise; and the history of the very clauses under which we are now acting (with which I will not trouble the House) is a strong illustration of its general character.

It is very common, in the political manoeuvring of this country, to start a theory, and by way of giving it currency and enlisting the prejudices of an ardent people, to call it the southern doctrine; on "argument alone my faith is founded," and I shall support no doctrines and no theories my understanding does not teach me are correct and proper. Although I am opposed to the tariff system in general, I do not think that "monstrum horrendum" some gentlemen seem to suppose it: I neither think it produces the bilious fever at Charleston, nor the yellow fever at New Orleans; it has sins enough of its own to bear; I will not saddle it with those of the imagination.

The great doubt originally entertained upon the capacity of this country to manufacture for itself caused many persons to oppose the system. It was thought premature; that the country was too young, that we had too much waste land, offering a healthier and better occupation for our population; the experiment has however been tried, the country has paid part of the cost of the experiment. It is now admitted that we manufacture some articles as cheap in this country as in any other, and we have been informed by documents laid on our tables that \$250,000,000 are invested in the different manufactures of the country. Can this amount of capital be destroyed in any part of our country without producing distress and embarrassment throughout its wide border? I should suppose no political economist could for a moment doubt upon such a proposition; at all events, I am satisfied it would very seriously affect that section of the country whose interests are confided to my care.

If there are any two sections of this country designated by nature for a close political and commercial union, they are the southern part of the Chesapeake bay, the sea coast of North Carolina and the New England states. Our earliest colonial history contains the most satisfactory evidence of this connection; the cheap navigators of the north, then formed, and yet form our principal means of intercourse with the markets of the world; while, at the same time, New England is becoming a great and growing consumer of our products. Of the article of Southern corn alone, the towns of Boston and Providence consumed in 1831, 897,793 bushels. Would it not then be madness to destroy this market, without some positive and certain assurance of bettering the condition of the country? As gentlemen tell us, therefore, this is entirely a cent per cent. question, let the corn planter ask himself if he is not willing to pay a higher duty on bread cloth than on coffee, for a few years, sooner than to prostrate his best customer, and drive him to the fertile lands of Michigan and Indiana for a maintenance.

I said that the bill on your table carried out the principle of the act of 1832, and reduced the revenue of the country nearer the wants of the government. It does so, with a few exceptions, where those exceptions propose to impose a duty, I shall vote against them. I shall therefore vote for the amendment before us, for striking out the duty on tea and coffee. I cannot, in January, vote to put on a duty which, in July preceding I voted to take off, when no sufficient reason has been assigned for doing so inconsistent an act. Were I to give such a vote, I should in truth suppose I deserved some of the epithets which have been so liberally bestowed on the Congress of the United States that passed the act of July, 1832. The duty on tea and coffee is likewise a violation of the principle upon which the bill is reported, which if I understand it is, to reduce the revenue to the wants of the government committing as little violence as possible to the existing interests of the country. This is the principle contained in the President's annual message, where he says, "the soundest maxims of public policy and the principles upon which our republican institutions are founded recommend a proper adaptation of the revenue to the expenditure; and they also require that the expenditure should be limited to what, by an economical administration, shall be consistent with the simplicity of the government and necessary to an efficient public service. In effecting this adjustment, it is due in justice to the interests of the different states, and even of the preservation of