

A. WILSON, Printer.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY.

R. D. Cottrell & T. O. P. Vernon.

Terms.—Three Dollars per annum, if paid within six months, or Three Dollars and fifty cents after that time within the year.

No subscription will be received from beyond the limits of this State, unless accompanied by the Cash, or the name of some person who is known to us.

Advertisements inserted at 75 cents per square for the first insertion, and 37 1/2 cents for each continuance—longer ones charged in proportion.

For announcing a CANDIDATE, Three Dollars in advance. For advertising Extras Tolled, Two Dollars, to be paid by the Magistrate.

Money can be remitted to the Publisher by mail, at his risk. Postmasters are allowed to frank letters (written by themselves) containing money for Newspaper subscription.

WEDDED LOVE.

BY ROBERT WALSH.

We have somewhere seen the doctrine that love in a state of courtship is the true beatitude of this life; and to be desired beyond any other fond relation even for a thousand years!

In the conjugal union, love may lose some of its intensity; it may be less vehement or rapturous; and the imagination, which, during courtship, commonly feeds, as it were, on nectar and ambrosia, and sports on a bed of roses,—may become comparatively inert and sterile; but the pleasures of pure, intense sentiment, and boundless, mutual confidence, and the excitement of virtuous and tender hope, are infinitely multiplied.

Lord Verulam has truly said that marriage halves griefs and doubles joy. It combines, in fact, and transuses existence for each party; it blends and identifies souls, so as to render common to them their several susceptibilities of gratification and refinement; it creates new energies, and generous sympathies; new objects of endearment and reliance; numberless reflected and reciprocated favors of regard and respect.

But what gives it a superior character of inherent dignity and genuine enjoyment is the religious essence peculiar to it; the vein of duty which pervades it; the consciousness of those who are suddenly allied in it, that they have adopted a tie hallowed by divine sanction, and are fulfilling one of the most sacred of their duties.

The ecstasies of courtship are dashed by fears, jealousies, misapprehensions, which are unknown to wedded partners of sound minds and affectionate hearts. With them, all is trust and security; their faith is beyond the sphere of temptation or accident; their adversity, if misfortunes come, has consolations derived from the most exalted sources; from the invisible and holy world, as well as the present checkered scenes of human action.

The qualified worship of an excellent fellow-being, natural and delightful as it is, involves something more rational and elevated, when the object is a wife or husband, than when it refers to a more mistress or lover. In the first case, it associates itself with duty, and implies an esteem the more proper and grateful as accompanied by intimate knowledge.

In proportion, however, as marriage is of a sacred and permanent nature, producing weighty obligations and liable to special and severe cares of calamities, ought it to be cautiously, and deliberately, and piously contracted. It is not to be viewed or anticipated as a merely halcyon career, though as it often is in smiling prospects and auspicious events, and serene as it may be rendered in all that the human creature can control. A childish penchant, a calculation of convenience, a momentary caprice, form no warrant for it; though they be frequently the only incentives.

Such a bond requires matured and discriminating attachment: comprehension of its good and evil; resignation to all the chances. But he or she who has the right, intelligence, feeling and opportunity, and yet avoids it, yielding to selfishness or cowardice, sins against the designs of Providence, and loses the final rewards of courageous and successful trial.

It was a favorite remark of Lord Littleton, the younger, that marriage is a lottery, and that, of course, it is as preposterous to rejoice at a wedding, as it would be to exult in purchasing a ticket for the State-wheel.

According to the same questionable authority, all epithalamians are, therefore, at least premature. A prudent husband, before he indulges himself in self-gratulation, or welcomes the greeting of his friends. The analogy is not, however, exact—because it is in the power of the bridal parties to determine their own fate, in a material degree. Life itself might be equally styled a lottery, looking to the diversity of its chances and the incertitude of its incidents; but it is, nevertheless, a positive blessing with well constituted minds and healthful frames. So, likewise, is marriage, which should be undertaken as life is accepted,—with stronger expectation of weal than woe:—with bright visions and cheerful resolutions; but, also with a spirit of philosophical or christian submission to whatever Providence may ordain to its course. The Greeks used to Hymen descend from Apollo, Urania, or Calliope. This origin from the fountain of harmony and light, and the two noblest of the muses, illustrates or shadows from the true character of the espousals over which the garlanded god waves his never-dying torch, and sheds his celestial influence.

A GOOD REASON.—A few days since a grand jury out South ignored a bill against a huge negro for stealing chickens, and before discharging him from custody, the judge bade him stand a reprimand. He concluded as follows: "You may go now, John, (shaking his finger at him,) let me warn you never to appear here again."

John, with delight beaming from his big white eyes, and with a broad grin, displaying a row of beautiful ivory, replied: "I wouldn't bin dis time, Judge, only de constable fetch me."

BIAS OF THE MIND RESPECTING THE FUTURE.

The common bias of the mind unduly is (such is the benevolent appointment of Providence) to think favorably of the future. To overvalue the chances of possible good, and to undervalue the risks of possible evil; and in the case of some fortunate individuals, this disposition remains after many disappointments. To what this bias of our nature is owing, it is not material for us to enquire; the fact is certain, and it is an important one to our happiness. It supports us under the real distress of life—cheers and animates all our labors; and, although it is sometimes apt to produce in a weak and indolent mind, those deceitful suggestions of ambition and vanity which lead us to sacrifice the duties and comforts of the present, to romantic hopes and expectations; yet it must be acknowledged, when connected with habits of activity, and regulated by a solid judgment, to have a favorable effect on the character, by inspiring the desire and energy which both prompt to great enterprises, and are necessary to ensure their success. When such a temper is united with pleasing notions concerning the order of the universe, concerning the condition and prospects of man, it places our happiness in a great measure, beyond the power of fortune. While it adds double relish to every enjoyment, it blunts the edge of all our sufferings; and even when human life presents to us no object on which our hopes can rest, it invites the imagination beyond the dark and troubled horizon which terminates all our earthly prospects, to wander unconfin'd in the regions of futurity. A man of benevolence, whose mind is enlarged by philosophy, will indulge the same agreeable anticipations with respect to society; will view the different improvements in arts, in commerce and in the sciences, as to co-operate in promoting the union, the happiness, and virtue of mankind; and amidst the political disorders resulting from the prejudices and follies of his own times, will look forward with transport to the blessings, which are reserved for posterity in a more enlightened age.—Douglas Stewart.

GAY SPIRITS.—It is a strange thing, but so it is, that very brilliant spirits are almost always the result of mental suffering, like the fever produced by a wound. I sometimes doubt tears; I often doubt the existence of that misery which flushes the cheek and kindles the eye, and which makes the lip mock with sparkling words, the dark and hidden world within.

There is something in intense suffering, that seeks concealment—something that is fain to belie itself. In Cooper's novel of the "Bravo," Jacques conceals himself and his boat, by lying where the moonlight dazzled on the water. We do the same with any great despair; we shroud in a glittering atmosphere of smiles and jests; but the smiles are sneers, and the jests are sarcasms. There is always a vein of bitterness runs through these feverish spirits, they are the very delirium of sorrow seeking to escape from itself, and which is cured only by the moonshine.

A GENTLEMAN.—The character of a gentleman may be explained nearly thus: A blackguard is one who does not care who he offends; a clown is a blockhead who does not know when he offends; a gentleman is one who understands and shows every mark of deference to the claims of self love in others, and exacts it in return from them. A man may have the manners of a gentleman without having the look, and he may have the character of a gentleman, in a more abstracted point of view, without the manners.—The feelings of a gentleman in this higher sense, only denote a more refined humanity—a spirit delicate in itself, and unwilling to offend, either in the greatest or the smallest things. This may be coupled with absence of mind, with ignorance of forms, and frequent blunders; but the will is good; the spring of gentle offices and true regard is unimpaired. A person of this stamp blushes at an impropriety he was guilty of twenty years before, though he is perhaps liable to repeat it to-morrow.

"Blessings on the man who invented sleep" said the immortal Sanchez Panza, "for it covers one all over like a garment." We subjoin half a dozen proverbs, with which we have met on the subject— One hour's sleep before midnight, is worth two after. The morning to the mountain, the evening to the fountain. Go to bed with the lamb and rise with the lark. The choleric drinks, the melancholic eats, the phlegmatic sleeps. Who sups well, sleeps well.

LACONICS.—Great minds express a good deal in a few words. Neither do nor say what you would not that the whole world should see or hear. Do not care to be thought so, and would have some difference paid to their understanding. Books of devotion and those of love are alike bought. The only difference is, that there are more who read books of love than buy them; and there are more who buy books of devotion than read them.

An Italian philosopher expressed in his motto, that time was his estate; an estate, indeed, that will produce nothing without cultivation, but will always abundantly repay the labors of industry, and safety the most extensive desires, if no part of it be suffered to lie waste by negligence, to be overrun by noxious plants, or laid out for show rather than for use.

Colton, the author of Lacon says, "some females will forgive a liberty but not a slight. You may steal her picture though it were set in gold without offence—but if you steal the frame and leave the portrait, you are a doomed man."

To weep for fear is childish; to weep for anger is womanish; to weep for grief is human; to weep for compassion is divine; but to weep for sin is Christian.

VARIETY.—No character will please long who is uniform. To be always jocose is buffoonry; pathetic, silly; always wise, sententious; always grave, tiresome.

There are some folks write, talk and think so much on virtue, that they have no time to practice it.

MR. McDUFFIE'S SKETCH

(CONTINUED.)

grounds some of the provisions of this act were adopted—what, in point of fact, is the true character of the act of 1816, so far as it can be considered in the light of a protective system, and the proviso which is usually called the minimum clause; and to that I call the attention of the Senate, for it has been subject of a great deal of misapprehension than any of the provisions of this act.

This minimum clause assumed that 5 cents per square yard, should be deemed to have cost 25 cents; and a duty of 20 per cent. was to be levied on that assumed value. This square yard upon all cotton goods costing less than 25 cents per square yard. Since the square yard looked into the pockets of the people, it was looked into the pockets of the States.

Mr. Lowndes by a letter addressed to Mr. Briggs, a manufacturer of Massachusetts, in which he states that a duty of 5 cents was wholly inadequate to give the necessary protection; and he was into a calculation to show that a duty of 5 cents a square yard would be equal to an ad valorem duty of something over 30 per cent. I also discovered, in an essay published by that same gentleman, this fact, which I regard as important; he stated that General Smith, of Maryland, who was at that time the representative of the mercantile interest, and who supported the principles of free trade during his whole life, had said in his plea that the actual cost of the coarse cotton manufactures then made in England was about 24 1/2 cents the square yard. Thus it appears that the assumed value of cotton manufactures in the act of 1816 corresponded with the actual cost at that time in Great Britain.

I am aware there was a coarse and flimsy fabric then imported from the East Indies, called humbugs, which cost abroad less than 25 cents a square yard. But I am also aware that the objects of the minimum clause of the act of 1816, was to exclude this article; for there was then a universal opinion prevalent among statesmen of all parties, that the East India trade, which operated as a constant drain of our specie, was injurious, and ought to be discouraged.

Now Mr. President, what were the principles embodied in the act of 1816? Did it involve the principles of a permanent and increasing tariff of protection? or a permanent and decreasing tariff for revenue? Beyond all question, it was of the latter character, and so it conclusively appears upon the face of the act itself, which provides a temporary protection of 25 per cent. on cotton and woolen manufactures, for three years, to be then reduced to 20 per cent.

The honorable senator, [Mr. Choate,] in expounding the tariff of 1789, has given us the commentary without the text. Now, sir, I have given you the text of the act of 1816, and shall proceed to give you the commentary. To show you that it was regarded as a measure of temporary protection, I will quote a few remarks from the remarks of the most eminent statesman who were engaged in its discussion.

Mr. Webster proposed that the duty on cotton and woolen manufactures should commence at 30 per cent. and come down to 20 at the expiration of four years, by two successive gradations. Mr. Clay proposed that the duty should begin at 30 per cent., and that it should be reduced to 20 in six years, by three gradations. Upon this the following conversation took place:

Mr. Lowndes remarked that "he rejoiced to see gentlemen who had manifested the strongest friendship for the manufacturing interest, the advocates of a proposition which would in prospect produce a return to correct principles."

What said Mr. Calhoun?—whom I suppose the honorable senator from Massachusetts means when he says South-Carolina is the author of the protective system. In opposition to Mr. Clay's amendment he said: "He hoped the amendment would not prevail. He believed the mode proposed by the original motion was correct; that the permanent duty of 20 per cent. was ample protection."

I have now given an exposition of the system of 1816—that protective system which the honorable senator from Massachusetts has solemnly declared was fatal to the commerce of the country, and compelled Massachusetts to abandon navigation and commerce, and embark against her will in the business of producing manufactures!! If the honorable senator considers the act of 1816 as the origin of the protective system, will he be kind enough to introduce a revenue bill providing the same rate of ad valorem duties? The bill I have introduced is founded upon the basis of that act—the rate of duties it provides being, with a few exceptions, precisely the same. And what does the honorable senator from Massachusetts say of this bill of mine? Why, sir, with the act of 1816 staring him in the face, and a proposition of Mr. Madison before him, made in 1789, to impose only a duty of 5 per cent. on all imports, he is pleased to characterize the act of 1816 as a "stupendous novelty," a thing without example in legislation, withdrawing "all protection whatever," and consigning the manufacturers to final and eternal perdition. And yet it gives as much protection as the act of 1816, which the honorable senator from Massachusetts says destroyed commerce, and from six to ten times as much as the act of 1789, which the senator himself [Mr. Choate] said was then amply sufficient. In what, then, does this stupendous novelty consist? Not, it seems in the rate of duties, but in their uniformity.

A horizontal tariff! an absolute water level! in equal violation of the laws of hydrostatics and of the protective system! Such a system, in the opinion of the honorable senator, would instantly cause the water wheel of every factory to stand as stock still as the current of a standing pool.

Such, Mr. President, is the profound and philosophical reasoning of the senator from Massachusetts, from the historical progress of the protective system, up to the year 1824.

The next great era in the progress of the protective system was produced by the tariff of 1824, by which the duty on woolen manufactures was raised from 20 to 33 1/2 per cent. that on cotton manufactures from 5 to 7 1/2 cents a square yard, and the duties upon Swedish iron and Russian hemp in a still greater proportion.

In the year 1820, when the increased duties afterwards imposed by the act of 1824 were in agitation, Mr. Webster, at a public meeting in the town of Boston, over which Judge Story presided, declared that the protective duties then in contemplation were, in his opinion, of doubtful constitutionality; and that meeting passed a string of resolutions, which were lately read at the instance of the honorable senator from Alabama, [Mr. Bagby,] which furnished a clear and conclusive answer to every argument now advanced in favor of the protective system. What then were the principles of Massachusetts in 1824? She stood shoulder to shoulder with South-Carolina in opposition to the tariff of that year; and it is worthy of special remark that, with the exception of two or three votes from Western Virginia, there was not a single vote given in either branch of Congress from any State south or southwest of the Potomac, in favor of that measure. But, in 1825, a great political alliance took place between the East and West, one of the fruits of which was soon seen in the new attitude suddenly assumed by Massachusetts in regard to the protective system. Mr. Webster, from being the leading opponent of that system, all at once became its prominent supporter. And distinguished statesman for sacrificing his constitutional scruples, his principles of political economy, of political justice, and of equal taxation, was that it had become the interest of Massachusetts to support a system which, (to use his own language in 1820,) was calculated to "favor great capitalists, rather than personal industry or the owners of small capitals;" to make "the farmer give more than he now does for all he buys, and receive less for all he sells;" and finally, "to diminish the industry, impede the prosperity, and corrupt the morals of the people." Such, sir, were the conclusive arguments urged in advance against the tariff of 1824, and such the great principles of justice and equality which Massachusetts sacrificed at the shrine of her own pecuniary interest.

Accordingly Mr. Webster voted for the tariff of 1825, and has ever since been a prominent supporter of the interest of "large capitalists," making "the farmer give more for all he buys and receive less for all he sells;" and at the same time "diminishing the industry, impeding the prosperity, and corrupting the morals of the people."

But the honorable senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] has selected certain votes given by the representatives of the South, including myself, increasing the duties upon certain articles in the tariff of 1828.

Now, I will inform that senator that those votes were given to defeat that "bill of abominations," urged upon the country to promote the special interests of Massachusetts. We saw that this system of protection was about to assume more gigantic dimensions, and to devour the substance of the country, and we determined to put such ingredients in the chalice as would poison the monster, and commend it to his own lips. This is what is sometimes called "fighting the devil with fire," a policy which, though I did not altogether approve, I adopted in deference to the opinions of those with whom I acted. In 1832, the public debt having been extinguished, the tariff of that year was passed, retaining all the more oppressive features of the act of 1828, and relieving the manufacturing States from almost all the burdens of taxation. This tariff was the compromise of 1833, which was regarded as a final adjustment of the question of protection, providing for a gradual reduction of the duties till they reached the revenue point of 20 per cent. But in 1842 the manufactures again besieged the Capitol; and in violation of the faith solemnly pledged by the act of 1833, induced Congress to pass the present tariff, incomparably more unjust and oppressive, as I shall hereafter show, than the tariff of 1832.

Having thus closed the historical review of the protective system, I shall now proceed to answer some of the prominent arguments in favor of the tariff of 1842.

And I shall first examine an argument of the senator from Maine, which he ventures to draw from the historical facts he has disclosed. He says that, from 1789 to the present time, every increase of protective duties has invariably produced an increase of revenue, an increase of foreign commerce, and a diminution of the price of manufactures foreign and domestic. Now, sir, I am happy to meet the honorable senator upon a proposition of fact so broad, tangible, and comprehensive. We have seen, then, that the temporary duties of 1816 were 25 per cent., and that, after eight years had elapsed, the manufacturers came to Congress, though these temporary duties had been prolonged till 1826, and declared that so far from being able to undersell the foreign manufacturers with a protection of 25 per cent., they could not maintain the competition unless the protective duties were raised some 50 per cent. higher. This additional protection was accordingly given. Did it produce that reduction of prices which the senator from Maine has told us invariably results from increased protective duties? Precisely the reverse. In less than four years, the manufacturers made a still more clamorous appeal to Congress, declaring that they would be totally ruined and their capital annihilated, unless Congress would add 50 per cent. more to the protective duties. And upon this allegation, the tariff of 1828 was passed, raising the protective duties greatly above 50 per cent. ad valorem.

fact, that in every stage of the progress of manufactures, from 1816 to 1828, there has been an increasing necessity for protective duties, clearly and conclusively demonstrating that they were higher in 1828, as compared with the price of foreign manufactures, than they were in 1816. Whatever reductions, therefore, may have taken place in the price of domestic manufactures between 1816 and 1828, a still greater reduction took place in the price of foreign manufactures during the same period. And if, as the manufacturers declared, double the rate of protective duties was required in 1828 to enable the domestic manufacturers to meet their foreign competitors in our own markets that was required in 1816, it follows that the fall in the price of domestic manufactures in the interval was 25 per cent. less than it was in foreign countries. Owing to the reduction of the circulating medium, the accumulation of capital, and the great improvements in machinery, there has been a progressive and unexampled reduction in the price of manufactures all over the world since 1816; and although the reduction has been less in the United States, by 25 per cent., than in Great Britain, it is a prevailing fallacy that the reduction has been produced by high duties on foreign manufactures. If, after twenty-eight years of protection, our manufacturers cannot meet their foreign competitors with the protection afforded by a system of revenue duties, when shall we realize the promised blessing of obtaining domestic manufactures cheaper than we can import them from abroad? For twenty-eight years, we have been steadily receding from the millennium instead of advancing to it, as the successive additions to our protective duties practically and historically prove. So that the great historical fact of the honorable

senator from Maine turns out to be something less than no act at all. I now propose to expose the stereotyped fallacy that high duties make low prices—to the test of a philosophical analysis. The honorable Senator from Maine has repeatedly said, in the course of his debate, that the price of manufactures, as every thing else, depends upon supply and demand. This is very true, as to those temporary fluctuations in price which result from the accidental increase of the supply beyond the demand, or of the demand beyond the supply. But that Senator well knows that the permanent price of every commodity depends exclusively upon the cost of production. No man will continue to produce a commodity which will not indemnify him for the expenditures incurred in producing it. Now there are three great elements that constitute the price of every manufacture.—The wages of labor, the profits of capital, and the cost of the raw material. Now I propose to enquire what is the effect of the protective system on each of these three elements. And, first, is it not the avowed design and obvious effect of this system to enhance the wages of the labor engaged in producing manufactures? The great and boasted merit of the system is its tendency to protect labor by increasing the wages of the laborer,—not for a day or a year but permanently. Take away this merit, and you dissolve the charm by which the people have been deluded, even in the manufacturing States, and the whole fabric will tumble into ruins. I readily admit, what the manufacturers so incessantly proclaim, that the protective system does permanently increase the wages of manufacturing labor. Let us now enquire what is the effect of the protective system upon the profits of the capital invested in the manufacturing business. That the design and the effect of this system is, to enhance the profits of capital, is avowed by the manufacturers, and is, indeed, a self-evident proposition. They solemnly declare to you that they cannot make any profit at all, but will be brought to utter ruin, even if they should reduce the duties to a fair revenue standard. And when we look to actual results, we find that the protected manufacturers are now realizing enormous and unexampled profits. What, then, is the effect of the protective system on the price of the raw material? As to wool, iron, and hemp, they are all protected by the highest rate of duties, and the price is obviously enhanced, as well by these duties as by the increase of the wages of labor, and the profits of capital engaged in producing them. And even as to the raw cotton, the honorable senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Simmons] gave us the comforting assurance that the price had been raised since 1842! Now, sir, I have demonstrated, and the manufacturers and their advocates here affirm, that the effect and design of the protective system is to increase the wages of labor, the profits of capital, and the price of the raw material—every one of the elements constituting the cost of production; and yet, by some incomprehensible and supernatural process, that same protective system actually reduces the price of manufactures!! In the annals of human delusion and superstition, I do not believe there can be found a more stupendous imposture than that which I have just exposed.

Mr. President, it was profoundly remarked by a great mathematician, whose name I have forgotten, though I think he lived in the age of Archimedes, that two and two make four; and though this proposition has been ably controverted by Dean Swift and other writers, I incline, after reviewing the whole arguments, to agree with Shakspeare, that "to prove that two and two make four is a very pretty argument." It was also the remark of another great philosopher, that all the parts are equal to the whole; and conversely that the whole is equal to all its parts. But you will at once perceive that these great philosophers knew nothing of the profound mysteries of the protective system. For it is an established and fundamental doctrine, upon which this great system reposes, that you may double all the parts and yet diminish the whole. What incalculable blessings would the honorable senators over the way confer upon the suffering operatives of England, if they would reveal to them this great discovery!

But when senators are driven from all their other defences, they contend that this reduction of prices, under a system which increases the cost of production, is produced by the extraordinary stimulus given to domestic competition, by excluding the foreign competitor, who can pay a revenue duty at the custom house, and still undersell the domestic manufacturer. This is certainly a strange mode of increasing competition, with a view to reduce prices. If the object of the competition were to see who could sell the highest, the means would be not badly adapted to the end. But Mr. President, I am literally worn down in contending with these intellectual phantoms by grave argument. They constantly elude the grasp of reason, and "vanish into thin air." For the sake, therefore, of obtaining for myself, and affording to the Senate, some relaxation from these abstruse disquisitions, I propose to furnish a practical illustration of the effect of the protective system which every body can understand. To proceed, then: I have a personal friend, who has been engaged in raising and training horses for the turf, for about 20 years—nearly as long as this system of protection has been in operation. He inherited a very superior stock of native American horses, and has all his life labored under the delusion, of which neither time nor adversity can cure him—that the native stock of race horses, if properly managed, is superior to the best strain of imported horses. It has so happened, that in a racing career of 20 years, he has never won a single race, even by accident. Yet he is as sanguine as ever. On one occasion, I met his trainer, who was a black servant, leaving the race course with the horses, all of them having been disgracefully beaten. I said to him, "how does it happen, Pompey, that with such a superior stock of horses you never win a race?" "Ah, dat's very true," said the trainer with an air of triumph, "our horses can't run wid dese 'ported horses you call 'Dolphin,' 'Rahian,' but I tell you what dey can do: dey can beat one another all to pieces.— And it would do your heart good to see dat bay filly, Anti-tariff, beat dat clumsy black horse we call protection."

Now, Mr. President, it has occurred to me that I can put my unlucky friend upon a plan by which he will be as successful hereafter as he has been hitherto unfortunate. I propose, then, if my honorable friends on the other side of the house think it a feasible scheme, to recommend to my friend, when I return home, to apply to the jockey club of South-Carolina for a protective tariff, by which it shall be enacted that every horse of foreign blood, or in whose veins foreign blood is the material of chief value, shall carry 40 per cent. more weight

than no act at all. I now propose to expose the stereotyped fallacy that high duties make low prices—to the test of a philosophical analysis. The honorable Senator from Maine has repeatedly said, in the course of his debate, that the price of manufactures, as every thing else, depends upon supply and demand. This is very true, as to those temporary fluctuations in price which result from the accidental increase of the supply beyond the demand, or of the demand beyond the supply. But that Senator well knows that the permanent price of every commodity depends exclusively upon the cost of production. No man will continue to produce a commodity which will not indemnify him for the expenditures incurred in producing it. Now there are three great elements that constitute the price of every manufacture.—The wages of labor, the profits of capital, and the cost of the raw material. Now I propose to enquire what is the effect of the protective system on each of these three elements. And, first, is it not the avowed design and obvious effect of this system to enhance the wages of the labor engaged in producing manufactures? The great and boasted merit of the system is its tendency to protect labor by increasing the wages of the laborer,—not for a day or a year but permanently. Take away this merit, and you dissolve the charm by which the people have been deluded, even in the manufacturing States, and the whole fabric will tumble into ruins. I readily admit, what the manufacturers so incessantly proclaim, that the protective system does permanently increase the wages of manufacturing labor. Let us now enquire what is the effect of the protective system upon the profits of the capital invested in the manufacturing business. That the design and the effect of this system is, to enhance the profits of capital, is avowed by the manufacturers, and is, indeed, a self-evident proposition. They solemnly declare to you that they cannot make any profit at all, but will be brought to utter ruin, even if they should reduce the duties to a fair revenue standard. And when we look to actual results, we find that the protected manufacturers are now realizing enormous and unexampled profits. What, then, is the effect of the protective system on the price of the raw material? As to wool, iron, and hemp, they are all protected by the highest rate of duties, and the price is obviously enhanced, as well by these duties as by the increase of the wages of labor, and the profits of capital engaged in producing them. And even as to the raw cotton, the honorable senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Simmons] gave us the comforting assurance that the price had been raised since 1842! Now, sir, I have demonstrated, and the manufacturers and their advocates here affirm, that the effect and design of the protective system is to increase the wages of labor, the profits of capital, and the price of the raw material—every one of the elements constituting the cost of production; and yet, by some incomprehensible and supernatural process, that same protective system actually reduces the price of manufactures!! In the annals of human delusion and superstition, I do not believe there can be found a more stupendous imposture than that which I have just exposed.

Mr. President, it was profoundly remarked by a great mathematician, whose name I have forgotten, though I think he lived in the age of Archimedes, that two and two make four; and though this proposition has been ably controverted by Dean Swift and other writers, I incline, after reviewing the whole arguments, to agree with Shakspeare, that "to prove that two and two make four is a very pretty argument." It was also the remark of another great philosopher, that all the parts are equal to the whole; and conversely that the whole is equal to all its parts. But you will at once perceive that these great philosophers knew nothing of the profound mysteries of the protective system. For it is an established and fundamental doctrine, upon which this great system reposes, that you may double all the parts and yet diminish the whole. What incalculable blessings would the honorable senators over the way confer upon the suffering operatives of England, if they would reveal to them this great discovery!

But when senators are driven from all their other defences, they contend that this reduction of prices, under a system which increases the cost of production, is produced by the extraordinary stimulus given to domestic competition, by excluding the foreign competitor, who can pay a revenue duty at the custom house, and still undersell the domestic manufacturer. This is certainly a strange mode of increasing competition, with a view to reduce prices. If the object of the competition were to see who could sell the highest, the means would be not badly adapted to the end. But Mr. President, I am literally worn down in contending with these intellectual phantoms by grave argument. They constantly elude the grasp of reason, and "vanish into thin air." For the sake, therefore, of obtaining for myself, and affording to the Senate, some relaxation from these abstruse disquisitions, I propose to furnish a practical illustration of the effect of the protective system which every body can understand. To proceed, then: I have a personal friend, who has been engaged in raising and training horses for the turf, for about 20 years—nearly as long as this system of protection has been in operation. He inherited a very superior stock of native American horses, and has all his life labored under the delusion, of which neither time nor adversity can cure him—that the native stock of race horses, if properly managed, is superior to the best strain of imported horses. It has so happened, that in a racing career of 20 years, he has never won a single race, even by accident. Yet he is as sanguine as ever. On one occasion, I met his trainer, who was a black servant, leaving the race course with the horses, all of them having been disgracefully beaten. I said to him, "how does it happen, Pompey, that with such a superior stock of horses you never win a race?" "Ah, dat's very true," said the trainer with an air of triumph, "our horses can't run wid dese 'ported horses you call 'Dolphin,' 'Rahian,' but I tell you what dey can do: dey can beat one another all to pieces.— And it would do your heart good to see dat bay filly, Anti-tariff, beat dat clumsy black horse we call protection."

Now, Mr. President, it has occurred to me that I can put my unlucky friend upon a plan by which he will be as successful hereafter as he has been hitherto unfortunate. I propose, then, if my honorable friends on the other side of the house think it a feasible scheme, to recommend to my friend, when I return home, to apply to the jockey club of South-Carolina for a protective tariff, by which it shall be enacted that every horse of foreign blood, or in whose veins foreign blood is the material of chief value, shall carry 40 per cent. more weight

than no act at all. I now propose to expose the stereotyped fallacy that high duties make low prices—to the test of a philosophical analysis. The honorable Senator from Maine has repeatedly said, in the course of his debate, that the price of manufactures, as every thing else, depends upon supply and demand. This is very true, as to those temporary fluctuations in price which result from the accidental increase of the supply beyond the demand, or of the demand beyond the supply. But that Senator well knows that the permanent price of every commodity depends exclusively upon the cost of production. No man will continue to produce a commodity which will not indemnify him for the expenditures incurred in producing it. Now there are three great elements that constitute the price of every manufacture.—The wages of labor, the profits of capital, and the cost of the raw material. Now I propose to enquire what is the effect of the protective system on each of these three elements. And, first, is it not the avowed design and obvious effect of this system to enhance the wages of the labor engaged in producing manufactures? The great and boasted merit of the system is its tendency to protect labor by increasing the wages of the laborer,—not for a day or a year but permanently. Take away this merit, and you dissolve the charm by which the people have been deluded, even in the manufacturing States, and the whole fabric will tumble into ruins. I readily admit, what the manufacturers so incessantly proclaim, that the protective system does permanently increase the wages of manufacturing labor. Let us now enquire what is the effect of the protective system upon the profits of the capital invested in the manufacturing business. That the design and the effect of this system is, to enhance the profits of capital, is avowed by the manufacturers, and is, indeed, a self-evident proposition. They solemnly declare to you that they cannot make any profit at all, but will be brought to utter ruin, even if they should reduce the duties to a fair revenue standard. And when we look to actual results, we find that the protected manufacturers are now realizing enormous and unexampled profits. What, then, is the effect of the protective system on the price of the raw material? As to wool, iron, and hemp, they are all protected by the highest rate of duties, and the price is obviously enhanced, as well by these duties as by the increase of the wages of labor, and the profits of capital engaged in producing them. And even as to the raw cotton, the honorable senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Simmons] gave us the comforting assurance that the price had been raised since 1842! Now, sir, I have demonstrated, and the manufacturers and their advocates here affirm, that the effect and design of the protective system is to increase the wages of labor, the profits of capital, and the price of the raw material—every one of the elements constituting the cost of production; and yet, by some incomprehensible and supernatural process, that same protective system actually reduces the price of manufactures!! In the annals of human delusion and superstition, I do not believe there can be found a more stupendous imposture than that which I have just exposed.

Mr. President, it was profoundly remarked by a great mathematician, whose name I have forgotten, though I think he lived in the age of Archimedes, that two and two make four; and though this proposition has been ably controverted by Dean Swift and other writers, I incline, after reviewing the whole arguments, to agree with Shakspeare, that "to prove that two and two make four is a very pretty argument." It was also the remark of another great philosopher, that all the parts are equal to the whole; and conversely that the whole is equal to all its parts. But you will at once perceive that these great philosophers knew nothing of the profound mysteries of the protective system. For it is an established and fundamental doctrine, upon which this great system reposes, that you may double all the parts and yet diminish the whole. What incalculable blessings would the honorable senators over the way confer upon the suffering operatives of England, if they would reveal to them this great discovery!

But when senators are driven from all their other defences, they contend that this reduction of prices, under a system which increases the cost of production, is produced by the extraordinary stimulus given to domestic competition, by excluding the foreign competitor, who can pay a revenue duty at the custom house, and still undersell the domestic manufacturer. This is certainly a strange mode of increasing competition, with a view to reduce prices. If the object of the competition were to see who could sell the highest, the means would be not badly adapted to the end. But Mr. President, I am literally worn down in contending with these intellectual phantoms by grave argument. They constantly elude the grasp of reason, and "vanish into thin air." For the sake, therefore, of obtaining for myself, and affording to the Senate, some relaxation from these abstruse disquisitions, I propose to furnish a practical illustration of the effect of the protective system which every body can understand. To proceed, then: I have a personal friend, who has been engaged in raising and training horses for the turf, for about 20 years—nearly as long as this system of protection has been in operation. He inherited a very superior stock of native American horses, and has all his life labored under the delusion, of which neither time nor adversity can cure him—that the native stock of race horses, if properly managed, is superior to the best strain of imported horses. It has so happened, that in a racing career of 20 years, he has never won a single race, even by accident. Yet he is as sanguine as ever. On one occasion, I met his trainer, who was a black servant, leaving the race course with the horses, all of them having been disgracefully beaten. I said to him, "how does it happen, Pompey, that with such a superior stock of horses you never win a race?" "Ah, dat's very true," said the trainer with an air of triumph, "our horses can't run wid dese 'ported horses you call 'Dolphin,' 'Rahian,' but I tell you what dey can do: dey can beat one another all to pieces.— And it would do your heart good to see dat bay filly, Anti-tariff, beat dat clumsy black horse we call protection."

Now, Mr. President, it has occurred to me that I can put my unlucky friend upon a plan by which he will be as successful hereafter as he has been hitherto unfortunate. I propose, then, if my honorable friends on the other side of the house think it a feasible scheme, to recommend to my friend, when I return home, to apply to the jockey club of South-Carolina for a protective tariff, by which it shall be enacted that every horse of foreign blood, or in whose veins foreign blood is the material of chief value, shall carry 40 per cent. more weight

than no act at all. I now propose to expose the stereotyped fallacy that high duties make low prices—to the test of a philosophical analysis. The honorable Senator from Maine has repeatedly said