

carpet-weaver, may no longer have work in the vocations to which they were bred and in which they are skilled; but then there will be so much the more work in growing wheat, picking cotton, or salting pork. I do not see the advantage of the change to Labor even affirmed in this statement, though it is not difficult to imagine that Trade may experience a fallacious and transitory improvement. But, while the merchant may just as easily ship or sell one article as another, the laborer cannot with like facility change from casting iron to growing corn, from weaving broadcloth to chopping timber, and so on. To compel him to give up his accustomed employment and seek some other is generally to doom him to months of unwilling idleness followed by years of relatively ineffective toil. The overthrow of an important branch of National Industry is therefore a serious calamity to a great portion of the Laboring Class—a blow which will be felt for years.

### 8. *Cheap Goods and Starving Laborers.*

But, thus far, I have conceded the main point assumed by McCulloch and his school, that the destruction of a branch of Home Industry by the influx of rival Foreign fabrics is necessarily followed by a corresponding extension of some other branch or branches, giving employment to an equal amount of labor, and rendering the depression of Industry only temporary. That this is a mistake, a few moments' reflection will establish. It assumes that the consumption of a given article is not diminished by the transfer of its production from the consumers' neighborhood to a distant shore, and that wherever a community receives its supply of cloths or wares from abroad, it necessarily follows that some staple or staples of equal value will be taken of it by the supplying nation in return. To prove that the fact is not so, I cite the memorable instance of the Dacca weavers of India, as stated in Parliament by the distinguished Free Trader, Dr. Bowring:—

"I hold, Sir, in my hand, the correspondence which has taken place between the Governor General of India and the East India Company, on the subject of the Dacca hand-loom weavers. It is a melancholy story of misery so far as they are concerned, and as striking an evidence of the wonderful progress of manufacturing industry in this country. Some years ago, the East India Company annually received of the produce of the looms of India the amount of from six to eight millions of pieces of cotton goods. The demand gradually fell to somewhat more than one million, and has now nearly ceased altogether. In 1800, the United States took from India nearly eight hundred thousand pieces of cottons; in 1830, not four thousand. In 1800, one million of pieces were shipped to Portugal; in 1830, only twenty thousand. Terrible are the accounts of the wretchedness of the poor India weavers, reduced to absolute starvation. And what was the sole cause? The presence of the cheaper English manufacture—the production by the power-loom of the article which these unhappy Hindoos had been used for ages to make by their unimproved and hand-directed shuttles. Sir, it was impossible that they could go on weaving what no one would wear or buy. Numbers of them died of hunger; the remainder were, for the most

part,  
chan  
that  
looms

"  
The  
rema  
Madn  
have  
many  
Dacc  
are a  
to nu  
comm

He  
1. T  
hand  
such  
looms  
of the  
suppl  
exist  
weav  
mater  
or ex  
impor  
acco  
verge  
the c  
suffer  
tion v  
in the

He  
notor  
strate  
to be

Pe  
inten  
ruino  
that  
its pr  
to co  
pervi