

fer themselves to the new
heads of these settlements;
could be as easy in all other
them as I am with Upper

HE HAS MOUNTED HIS HORSE
HIM ON, ROUGH SHOD OVER
THAT LIE IN HIS WAY."

AN ECONOMIST.

her international Hand,
the United States to their
e can be no doubt that the
Bill (1832), in consequence
needed her exports, and the
England for several hundred
nable to cancel by their ex
most chiefly be ascribed to
t, that they invariably co
on manufactures in conse
the contrary, they never
when few imports could tak
the exports had been im
ports. * * * It was in
a framed, imposing a tri
bles of import. Trading a
the prosperity of the coun
in his message (1791), a
flourishing state of manne
by the success of the first
4, the Import Duties toll
Report of the Commercial
lands, and the annual
sixty millions of dollars,
of all sorts of goods, as al
gre. After the peace of
of duty for the first year
disciples of Free Trade, i
in the calamities of the p
appearance, viz., ruin
ductions, and a fall in the
country had thus again
blessings of peace, it on
is after the conclusion
ures again took place, a
than those caused by the
1824 that the Congress sa
raising the tariff; but th
son's threat of retaliation
the industrial classes of the
Congress to raise the tariff
in 1832 (by the Commis
Mr Poulett Thompson, as
sided by the planters a
cheap tariff. The conse
the importation into the
ties of English manufac
of Trade between the tw
mercial crisis in 1835, fr
tion recovered, despite th
plainly shows the necessi
to exceed the exports, a
at the Balance of Trade.
on presented itself
ere arose a teacher of the
the taught in Russia wh
England, viz., that Balan
engendered in the disc
cantile system. Govern
trial, until the Com
declared in an Office
himself compelled by cr
stem in commerce, as the
at an indifferent mark
becoming ruined, all the
solid mercantile busin
afterwards the new p
ficial consequences
t, and mechanical indu
from all parts of the c
England and German
mercial crises, caused
prosperous and the man

try are running at a loss: many have stopped, and more must stop, if some decided change is not effected." That "our iron-works are closing up, while British rails fill our ports, and are spreading over the country."

Presuming the information on which you found your assertion to be correct, still, I do not admit the propriety or justice of farther protection to manufactures of the articles in question. The people require these articles for their consumption—they already submit to a duty of 30 per cent., and if manufacturers cannot produce profitably with that protection, it appears to me that they had better employ their capital elsewhere. The consumers of the country constitute the great majority, and their interests should be first considered. They require railroads, and if British rails are cheapest, they should be permitted to use them, rather than be taxed for the benefit of the few manufacturers. Railroads are for the benefit of the people—they place the producer and consumer side by side, and should not be cramped by partial legislation. I am a Whig—but with reference to party, support those measures only which are conducive to the welfare of our COMMON COUNTRY.

New York, July 31, 1850.

THE EDITOR'S REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

The difficulty in bringing this Tariff controversy to a conclusion grows out of the fact that *one party pays no attention whatever to the other's arguments.* We, who stand for Protection, read the writings of our opponents, and discuss the question with direct reference to their arguments; but our adversaries coolly assume at the outset that all we have to say is nonsense and absurdity, dictated by selfishness or bigotry, and never take the trouble of listening to us for the first minute. Thus, after we have patiently met their arguments, point after point, and as we think refuted them, they simply repeat their previous assertions, paying no attention to our replies, and deeming themselves unanswerable because they have not looked at the answers.* Our correspondent is a fair sample of the breed, calling himself a "Whig," (*why a Whig?*) he coolly assumes that the first article in the Whig creed is a fallacy, and gives us a relish of the most ordinary sophisms of free trade, with a seeming unconsciousness that they had never before been uttered—much less answered. Yet there is not a suggestion in his letter that has not been at least ten times fully considered—and we think refuted in the *Tribune* alone. That 30, 25, and even 20 per cent. is sufficient protection for many branches of manufactures, we have freely and often stated. There are other branches which need more, and for these among other reasons: 1. They (not all manufactures, but these branches) are yet in their infancy, and are necessarily prosecuted at great disadvantage while exposed to the fierce rivalry of the mature experience, unlimited capital and depressed labour of Europe. 2. The cost and charges of importation are little more (often less) than the cost of transporting them to and selling them at the great markets of our country: (for even Pittsburgh, geographically in the north-east quarter of the Union, is practically as far from London as Liverpool.) 3. The possessors of the market, those who have for years supplied it, and have a knowledge and command of all the channels of sale and diffusion—have an immense advantage over upstarts, who are striving to take it from them, as our manufacturers are with regard to European; and 4. The popular presumption that the foreign fabric is superior in style or in quality, is another serious drawback on the home-producer. The infancy of manufacture is necessarily marked by imperfections and errors; the colours are little more or hold; the workmanship is inferior in various ways. Now the influence of this lie on the public mind does not cease with the imperfection, but continues and prevents the free purchase of the home-made article, and the general preference given in all matters of style or fashion to "far-fetched" fabrics, also operates against the domestic producer. Let an invoice of French calicoes, for instance, be put on the markets at 15 cents per yard, at the same time with an invoice of American calicoes of equally good quality at 12 cents, and the French will sell first—will or recently would. These are but a part of the reasons why certain branches of manufacture require efficient protection. Because a duty of 30 per cent. is required to secure the home market to our producers, it by no means follows that they charge 30 per cent. more than the price of similar goods from abroad. Often, they are sold as low, yet cannot command the market in an unprotected struggle.

Now, as to iron. There is a 30 per cent. duty in favour of our own iron, and some people talk of 10 or 15 per cent. more advantage in transportation, commissions, &c., just as though it cost nothing to bring our own iron to the great marts of commerce and sell it there. In fact, the average cost of transportation from our iron mines to the chief Atlantic cities can hardly be less than that of bringing hither a like quantity from Stafford and Glasgow. A good specific duty, equivalent to 30 per cent. on the average prices of iron, would be quite a fair duty. But it is one fatal defect of the present tariff that by reducing all duties to *ad valorem*, it makes them high or low, precisely the reverse of what they should be. When there is least need of protection, this tariff gives the most of it; when there is most need it gives least. For instance, say the average value of railroad iron is 60 dollars per ton; 30 per cent. on which is 18 dollars, a fair duty.

* This is a description to the life, of the *whig* oil themselves F. (a Traders in England.

Let this iron rise to 80 dollars per ton, and the duty becomes 24 dollars—just when no protection is needed. But let the price fall to 30 dollars, and the duty sinks to 9 dollars, a very low duty just when there is pressing need of a high one to keep our works from stopping. Has "common country" ever heard or thought of this? The same is true with regard to all our manufactures. Let fair calicoes or prints average 10 cents per yard, and the American producer is protected by a duty of 24 cents; but let the price fall to six cents, and the duty falls to 18. Such is the statesmanship, the provident care for the prosperity and stability of industry, with which the country is now governed.

Now, our correspondent, taking the narrowest view of a very broad subject, assumes that we are paying 30 per cent. more for our fabrics because of protection—that we are paying this for the benefit of the manufacturers—and that the "interest of the consumers" is lost sight of in the premises—three assumptions which could not be sustained with ten times the labour and logic our friend bestows on the whole subject. It is not true that we are paying 30 per cent. more for our iron even because of the tariff. Abolish the entire duty to-morrow, and a great many of our forges and furnaces would be stopped, and the amount of importation would be increased. This would raise the price abroad and increase the cost here; and the actual average reduction in our seaboard markets would not be 20 per cent.—we think not 15—while across the mountains it would be little or nothing. We repel the assumption with regard to favouring manufactures; their interests should have no weight save that they are coincident with the general interest. *If Protection benefits none but the classes and avocations immediately affected by it, it ought to be abandoned at once. But the fact is otherwise.* Our correspondent talks as though the fact that British rails and other iron are now sold here at 50 dollars per ton, while a like article made in our own country must sell here at 60 dollars in order to be made at a profit, proves the former 10 dollars the cheapest to our people—which we consider very far from the truth. Let us look closely at the matter, and see which of us is right. Our country requires, we will say 300,000 tons of iron annually, of which a large portion will be made here, while another portion will be imported, no matter what may be the duty; the practical question being—Shall we import 150,000 tons, or 50,000 of the aggregate we require? "Common Country" settles the matter off-hand by a simple arithmetical process, viz.: "It would cost 6,000,000 dollars to make this at home, and only 5,000,000 dollars (or if you please 4,000,000 dollars) to buy it abroad—saving one or two millions." But no, sir! You have forgotten that the dollars in either case are but counters—the practical question being—Will it cost more of our labour (or its products) to import this iron than to make it at home? We say yes, decidedly, certainly. To import it is to necessitate a larger exportation of grain or cotton, depressing the market for our staples abroad, and reducing their market value at home. But let us make it at home, and not only is this injury obviated, but the *real* cost is far less, though the *nominal* be more than in the other case. For this 60 dollars represents the fuel and art employed and paid for in making the iron, which would else have been valueless—represents the grain, meat, butter, fruits, &c., consumed by the choppers, ore-diggers, colliers, furnace-builders, &c., &c., as well as the immediate iron-makers whom this home-production has set at work at prices far above what they would have commanded if this work had not been done. The farmer of the Susquehanna or the Allegheny sells his vegetables and fruits for cash at fair prices when the iron works are in full operation; stop them, and he must travel far for a market and sell much cheaper; or perhaps could not afford to send them to market at all. Suppose he pays 10 dollars more per ton for his iron, and pays it by selling wood on the stump at 50 cents per cord, when with Free Trade and the Iron-Works languishing, he could not sell his wood at all, but must pay 10 or 12 dollars to have his land cleared of it—what would be his gain by Free Trade! Now it is clear that every man who wants iron will not sell his wood to make it with; but he will sell something else—and there is no branch or kind of useful industry which will not be benefited by that diversification of labour which the multiplication and growth of manufactures among us insures.

All we have here affirmed we are prepared to sustain by statistics if required, but we have endeavoured to make our statements which the common sense of every observing reader will readily confirm. The actual saving in labour and mercantile charges effected by making our fabrics at home instead of sending the cotton and wool to Europe, having them manufactured, then returned to and sold among us, must amount to many millions per annum. This saving does not always tell on the prices of the goods, but must be felt in that of the articles exchanged for them. Let our Iron and Cloths be made in Europe, and there can be no market among us for bulky and perishable articles, such as vegetables and fruits, save in the neighbourhood of our seaboard cities; still less for fuel, &c.; and these articles must sell accordingly. THE MONEY PRICE OF AN ARTICLE IS A MOST UNCERTAIN CRITERION OF ITS COST TO A NATION; it is always dear if bought abroad while the labour and skill which should have produced it stands idle at home; or if the skill remains undeveloped and unknown for the want of such home production.

of immense circulation.
un of this morning, 30
anufactories in the cou