



EX LIBRIS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRY.

ITS NECESSITY AND EFFECTS.

BY H. GREELEY.

THE science of Political Economy is among the latest achievements of the human intellect. For thousands of years the energies of Government, (using the term in its largest sense, as designating all the various forms and shades of political organization which have assumed to regulate and control the conduct and relations of men,) were put forth almost exclusively to ravage and destroy; rarely or never to build up and foster. The monarch or the chieftain looked abroad on the smiling fields and wealth-creating industry of a neighboring nation, and was incited not to emulate, but to devastate them. The field, in the language of courts and cabinets, was not the theatre of man's efforts to increase the sum of human comforts by peaceful and skilful industry, but the arena of murderous conflict—of carnage, hideous uproar, and fiendish desolation. The renowned and illustrious ruler was not he who had fostered industry, encouraged laudable enterprise, and largely aided in increasing and diffusing the sum of comforts among his people, but he who had gained victories, destroyed armies, ravaged countries, and slaughtered unoffending thousands and tens of thousands. From this horrible delusion, with regard to the nature and true ends of Government, the basis and character of true glory, mankind have tardily and partially awakened. Even in this nineteenth century, the most eminent and renowned warriors—the wholesale butchers of the last and former ages—are still the idols of unthinking millions.

Slowly, irregularly, the conviction struggles into ascendancy over the human mind, that the proper functions of Government are beneficent, creative, invigorating; and that the infliction of evil, whether on individuals or communities, for the repression of crime and wrong-doing, is not the sum of its objects and obligations. The completeness of its organization, the fulness of its powers, the universality of its sway, seem clearly to fit it for an instrumentality of positive as well as negative good; and the researches of statesmen and philosophers have demonstrated that Government need not be a burden upon the people, but may, by its indirect and salutary influences, more than compensate for the taxes which it levies, in the amount of its positive and un-failing benefits. In other words, the advantages accruing to the community, through a proper use of its organization and its faith, may far more than repay the cost of its economical support.

Political Economy is the science which treats of the production and existence of wealth in a community, defines what is real wealth,

and points out the means by which it may be increased and diffused. This science is yet in the first century of its recognised existence. It opened its eyes upon a world full of absurd regulations, vexatious restrictions, and pernicious monopolies, intended to enrich particular communities at the expense of mankind, and particular individuals at the expense of their respective communities. These restrictions it very properly tested and condemned. Having their origin in narrow and selfish views, they aimed to advance the interests of a part to the damage of the whole, of the few at the expense of the many. Thus hostile to the highest and broadest good, they stood condemned alike by enlightened policy and by a generous philanthropy.

In this determined, and, to a great extent, victorious warfare of the new science upon existing errors and evils, many of its more ardent and indiscriminating apostles have been led to assume grounds of sweeping hostility to any legislation in aid of the development and due reward of Industry. Regarding intently the perversion and abuse to which the power of Government has in this province (as in all others) been subjected, when impelled by ignorance and selfishness, they have chosen to deny the power altogether, or dispute the safety and feasibility of its exercise, as the only sure way of avoiding the danger of its perversion. But, while such have been the dictates of some eminent philosophers of the closet, and readily caught up and re-echoed by their more impetuous and less discerning followers, it is at the same time true that a large proportion of the writers on Political Economy inculcate different views—views which accord both with the opinions and acts of the great majority of practical statesmen. While essay is piled upon essay to prove that a Government can properly usefully do nothing in aid of the industry of the people it serves, and that the perfection of national policy would be the abolition of all duties on imports, and the establishment of absolute Free Trade, even though unreciprocated, but met by restriction and prohibition, not a single maritime or civilized nation ever seriously attempts to reduce these principles to practice, but each imposes duties in aid of its revenue, and each arranges these duties, whether wisely or unwisely, with a view to the encouragement of industry and the increase of production within its own territory. Adam Smith, Say, Ricardo, may inculcate, to the satisfaction of their followers, the folly of protection and the advantages of universal Free Trade, but Colbert, Pitt, Napoleon, Canning, Washington, Jefferson, Hamil-

ton, Clay, Webster, are taught by experience the absolute necessity of discriminating duties to the successful prosecution of industry in all its necessary branches, and the upbuilding of a stable prosperity. Thus the errors of theory are corrected by the surer inductions of practical knowledge, and the most specious fallacies are rendered harmless, except to unsettle and to disturb. In an age of intelligence and universal discussion, they never can be permanently engrafted on the actual policy of nations.

But a difference between prevalent theory and necessary practice, the deductions of philosophers and the conduct of practical men, argues grave error on one side or the other. On which is it in this case? Unquestionably on the side of the theorists, so far as the collision actually exists. Nine-tenths of the propositions and arguments of the Free Trade Economists are sound and instructive; their works may mainly be read with interest and profit by all. But on the precise point at issue between them and their intelligent opponents, they err through a miscalculation in their premises. They assume, first, that a community or individual should always *buy where he can buy cheapest, and sell where he can sell dearest*; that Government should leave all at full liberty to do so; and that thus will be secured at once the greatest incentive and the greatest reward to Productive Industry in all desirable branches. In this way, it is urged, those articles which we import from abroad are just as truly the product of Home Industry as if grown or fabricated on our own soil, being procured by exchange for articles which we actually *did* produce—the only difference being that we have obtained a greater amount or value from a given quantity of labor, and thus *increased* the inducement to and reward of industry. Such are the fundamental positions of the advocates of Free Trade; we have stated them as nearly as may be in their own language, and with all their natural plausibility, in order that their full force may be perceived.

The elemental and fatal error in these propositions is, their confusion of the ideas of *price* and *absolute value*. Price is a condition wholly arbitrary, and of itself affords no reliable measure of cost or value. For instance—let us suppose that the entire quantity of Woolen goods required for the annual consumption of the United States would cost, if produced at home, one hundred millions of dollars, while the same goods could be procured from Europe for eighty millions. Now Protection affirms that in this case it would be conducive to the welfare of our country, and to the increase of wealth and comfort among our people, to protect efficiently the Home Manufacture of Woolens, and produce them on our own soil; while Free Trade asserts that we should thereby subject ourselves to a dead loss of twenty millions. Which is in the wrong? In the absence of a Tariff, the goods will flow in from abroad—there is

no dispute on that point—and the domestic manufacture will be almost if not utterly annihilated. But shall we thereby obtain our goods *really* cheaper, or but nominally so, and in reality much dearer?—in other words at a far greater expense of our Labor, than under a system of Protection? We answer, that the saving would be nominal and deceptive, and that the real cost of the foreign would be far greater than that of the domestic supply; and this truth we shall endeavor to make clear to every unprejudiced mind.

Allowing that we buy our woolen fabrics from Europe for eighty millions, we shall of course subject ourselves to the necessity of paying for them—and in what? Obviously not to any considerable extent in coin; for our country does not produce specie, and can only export it to a very limited extent. We must pay mainly in the products of our agriculture—no matter whether those products are sold directly to the manufacturing nations, or to others who pay us in something that those nations will receive. In either case, this law inflexibly applies, that, *in order to pay for our woolen fabrics, we must produce and sell eighty millions' worth of agricultural or other staples, at a price so much below that prevailing elsewhere as to admit of their profitable export*. If, for instance, we pay to a considerable extent in Grain or Flour shipped to Europe, we must produce Grain so that it shall be considerably cheaper here than there. Now the average price of Wheat at Odessa, Dantzic, and other continental grain-exporting ports, is rather under 90 cents, and it can be thence conveyed to England for 10 to 15 cents per bushel. Now, no matter whether the British Corn Laws are upheld or abolished, if we sell Grain at all to England, (and selling it to the Continent is out of the question,) we must produce it so that it will be at least as cheap in our ports as at Odessa and Dantzic. If we are to export any considerable quantity, the price must average in New York as low as a dollar a bushel, and in more southern ports still lower. And in order to be sold in New York at one dollar, it must be produced in Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, at prices ranging from seventy-five down to twenty-five cents a bushel, according to the advantages of location or facilities of transporting it to market. The average price paid to the wheat-growers could not certainly exceed fifty cents a bushel, and would probably fall below that amount.

But, on the other hand, if we decided to protect the Home Manufacture, and produce our own Cloths, the bare fact of our so doing secures a Home Market for any probable product of Grain, and at once raises the price of that article very nearly or quite to its average rate throughout the world. It may be that the difference will not be twenty-five per cent. on the seaboard, while at the same time it will be a hundred per cent. in the interior, where it is grown. The necessary effect of efficient and stable Protection, as soon as Manufactures

shall have had time to diffuse themselves over the country, is to provide a Home Market for Agricultural products, not merely on the seaboard or in one section, but in every section. The reward of Labor and other elements of cost being substantially equal, Manufactures will tend to that section in which food, fuel, and other elements of production are cheapest,

by a law universal as that of gravitation. And thus, while the Farmers are continually told by our Free Traders that a duty of forty per cent. on Woolens would *tax them so much for the special benefit of the Manufacturers*, the actual effect of Protection on their interests as a class, and on those of the whole community, will be fairly exhibited by the following table:

Actual Cost of the Woolen Goods required for a year's consumption of the Country.

UNDER FREE TRADE. (Nominal Cost \$80,000,000.)		UNDER PROTECTION. (Nominal Cost \$100,000,000.)	
50,000,000 bushels of Wheat at 50 cts. per bushel	\$25,000,000	50,000,000 bushels of Wheat at \$1.00	\$50,000,000
10,000 tons of Ashes at \$100	1,000,000	10,000 tons of Ashes at \$1.25	1,250,000
50,000,000 lbs. of Wool (exported) at 20 cts.	10,000,000	50,000,000 lbs. of Wool (wrought up at home) at 40 cts.	20,000,000
20,000,000 bushels of Apples, in the absence of a Home Market, worth but 10 cts.	2,000,000	20,000,000 bushels of choice Apples, with a Home Market, worth at least 25 cts.	5,000,000
100,000,000 bushels of Potatoes, with an adequate Home Market, worth to the farmer 12½ cts. per bushel	12,500,000	100,000,000 bushels of Potatoes, with an adequate Home Market, worth 25 cts. per bushel	25,000,000
2,000,000 tons of Coal, worth at the mines, say \$1.50	3,000,000	2,000,000 tons of Coal, worth at the mines \$2.50	5,000,000
Total product, to the farmers	\$53,500,000	Total	\$106,250,000
Deficiency	\$26,500,000	Excess	\$6,250,000

Here it will be seen that the same Agricultural products which pay for the year's consumption of Woolens and leave an excess, though costing nominally \$100,000,000, will only pay two-thirds of the cost of the same goods if imported, though costing nominally but \$80,000,000. The difference is made by the existence in the one case of an ample market for the farmer's surplus produce, within his own vicinity, and in the other trusting to one three or four thousand miles off. I have endeavored to state the prices in each instance at least as favorably to Free Trade as truth and the experience of the country will warrant. If the correctness of this or that item, or even of the general exhibit, be caviled at, the essential truth cannot be disputed, that *we may buy a required amount or description of goods abroad much cheaper, (that is, for a smaller amount of money,) and yet pay very much more for them than if we produced them at a nominally higher price.* And this is the vital element which finds no place in the Free Trade calculation.

The attentive reader will have perceived ere this that the essential question to be solved by a true policy is one of real, and not at all of nominal cheapness. Political Economy is the science of labor-saving, applied to the action of communities. Its object is to save labor from waste, from misapplication, and from loss through constrained idleness. Whatever tends to prove that a particular article can be procured abroad for a less amount of our domestic labor or its products than it would cost to produce it at home, and that this difference in favor of the foreign article is not casual or transient, but has a positive and permanent reason in the nature of things, will prove effectually that this article cannot be advantageously produced at home, and is not a proper

subject of Protective legislation. For example, Coffee and Spices may be produced in New York, but only through a forcing process that renders the cost of such product one hundred times that of the imported article. This necessity of hot-house culture is not a transient condition, pertaining to the infancy of the culture; it is fixed and immutable, so long as our present climate shall continue. So long, then, it would be idle, it would be madness, to attempt fostering the home production of Coffee by protective legislation or otherwise. But suppose that by some mutation of Nature the climate of New York should become such as that of the West Indies now is, then it would be expedient and wise to encourage the home production of Coffee, even though its money cost at first should considerably exceed that of the imported article. The comparison of Protection, therefore, to the policy of raising Coffee in hot-houses, or 'extracting sunbeams from cucumbers,' may be very smart, but it fails of becoming effective from its want of pertinence and truth.

We have the means of testing the soundness of the Free Trade maxim, that 'trade will best regulate itself;' or that individual interest will unerringly discern and follow the path which leads to the greatest general good, if untrammelled by legislation or public policy. 'Why should I not be allowed to buy my coats of a Paris tailor, if he will supply me cheaper than an American one?' is the standing problem of Free Trade: 'what right has Government to interfere and prevent my following the dictate of my own interest?' The answer is, simply, that what he esteems his private interest is at war with the public good; for while the individual may purchase a coat for fewer dollars of a French than he could of an American

tailor, the community will pay, perhaps, fewer dollars, but yet a far greater amount of its products, for coats, if they are generally bought abroad than if made at home. In other words, the subtraction from the gross amount of our National wealth will be greater if our coats are obtained abroad than if they were produced at home.

‘But why will not this regulate itself?’—That is just what we have been showing. The individual, having dollars to pay for a coat, may obtain it cheapest, looking only to that single transaction, from the Parisian maker; but the public will lose more than he gains by the transaction, since it pays more for its supply of coats from abroad than for a similar supply produced at home. Thus the momentary apparent individual interest is in conflict with the permanent, intrinsic public interest, and one or the other must yield. It is the first law of an organized community that individual action shall be made to conform to the general good.

Let us put this essential truth in a still clearer light. A. B. is an extensive farmer in Indiana, and this year plants fifty acres with Corn, receiving therefrom two thousand bushels, and sows fifty acres more with Wheat, of which the product is one thousand bushels. In the absence of a Tariff, he can only procure, say fifty cents a bushel for the Wheat, and twenty-five for the Corn, or one thousand dollars for his entire crop. Now he knows perfectly well that, with a good Protective Tariff, which should secure the manufacture at home of all the Cloths and Wares required for our own consumption, the price of his products would inevitably be fifty per cent. higher, amounting to fifteen hundred dollars. He could then richly afford to pay even fifty per cent. higher, if required, for whatever fabrics he should need. But in the absence of such a Tariff, will he, an individual, out of the meager proceeds of his Grain, purchase domestic manufactures at the higher prices, while he is selling his own products at Free Trade prices? Obviously, he will do no such thing. If he did, his unsupported individual action would have no good effect, either for him or the community. He might go on buying at high and selling at low prices till doomsday, to his own individual detriment, and to no good end for the public. But only impose a Tariff which shall secure the Home Market mainly to the home producer, and the competition, stimulated by a certain and steady demand at living rates, will reduce the price of the manufactured fabrics, while, by increasing largely the number in his vicinity who wish to buy Agricultural staples, and are able to pay for them, it correspondingly increases the market for his produce and the price for it. For, while the price of labor and of materials must always govern the price of manufactures, after the difficulties incident to their infancy and to foreign competition are surmounted, the price of Agricultural staples, which are of greater bulk and

more costly of transportation, will, to a great extent, be governed by the nearness or distance of the market at which the surplus is consumed, as we have already indicated. Assuming the average value of Wheat throughout the world to be a dollar a bushel, and in districts where Manufactures preponderate, (in other words, where the demand for Grain exceeds the home supply,) a dollar and a quarter, it follows inevitably that if our Manufactures are generally brought from Europe, the market for our surplus Agricultural produce must also, to a great extent, be found abroad; and the farmer in Illinois must sell his Grain at the price it bears in a foreign market, less the cost and charges of sending it there; in other words, at thirty to fifty cents a bushel. But let our policy be so adjusted that the Manufactures consumed by those regions are mainly produced at Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, St. Louis, and on the rapids of their own abundant streams, and the money price which the farmer receives for his grain will be more than doubled, and the amount of goods of all kinds received by him in exchange for a hundred bushels of Grain will be nearly or quite doubled. But this is not all, nor even the best. There are thousands of Agricultural products which command next to no price at all in the absence or distance of such a market as Manufactures must supply. Thus Wood, Fruits, Pork, Vegetables, Poultry, &c., are now sold throughout the West at prices so low as hardly to be credible, while, if the manufactured goods there consumed were there made, they would readily bring from three to ten times as much. And yet the public ear is incessantly dinning with the bold assertion that the *Farmers* do not need Protection! and that a Discriminating Tariff taxes them for the sole benefit of the *Manufacturers*!

‘But why,’ asks an inquirer, ‘do *Manufactures* need Protection any more than other products?’ We answer: The cost of transporting Manufactures from England to Peoria or Indianapolis will probably fall below two per cent. on their value, while to send back Wheat and Corn in return will cost at least *two hundred* per cent. The mere bulk of Agricultural staples, and the consequent expense of transporting them, affords a Protection twenty-five to one hundred per cent. against any influx from abroad, which is wholly absent in the case of Manufactures. But, in addition to this, the price or rent of Land is one great element of the cost of Agricultural products, and one which is much cheaper in America than in Europe. On the other hand, immediate Labor is the chief element in the cost of Manufactures, and Land hardly an item. In a country where Labor is comparatively dear, and Land cheap, as in ours, Agricultural products will be relatively cheaper and Manufactures dearer than in Europe, in the absence of counter-acting policy. A Protective Duty in aid of Home Manufactures, while it will hardly increase the price of the protected articles, and

will in most cases ultimately reduce it, will inevitably and largely increase the price of Agricultural products, perhaps not so much in our sea-ports, but certainly over the wide expanse of the country. A duty of one hundred per cent. on Agricultural staples alone would not increase their price ten per cent., because there is no considerable importation to check; while a duty of fifty per cent. on foreign Manufactures would increase the average price of Agricultural staples at least fifty per cent. It is, therefore, one of the plainest, clearest of economical truths, that the true way to encourage and reward Agriculture is by protecting and fostering Manufactures, and thus providing a convenient and safe market with adequate prices for Agricultural products. In other words: the true way to increase Industry and its rewards, is not by attracting it to those departments of production already overstocked, and so increasing surpluses for which there is no adequate demand or reward, but by developing new branches of industry, opening new avenues to useful employment, and thus rounding out and perfecting the great circle of industrial effort. If all the industry of a country or community is directed to one department, one inevitable result is, that the product of that industry bears a lower price there than throughout the world generally, while whatever else they buy or consume costs them more than its average price elsewhere. At the same time that single department does not furnish sufficient and advantageous employment for all ages, tastes, sexes, capacities, and conditions; and there is inevitably much idleness or comparatively unproductive effort. But let Agriculture, Manufactures, Arts, and every department of industrial effort be prosecuted together, as nearly as may be, and there is employment and reward for all, and no danger of prostration to any through a revulsion or caprice in some far-off market, or through the obstacles interposed by maritime or other hostilities. This is the consummation to which National Prosperity aspires, and Protection emphatically tends.

Let us suppose, for farther example, that the American People, tired of buying the products of a European manufacturing population of three or four millions, at an oppressive disadvantage to the producers on both sides, should at once resolve and proclaim, 'We will buy no longer of Europe, but let the European manufacturers come to us, and we will give them better employment, better pay, and better living than they now have;' what would be the result? The manufacturers, finding their employment and pay diminished, would certainly come over in sufficient numbers, and, foreign manufactures being no longer imported, would find abundant employment. No truth is more settled than this, that the exchanges of Agricultural and Manufacturing products among the same people will always find their natural and proper equilibrium. Now, our Farmers could surely produce as much

Grain and Meat as now, since there would be nothing to prevent, and the Manufacturers could very soon produce as much Cloth, Wares, &c. in this country as they do in Europe; the advantages offered by the immense aggregation of Capital and Machinery abroad being fully counterbalanced by the superior cheapness of our abundant Water power over Steam, of our timber, wood, &c., and the remarkable ingenuity of our people in the invention and improvement of labor-saving machinery. Our Farmers thus producing as much food as now, and our Manufacturers producing as much cloth, &c., here as they now do in Europe, does not every one see that an immense saving would be secured to both in the diminution of the enormous force now diverted from production to needless transportation and traffic? Here is an utter waste of the energies and efforts of millions, who must levy their support upon the actual producers, to whom they are necessary under the present system. At this moment, for broadcloth costing three dollars per yard, the farmers of Illinois and Indiana are paying from six to twelve bushels of Wheat; while the manufacturer in England is receiving less than two bushels! The balance is swallowed up by the expenses of transportation, sale and resale, British taxes, tithes, &c. But let us adopt and adhere to such a policy as will woo the Manufacturer to a residence among us, and he will receive much more Wheat for a piece of Cloth, while the Farmer receives much more Cloth for a load of Wheat; the saving of four thousand miles' profitless transportation being shared between them. Such are the results and the benefits of the Protective System.

The careful reader will have already perceived that the foundations of that system are laid not in strife, not in envy, jealousy, or ill-will, but in the highest good to Man, and to all men. We do not commend it as desirable for or beneficial to this country, or its farmers, only, but for all countries, all classes, and all times. Wherever Man shall, in the sweat of his brow, eat bread, there it is desirable that all departments of Industry shall be prosecuted as nearly as may be together, unless some condition of climate or soil shall forbid it; and if, through unequal currencies, diverse institutions, or other cause, this intermingling of Agricultural with Manufacturing avocations fails to take place naturally, there it is desirable that public policy should interpose to secure it. If the articles which one now buys shall for a time cost more, those which he has to sell will, at the same time, command more; and, after a brief season, the alleged evil will disappear, while the benefit permanently remains, having its root in the nature of things. The case is just like this: A. B. raises Wheat in Ohio, which he exchanges with C. D. for Manufactures in Montreal, while E. F. makes his living by carrying back and forth the Grain and Goods. But in course of time, G. H. sets up a manufactory or depot within a

mile of A. B., and offers to supply him Goods for Grain at the same rate that he has hitherto traded in Montreal. By accepting this offer, A. B. makes a clear saving of the amount formerly paid to E. F. for his services, and the latter is left to abandon his unproductive, and betake himself to some productive employment, whereby there is a clear saving of the whole of his services to the world. In other words, the same amount of labor produces so much more of the necessaries or comforts of life than formerly, and the community is to that extent enriched by the change.

And here is shown the fallacy of the Free Trade cavil, that if Protection is so good a thing for Nations, it must be good for States, Counties, Towns, and even Families also, and that each should protect its own industry against the rivalry of all neighbors, and the farmer make his own boots, hats, and broadcloth, as well as the nation. All must see that while a Nation affords full scope and materials for a perfect and economical division of labor, a family or township does not; and that, while the expense of transporting grain from Indiana to manufacturers in Cincinnati or Louisville may be very light, the cost of taking the same grain to Birmingham or Manchester would be enormous. The case is just as if a man should say, 'You tell me I cannot afford to go a hundred miles for the boots and shoes I need, because the cost of the journey will overbalance the saving in price; now, on the same principle, I cannot go a hundred rods, but must buy of the nearest and dearest manufacturer, or make for myself.' The analogy here is obviously defective and unsound, and so with the cavil referred to.

— Equally fallacious is the objection that *England* protects her own Industry, yet her Laborers are depressed and wretched; therefore, Protection is a curse to the Laborer. This is one of those loose, imperfect analogies by which any thing may be proved, and which of course prove nothing. The English laborer is depressed, not because his labor is protected, but for very different reasons. He is trodden down by laws of primogeniture, which secure to a few persons a monopoly of all the real property in the kingdom, and of course compel the mass to pay enormously high rents for the use of land, &c.; by an enormous public debt and public burdens of all kinds; by an extravagant Government, an immense Army, a pampered Priesthood of the Established Church, &c. &c. Put the public burdens of the English upon us, and we could not bear them a single year. Abolish every vestige of her tariff, and, without other and more radical changes, she would still be a nation of prodigals and paupers. Her evils lie far too deep for so superficial a remedy.

I have not urged at all the argument of necessity founded on the Tariffs of other nations, and their bearing upon our interests. How we are to pay for foreign Manufactures when the producing nations *will not* take our Grain,

Wheat, &c. in return, is indeed a problem most difficult to solve, and of whose insolubility our present depressed, embarrassed, and crippled condition is a mournful evidence. At this moment, while the makers of our Cloths and Wares are paying twenty cents a pound for Pork in England, the wearers of that Cloth are selling Pork at *one cent* a pound in Illinois. Here is an enormous difference between the price received by the producer and that paid by the consumer—a difference which is utterly ruinous to productive industry on both sides. How long shall it be submitted to?

Enlightened Protection is emphatically the hope and stay of the toiling millions over the whole face of the earth. Wherever a hammer is lifted, a plough held, a shuttle thrown, over the globe, there is one whose direct interest it is that labor should be efficiently protected, not merely in his own but in all countries, and that the excessive and fatal competition of capital with capital, sinew with sinew, privation with privation, to excel in cheapness of production—that is, cheapness of money price—should be checked and bounded. Let Labor, therefore, with one mighty voice, demand adequate, stable Protection, and a wider and deeper Prosperity will soon irradiate the land, carrying independence, comfort, and joy to the dwelling alike of the farmer and artisan in every section of the country. Aug. 20, 1824.

GENERAL JACKSON ON PROTECTION.

LETTER TO DR. COLEMAN OF N. C.

Washington City, April 20, 1824.

* * * * Heaven smiled upon and gave us liberty and independence. That same Providence has blessed us with the means of National Independence and national defence. If we omit or refuse to use the gifts which he has extended to us, we deserve not the continuation of His blessing. He has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals—with lead, iron, and copper—and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the great materials of our national defence, they ought to have extended to them adequate protection; that our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in a fair competition with those of Europe, and that we have within our country a supply of those leading and important articles so essential to war.

I will ask what is the real situation of the agriculturist? Where has the American farmer a market for his surplus produce? Except for cotton he has neither a foreign nor a home market. Does not this clearly prove, when there is no market at home or abroad, that there is too much labor employed in agriculture. Common sense at once points out the remedy. Take from agriculture in the United States six hundred thousand men, women, and children, and you will at once give a market for more breadstuffs than all Europe now furnishes us. In short, sir, we have been too long subject to the policy of British merchants! It is time we should become a little more *Americanized*, and instead of feeding paupers and laborers of England, feed our own; or else, in a short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall be rendered paupers ourselves. * * * *

ANDREW JACKSON.

THE VOICE OF OUR PRESIDENTS,

IN FAVOR OF PROTECTION.

GEORGE WASHINGTON, in his first Annual Message after signing the first Tariff bill, framed avowedly 'to protect manufactures,' says:

"The safety and interest of the People require that they should promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly for military supplies."

THOMAS JEFFERSON, in his Message to Congress of December 15, 1802, thus enumerates the proper objects of our Government:

"To cultivate peace and maintain commerce and navigation in all their lawful enterprises; to foster our fisheries as nurseries of navigation, and for the nurture of man, and *protect the manufactures* adapted to our circumstances; to preserve the faith of the nation by an exact discharge of its debts and contracts, expend the public money with the same care and economy we would practice with our own, and impose on our citizens no unnecessary burdens; to keep in all things within the pale of our constitutional powers, and cherish the federal Union as the only rock of safety:—these, fellow-citizens, are the landmarks by which we are to guide ourselves in all our proceedings. By continuing to make *these the rule of our action*, we shall endeavor to our countrymen the true principles of their Constitution, and promote an union of sentiment and of action equally auspicious to their happiness and safety."

Again, in his Message of 1806, apprehending a surplus Revenue, he says:

"To what other objects shall these surpluses be appropriated, and the whole surplus of impost after the entire discharge of the public debt? Shall we suppress the impost, and give that advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures?"

He proceeds to say, that on a few articles he thinks the impost may be suppressed, but that, with regard to the great mass of them, the "patriotism" of the people would "prefer its continuance and application to the great purposes of public education, roads, rivers, canals, and such other objects of public improvement as it may be thought proper to add to the constitutional enumeration of federal powers."

In his last annual Message sent to Congress, on the 8th of November, 1808, Mr. JEFFERSON says:

"The suspension of foreign commerce produced by the injustice of the belligerent Powers, and the consequent losses and sacrifices of our citizens, are subjects of just concern. The situation into which we have thus been forced has impelled us to apply a portion of our industry and capital to internal manufactures and improvements. The extent of this conversion is daily increasing, and little doubt remains that the establishments formed and forming will, under the auspices of cheaper materials and substance, the freedom of labor from taxation with us, and of *protecting duties and prohibitions, become permanent.*"

JAMES MADISON, in his Message of November 5th, 1811, thus speaks:

"Although other subjects will press more immediately on your deliberations, a portion of them cannot but be well bestowed on the just and sound policy of securing to our manufactures the success they have

attained, and are still attaining, under the impulse of causes not permanent, and to our navigation, the fair extent of which is, at present, abridged by the unequal regulations of foreign Governments. Besides the reasonableness of saving our manufactures from sacrifices which a change of circumstances might bring upon them, the national interest requires that, with respect to such articles at least as belong to our defence and primary wants, we should not be left in a state of unnecessary dependence on external supplies."

President MONROE, in his Inaugural Address, March 5th, 1817, observes:

"Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government. Possessing as we do all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend, in the degree we have done, on supplies from other countries. While we are thus dependent, the sudden event of war, unsought and unexpected, cannot fail to plunge us into the most serious difficulties. It is important, too, that the capital which nourishes our manufactures should be domestic, as its influence in that case, instead of exhausting, as it may do, in foreign hands, would be felt advantageously on agriculture and every other branch of industry. Equally important is it to provide at home a market for our raw materials, as, by extending the competition, it will enhance the price and protect the cultivator against the casualties incident to foreign markets."

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, in his Message of December 2d, 1828, thus vindicates the power and policy of Protection:

"Is the self-protecting energy of this nation so helpless, that there exists in the political institutions of our country no power to counteract the bias of this foreign legislation; that the growers of grain must submit to this exclusion from the foreign markets of their produce; that the shippers must dismantle their ships, the trade of the North stagnate at the wharves, and the manufacturers starve at their looms, while the whole people shall pay tribute to foreign industry, to be clad in a foreign garb; that the Congress of the Union are impotent to restore the balance in favor of native industry, destroyed by the statutes of another nation? More just and more generous sentiments will, I trust, prevail.

"If the tariff adopted at the last session of Congress shall be found by experience to bear oppressively upon the interests of any one section of the Union, it ought to be, and I cannot doubt will be, so modified as to alleviate its burdens. To the voice of just complaint, from any portion of their constituents, the representatives of the States and the people will never turn away their ears. But so long as the duty of the foreign shall operate only as a bounty upon the domestic article—while the planter, and the merchant, and the shepherd, and the husbandman, shall be found thriving in their occupations, under the duties imposed for the protection of domestic manufactures—they will not repine at the prosperity shared with themselves by their fellow-citizens of other professions, nor denounce as violations of the Constitution the deliberate acts of Congress to shield from the wrongs of foreign laws the native industry of the Union."

Gen. JACKSON, in his Message of Dec. 7th, 1830, thus asserts the Constitutional power:

"The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust

these duties, with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry, is so completely incidental to that power, that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them; and, consequently, if it be not possessed by the General Government, it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry, and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely cannot be the case. This indispensable power, thus surrendered by the States, must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress. In this conclusion I am confirmed as well by the opinions of President Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people."

The same sentiments, in different language,

were repeatedly and strongly expressed by each of these Presidents. Lastly, John Tyler, in his Message of December, 1841, favors us with the following:

"In imposing duties for the purpose of revenue, a right to discriminate as to the articles on which the duty shall be laid, as well as the amount, necessarily and properly exists. Otherwise, the Government would be placed in the condition of having to levy the same duties upon all articles—the productive as well as the unproductive. The slightest duty upon some might have the effect of causing their importation to cease; whereas others, entering extensively into the consumption of the country, might bear the heaviest, without any sensible diminution in the amount imported.

"So, also, the Government may be justified in so discriminating, by reference to other considerations of domestic policy connected with our manufactures. So long as the duties shall be laid with distinct reference to the wants of the Treasury, no well-founded objection can be raised against them."

Who will now assert that Protection is unconstitutional? or that it taxes the other classes of the community for the special benefit of the Manufacturers?

Manufactures in the United States.

STATE.	Capital invested.	STATE.	Capital invested.
New York...	\$55,252,279	North Carolina...	\$3,838,900
Massachusetts...	41,774,446	Tennessee.....	3,731,580
Pennsylvania...	31,815,105	Illinois.....	3,136,512
Ohio.....	16,905,257	Michigan.....	3,112,240
Connecticut.....	13,669,139	South Carolina...	3,216,970
New Jersey.....	11,517,582	Georgia.....	2,899,565
Virginia.....	11,360,861	Missouri.....	2,704,403
Rhode Island...	10,696,136	Alabama.....	2,130,064
New Hampshire...	9,252,448	Mississippi.....	1,797,727
Maine.....	7,105,620	Delaware.....	1,589,215
Maryland.....	6,450,284	Dist. Columbia...	1,005,875
Louisiana.....	6,430,699	Florida.....	669,490
Kentucky.....	5,945,259	Arkansas.....	635,926
Vermont.....	4,326,440	Iowa.....	424,467
Indiana.....	4,132,043		199,645
Total.....			\$207,726,579

Cotton and Woolen Manufactures.

VALUE OF ARTICLES MANUFACTURED IN 1839.

STATES.	Cotton.	Wool.
Massachusetts.....	\$16,553,423	\$7,082,898
Rhode Island.....	7,116,792	842,172
Pennsylvania.....	5,013,007	2,319,061
New Hampshire.....	4,142,304	795,784
New York.....	3,640,337	3,537,337
Connecticut.....	2,715,964	2,494,313
New Jersey.....	2,086,104	440,710
Maryland.....	1,150,580	235,900
Maine.....	970,397	412,366
Virginia.....	446,063	147,792
North Carolina...	435,900	3,900
South Carolina...	359,000	1,000
Delaware.....	332,272	101,700
Kentucky.....	329,380	151,246
Tennessee.....	325,719	14,290
Ohio.....	139,378	685,757
Indiana.....	135,400	58,867
Vermont.....	113,000	1,331,953
All others.....	38,291	36,953
Total.....	\$46,350,453	\$20,696,999
Total Capital invested...	\$51,102,350	\$15,765,124

Facts for Farmers.

While we have for several years down to September, 1842 been reducing our duties on Imports until they had reached the horizontal standard of 20 per cent., the following are the rates of duty imposed on the Agricultural Staples by the country (Great Britain) which has supplied us with the larger share of our Manufactures—our own Manufactures having no chance at all in her markets—viz.:

Amt. Agricultural Products.	Present Value in New York.	Amt. of British Duties thereon.	
Louisiana Sugar..	5 cents per pound.	270 per cent.	
Do. Molasses..	21 cents per gallon.	400 per cent.	
S. Carolina Rice..	2½ cents per pound	118 per cent.	
Southern Tobacco	6 cents per pound.	1200 per cent.	
Do. Cotton.....	8 cents per pound.	8 per cent.	
Spirits from Grain	20 cents per gallon.	2700 per cent.	
Cider.....	15 cents per gallon.	273 per cent.	
Farm Prod.	Wheat ..	\$1.25 per bushel.. 60	
	Barley ..	75 cents per bu. 74	
	Oats.....	50 cents per bu. 100	
	Potatoes..	30 cents per bu. 84	
	Flour.....	\$6 per barrel..... 60	
	Hay.....	75 cents per 100 lbs 137 per cent.	
	Animal Prod.	Salted Beef	\$6.50 per barrel... 80 per cent.
		Do. Pork	\$7.50 per barrel... 68 per cent.
		Bacon.....	7 cents per pound.. 85 per cent.
		Hams.....	7 cents per pound.. 85 per cent.
Lard.....		5 cents per pound.. 34 per cent.	
Cheese.....	Butter.....	15 cents per pound. 28 per cent.	
		7 cents per pound.. 32 per cent.	
	Linseed Oil.....	95 cents per gallon. 80 per cent.	
Forests—Timber..		14 cents per cubic ft 96 per cent.	
	Staves..	\$50 per thousand.. 110 per cent.	

* Generally they are prohibited.

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

RETURN TO → CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
202 Main Library

LOAN PERIOD 1	2	3
HOME USE		
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

1-month loans may be renewed by calling 642-3405
1-year loans may be recharged by bringing the books to the Circulation Desk
Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

DEC 13 1984	←	
RECEIVED BY		
NOV 26 1984		
CIRCULATION DEPT.		
SENT ON WILL		
FEB 03 2000		
U. C. BERKELEY		

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
FORM NO. DD6, 60m, 1/83 BERKELEY, CA 94720



