

S441

.N7



S 441  
.N7  
Copy 1













# AGRICULTURE OF THE UNITED STATES,

OR,

AN ESSAY CONCERNING

## Internal Improvement & Domestic Manufactures,

SHEWING THEIR INSEPERABLE CONNECTION WITH

### THE BUSINESS AND INTERESTS OF AGRICULTURE,

In the establishment of a home-market for bread-stuffs and meats, wool, cotton, flax, hemp, &c. as well as the supplies that they will furnish in aid of the foreign commerce of the United States.

BY H. NILES, OF BALTIMORE.

First published in Niles' Register, of March 24, 1827.

WITH ADDITIONS.

After considerable reflection on the subject and careful references to some of the important statistical facts that bear upon it, we have reached the conclusion—that, at no previous time, during the period of our national existence, has the state of our agriculture more imperiously demanded the serious reflection and care of a wise and paternal government, than at the present moment. Though there is, perhaps, less of actual suffering in the United States than in any other country under heaven, a great degree of pecuniary distress and private embarrassment prevails, and “the prospect before us” is, unless the profound attention of our *statesmen* shall be excited and exerted to relieve the people, that we cannot *advance* to those high destinies to which our republic seems called, so certainly and rapidly as we ought. We totally disavow any desire to build up a *forced* or *artificial* system, for the benefit of any class of individuals, even for the agricultural, though they make up about three-fourths of our whole population—but hold it to be expedient and proper, at all times, and in behalf even of an individual citizen, to profit by all the advantages which God and nature have given, to promote “the general welfare,” by securing happiness and prosperity to all, and each, through wholesome employment and reasonable compensation for labor. Foreign commerce, as to many of our late most valuable commodities, fails to produce its former effects, and men have been compelled to turn their attention to new articles; and the mighty changes which have taken place in the condition of our country, in various and important respects, should inspire us with deep and solemn considerations as to the future; and indignantly forbid a yielding to temporary or political-party purposes, whatever may impede the march of prosperity or cause abandonments of immutable principles of right. It is the gift of PROVIDENCE, that these United States should be free, independent and happy—and it depends upon ourselves whether we shall retain or cast away the blessings bestowed. The policy of this republic, whether it regards agriculture, manufactures or commerce, interior or exterior, must not be subjected to the caprices of transient parties, or made a matter for political bargaining—as *has been* partially the case heretofore, and, as it appears probable, *may be* attempted again.

These general remarks naturally occurred when we sat down to make some observations on the past, present and probable state of our agriculturalists—in which we hope to adduce some facts and opinions that will lead many to a serious consideration as to that policy which ought to be *steadily* pursued. We have no manner of reference to local circumstances or peculiar things, except as they shall appear to affect the well-being of the community at large—and, let factions and parties draw their *political* or *geographical* lines as they may, we never yet have believed that there is any material diversity of interest among the widely scattered people of the United States; and that, in matters of *business*, the same amicable compromises do, or may, exist, which have been established in our *political* constitution, under which we have had “peace, liberty and safety,” however much we have been agitated by political feelings—and the jarrings between *ins* and *outs*, with the intrigues of those who, in the language of *De Witt Clinton*, have seemed as if they would “rather reign in hell than serve in heaven.”

The chief products of our agriculture are vegetable and animal food and wool, tobacco and cotton, with considerable quantities of sugar, flax and hemp, &c. but we shall principally confine our remarks to articles of the first class.

Vegetable and animal food (except rice), are the main agricultural products, for export, from the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois—and partly so

of Maryland, Virginia, Tennessee and Missouri. We shall take the three first and the three last years inserted in the valuable table given in the 28th vol. of this REGISTER, page 329, to see what progress we have made as to the export of vegetable and animal food:

|      |        | <i>Flour, bbls.</i> |         | <i>Flour, bbls.</i> |         |
|------|--------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|
| 1791 |        | 619,681             |         | 1823                | 877,865 |
| 1792 |        | 824,464             |         | 1823                | 756,702 |
| 1793 |        | 1,074,639           |         | 1824                | 996,702 |
|      |        | <hr/>               |         | <hr/>               |         |
|      |        | 2,518,784           |         | 2,581,269           |         |
|      |        | <i>Beef. Pork.</i>  |         | <i>Beef. Pork.</i>  |         |
| 1791 | 62,771 | 27,781              |         | 1822                | 97,610  |
| 1792 | 74,638 | 38,098              |         | 1823                | 61,418  |
| 1793 | 75,106 | 38,563              |         | 1824                | 66,074  |
|      |        | <hr/>               |         | <hr/>               |         |
|      |        | 212,515             | 104,442 | 225,102             |         |
|      |        | <hr/>               |         | <hr/>               |         |
|      |        | 104,442             |         | 191,110             |         |
|      |        | <hr/>               |         | <hr/>               |         |
|      |        | 316,657             |         | 416,212             |         |

Shewing an increase in thirty-five years, during which the population of the producing states has been almost trebled, of only 62,485 bbls. of flour and 99,255 barrels of beef and pork in three years, or a yearly increased export of 21,000 bbls. of flour and 33,000 barrels of beef and pork. And, in the years 1791, 1792 and 1793 we exported 373,352 tierces of rice, and only 301,683 in the years 1822, 1823 and 1824.

It is the quantity that establishes the capacity to produce, or the amount of the foreign demand; but if the money-value of these articles is regarded, it is probable that those exported in the three first years was, nearly, twice as large as that of those exported in the three last. Such value was not given in the official papers until the year 1803, and, referring again to the table, we have the following items:

|                 | <i>Flour—dollars.</i> | <i>Beef &amp; Pork—dollars.</i> |
|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1803            | 9,310,000             | 4,135,000                       |
| 1804            | 7,100,000             | 4,300,000                       |
| 1805            | 8,325,000             | 4,141,000                       |
|                 |                       | <hr/>                           |
|                 |                       | 24,735,000                      |
|                 |                       | <hr/>                           |
|                 |                       | 12,576,000                      |
|                 |                       | <hr/>                           |
| <i>Together</i> | \$37,311,000          |                                 |
|                 | <i>Flour—dollars.</i> | <i>Beef &amp; Pork—dollars.</i> |
| 1822            | 5,103,000             | 2,529,000                       |
| 1823            | 4,962,000             | 2,461,000                       |
| 1824            | 5,759,000             | 2,628,000                       |
|                 |                       | <hr/>                           |
|                 |                       | 15,824,000                      |
|                 |                       | <hr/>                           |
|                 |                       | 7,618,000                       |
|                 |                       | <hr/>                           |
| <i>Together</i> | \$23,442,000          |                                 |

So we see that the money-value of the chief agricultural products exported from the many states named, was fourteen millions of dollars and considerably exceeding one half more in 1803, 1804 and 1805, than in 1822, 1823 and 1824. The value of the rice exported bears fully the same proportion in favor of the earliest years. There are no specialities in these selections—for the earliest and the latest years given in the table are offered, and almost any one of the early years compared with another of the later, will shew the same general fact.

With these results before us, it is perfectly plain, or, indeed, self-evident, that the numerous people of the grain-growing and grazing states enumerated above, and containing about three-fourths of all the people of the United States, could not possibly depend upon the foreign demand for their surplus productions: hence it was indispensable to their existence, perhaps—at least, to their reasonable comfort, (which no human laws can rightfully deprive them of), that they should turn their attention to other matters—and they have vested, probably, about 300 millions of dollars in manufacturing establishments, in the breeding of sheep, and in commerce and navigation, and the fisheries, to employ their surplus population, and give bread to the hungry. The present annual value of the products of sheep, because of their wool and skins only, is about twice or thrice as large as that of all the flour or tobacco at present exported, however much the latter articles engage the national legislation and public care, because we have been accustomed to look at things abroad and disregard those at home. We do not speak wildly. There are about fifteen millions of sheep—and their increase, wool and skins may surely be estimated at fifteen millions of dollars, which is considerably more than the average value of all our flour and tobacco annually exported for the last three years. Ought not this matter, this "wool-gathering" idea, as in derision it may be called, in respect to the home-trade and home supply, to sink deep in our minds, when

we compare it with the two GREAT STAPLES of our *foreign trade and foreign demand*, for the protection of which latter, or either of them, we always stand as prepared even to contend in battle? It would be well for every person to enquire, in the secret of his own heart, why these things are—why it is that we despise, or neglect, that which we have within ourselves, while we support ministers abroad and maintain fleets of men-of-war in the most distant seas, to defend by *argument and arms*, interests that yield so small a comparative profit, when we have reference to the amount received for flour or tobacco *exported*? We complain not of this defence—we wish it continued and extended as the case shall require; but we cannot see why property and products at *home* should not have the same fostering care as property and products *abroad*? If a tariff, which shall protect the growers and manufacturers of wool, and the scores of millions of dollars vested by them,\* may operate as a tax on other parts of the community (which, however, we do not admit that it would), shall not these say also, and with certainty, that *they are taxed* to keep up fleets in the Mediterranean, West Indian, South Atlantic and Great South seas, to protect articles exported of much less annual value than those which *they* produce and possess within our own land—and ask why, *peculiar* privileges or advantages have been granted, or are continued? If they so ask, what answer must be given?

Further—much fear is expressed of a loss of the British West India trade,—and a shutting of the ports of Cuba would throw us into great alarm, because of a restricted demand for our flour—and yet the *New England states* receive from New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia, a much greater quantity of flour than we export to *all the West India Islands*. Those states import, from their sister states, more than 625,000 barrels a year, besides large quantities of corn—the *whole* foreign export of flour was only 813,000 barrels in 1825, and 858,000 in 1826. New England is enabled to receive and *consume* this great quantity because of her manufactures—more than 281,000 barrels were received at the single port of Boston, of which 72,000 were exported, leaving 209,000 for *consumption*, chiefly from Maryland and Virginia, in the last year; and the latter, *of itself*, is almost equal to the whole export of the U. States to the British West Indies and Cuba—which, in 1825, was no more than 223,000 barrels. How small then, is the foreign demand compared with the home market, for the growers of grain? And if we allow to the people of the United States a quantity of bread stuffs equal only to “*a peck of corn per week*,” for each individual, the whole consumption will be about 150 millions of bushels a year, equal to 30 millions of barrels of flour, (allowing five bushels of *grain* as equal to one barrel of *flour*), while the export is less than one million of barrels. Why, the *horses and hogs* in the United States annually consume more than five times as much grain as would be equivalent to the quantity of flour exported! The foreign demand, however, even for so small a proportion of our bread-stuffs produced, is exceedingly important, because of its effect to establish a selling-value for all the rest. But we have not time to descant upon the operations of *scarcity and supply*; and besides, their principle has often been shewn in this work. The surplus, or want, of a small quantity, every body knows, has effect on the value of a whole quantity in market, to diminish or increase its price. And if we compare the amount of the *animal food* exported to that which is consumed at home, how will the account stand? Admit, that *half a pound* is used or wasted, for an individual, per day, the aggregate is 2,160 millions of pounds annually—whereas the quantity of beef and pork exported is only about 28 millions of pounds; thus, the vegetable food consumed at home, by man and beast, is thirty-five times greater than the amount exported, and of animal food, also the product of agriculture, eighty times greater, under the most reasonable allowances that it is possible to make; and which are advanced not as being the *real* amounts, but as reasonable *dicta*, to assist in forming general and important opinions. It is perfectly evident then, that the grain growing and grazing states *must* establish and keep up a home-market for the commodities of their agriculturalists—[for the amount which the foreign market will receive is, in bread stuffs and meats, together, *less than a hundredth part of their aggregate products*, and, to our whole free population, would yield not much more than one dollar, a year, for each person. Can the *farmer*, the man who cultivates his own field, depend upon *this* for all the supplies which he has to purchase, for the payment of his work-people and taxes? Pshaw!

\*The property vested in the wool-growing business has been thus estimated:

|                     |              |
|---------------------|--------------|
| For land, - - - - - | \$20,000,000 |
| sheep, - - - - -    | 20,000,000   |
|                     | 40,000,000   |

which is much under the real amount; and the *annual product* is \$15,000,000 a year, as stated in the text.

It is very probable that the *starch* used in our manufacturing establishments consumes a greater value of the products of agriculture, than the amount of all such articles consumed, (cotton and tobacco, excepted), in *Great Britain and Ireland, Russia, Prussia, Holland, &c.* We are not joking. We see it stated that five factories near Springfield, Mass. annually use 40,000 lbs of starch. It is ascertained that at one factory in Massachusetts, employing 260 hands, 300 barrels of *flour* were consumed last year. Mr. Mallary stated the latter in his masterly speech, on the woollens bill.

—the directly operating *foreign* business of a whole year, would hardly supply him with necessary money for the business of a week. Let this be looked into. Nothing more than a momentary application of the self-evident facts which we have suggested, is needful to convince any one as to what is the real state of things.

There is another point of view, however, in which this subject should be considered. At present, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, consumes of *all* the agricultural products of *all* the states north of the Potomac and Ohio, a less value than 500 dollars a year! though the people of these states consume or purchase of her manufacturers to the value of about twenty-eight millions of dollars a year, according to the returns of 1825, and allowing 14 millions for the consumption of the rest of the states, which we presume is about a fair proportion.\* But suppose there was a little of *reality* in the pretensions of Mr. Huskisson as to "free trade," and that the British ports were opened only for the admission of bread-stuffs. It is reasonable to believe that such proceeding might advance the price of flour one dollar per barrel. This increase of price would be laid, of course, on the *whole quantity sold by the growers of grain*—which is pretty nearly equal to 15,000,000 barrels—their *profits* would, therefore, be increased in the sum of fifteen millions of dollars. I beseech the farmers to look at this—the proposition is, in its own nature, as sure as any that can be drawn from "holy writ." And are they to be gulled and cheated thus, by British agents and others, about British "free trade?" There is a degree of *impudence* in the proceedings of these men that is intollerable. And can the farmers support a trade which, (directly), does nothing to support them—which stands as *five hundred* dollars exported and consumed to *twenty eight millions* imported? I have hardly patience when I think of those who gravely resist whatever may tend to remove this outrageous inequality.

In *statistical* subjects, it is especially necessary that the writer should be assisted by the *consideration* of the reader; indeed, he must measurably rely upon it, else the details would be tedious and dry beyond all bearing. But some captious person may ask—how do the grain-growing states bear this inequality in their trade with Great Britain? The answer is easy: by the invaluable trade which they have with one another, and with the rest of the states, and they with them, and by that enjoyed with *other* nations than the British. What sea is not vexed with our industry, what port which is opened to us is not frequented, if theret we can dispose of any commodity, the avails whercof will enable us to pay Britain for her goods? We go over all the world to gather *profit*, and cast it into Britain's lap. But we shall at some future period, shew these things from official documents. The facts, however, are as stated and cannot be denied.

The growth of wool, hemp and flax, and of other articles, *must* be resorted to by the farmers, and the manufacture of them be encouraged and supported, else the greatest and most important branch of business, the agricultural, will fail to produce a reasonable profit to land owners and those who till the soil; and a comparative state of want, (in the present condition of society), become the portion of this chosen and peculiarly valuable people—the *free cultivators of their own lands*—the best depository of the morals, the rights and the liberty of their country—the class which must mainly defend our institutions at arms—the bone and the sinew of every nation in the world. And besides, are their *forests* and their *mines*, the gifts of God for the benefit of his creatures, to remain useless and valueless, because their products, in a rude state, are not required for *FOREIGN* exportation? No—no, they have a "natural and unalienable right" to make

\*That distinguished member of the Pennsylvania delegation in congress, Mr. Stewart, in his excellent speech on what is called the "wool bill," said—

"The plain question is now, shall we abandon our manufactures and our agriculture, and import agricultural productions—wool and woollens, from Great Britain, whose policy now compels her people so starve before they dare consume a mouthful of American bread or American meat, though it were offered to them for nothing?—it is made by their laws a penal offence to do so. This is the question. We are told that we must buy from Great Britain, that she might buy from us! How is this? Great Britain buy from us? What does she buy from the middle and northern states? Nothing. Great Britain from whom we bought in 1825, upwards of 42 millions of merchandise—\$10,682,000 of it wool and woollens, took in exchange of the agricultural produce of all the states north of the Potomac and Ohio, an amount less than \$200! and yet we are told by American statesmen, gentlemen representing these states, that we must purchase wool, (and why not flour too?) from Great Britain, to induce her to purchase from us! I repeat it, and I defy contradiction, for it is proved by our records, that in 1825, the whole exportations into England, Scotland, Ireland, from this country, to feed and support their manufacturers, did not amount to \$200! Sir, only 151! Of flour, rye, corn, wheat, oats, pulse—and every other species of grain, \$88! Of all kinds of animal food—beef, pork, &c. \$31! And of all kinds of drink—whiskey, gin, beer, cider, &c. \$29! With these facts staring him in the face, the British minister himself would blush to ask the grain-growing states of the union to "buy from them, that they may buy from us." Sir, I would say when Great Britain resorts to prohibition, I will countervail her policy by a like resort to prohibition. If she prohibits our flour and provisions, I will prohibit her wool and woollens. We can live as independently of her as she can of us. If she will take but \$151 worth of our bread and meat to feed her manufacturers, I will take but \$151 worth of her wool and woollens. I will go to New England or Steubenville, and buy from those who will buy from me, and who will gladly give us cloth in exchange for our provisions and wool. [See note A.]

such products useful and valuable, and they must and will have *manufactures* of them at home, with *roads* and *canals* for the supply of the *domestic market*, seeing that otherwise they will be considered as rejecting the bounties of heaven, to their own misery, degradation and shame. That little work, the improvement of the navigation of the Schuylkill, in Pennsylvania, will yield a greater annual money-profit, for coal and iron brought into use by it, than the whole foreign export of the state affords to the incalculably valuable body of freemen and farmers in that powerful commonwealth. Those great works, the New York canals, by opening ways to the market, are, or soon will be, in the actual production of more profit to the land holders and farmers of New York and Vermont, &c. than the whole value of the products of agriculture exported from all the states, east and west, located north of the Potomac, and containing a large majority of all the people of the United States. The trade which quietly passes down the Susquehanna, in the products and property of farmers and other land owners on the shores of that river, and its tributaries, and which chiefly centers at Baltimore, though the navigation is hazardous, is of itself equal to about one-half of the whole value of domestic articles exported from Baltimore to foreign places; which includes nearly all the Maryland *tobacco*, with a considerable quantity from Ohio, and large supplies of flour, &c. brought by land from the adjacent parts of Pennsylvania, Virginia, &c. These things are seriously asserted, and we are sure that they are substantially true. Similar cases might be multiplied without end, to shew what is the home market compared with the foreign one, and how insignificant the last is, except as a regulator of the other, to about seven-eighths, perhaps, of the people of the United States who personally till their own fields.—The *hides* of their cattle, when manufactured into leather, are worth much more than the part which they have in the *immediate foreign trade* of the United States\*—and yet their share of the expenses of the navy and foreign missions, &c. incurred for the *immediate defence* of the interests of that trade, is pretty nearly, or about, two millions of dollars a year. But they pay this *tax* cheerfully—as well from patriotic principles as from self-interest, well knowing that whatever gives profitable employment to any portion of their countrymen is beneficial in making a market for themselves.† [See note B.]

We shall now proceed to speak of the cultivation of tobacco—which is chiefly an article for export, and of two very different qualities, "Maryland" and "Virginia," as they are commonly denominated, though made in smaller parcels in several other states.

The produce of this article was greater before the revolution than it is now! Even in 1758, Maryland and Virginia, alone, exported 70,000 hhds. and in the three years 1791, 1792 and 1793 [see the table], we exported 273,647, but in the three years 1822, 1823, and 1824, only 250,061, notwithstanding the great increase of laborers. But the foreign market will not receive more than a certain quantity—the average of the Maryland quality, used for smoking, being short of 30,000 hhds. and that of the Virginia, chiefly used for chewing, less than 50,000; and such is the peculiar condition of this commodity, that 90,000 hhds. exported will produce no more money, on an average, than 80,000! This is a curious example of the effect of *scarcity* and *supply*. and we speak understandingly, as will be seen by a reference to the table, made up from official documents—take the following examples of succeeding years:

\* *Cattle*. The last census of N. York, shews that, more than a year ago, there were 1,513,421 neat cattle in the state—the like of Ohio gives 252,544—together for these states 1,765,965. Such data justify us in believing that these amount to 7,000,000 in the grain-growing and grazing states, already recapitulated. Pennsylvania had 612,998, returned in 1810—seventeen years ago; and they are very numerous in the New England states. But the preceding are all the official statements that we recollect to have seen, and, while it is hardly possible that either could have exceeded the real amount, every probability is that each fell short not less than a fourth. So our calculation appears to be a safe one—and far within the actual amount. Supposing that *calves* are included, the whole stock is renewed about every two years. The "manufacture of hides and skins," as stated in 1810, were valued at \$17,935,477—and the value returned of business done in the tanneries of the states referred to in the same year, (1810,) was about seven millions of dollars—*millions short of the then actual amount*. The returns are so imperfect, as any one will perceive on inspecting them, that, though they keep us from going *too low* in our estimates, they only partially, indeed, assist us in rising to the real sums. We hope better returns hereafter. See REGISTER, vol. VI, page 323, &c. for those of 1810.—Those of 1820 we have not published and hardly ever refer to—for the act of congress so stinted the allowance for this service, that the facts stated are altogether useless for general purposes.

† We meet with the following paragraph in the newspapers—

"A Mr. Wimmel, of Berlin, Prussia, (a brewer), has discovered a method of obtaining *twenty pounds* of good chrystalized sugar, from a Prussian bushel, (about 93 pounds), of wheat. The Paris papers consider the discovery of immense importance. Mr. Wimmel has applied to the French government for a patent."

Now, if this is true, and the process be not very expensive, a considerable source of profit is offered to numerous wheat-growers of the interior of our country, in which four bushels of wheat, or 240 lbs. will not pay for twenty pounds of sugar; and the residuum, after the saccharine matter is extracted, would feed and fatten cattle and hogs, which might be made their "own carriers to market."

| Years. | Hhds.  | Dollars.   |
|--------|--------|------------|
| 1802   | 77,721 | 6,220,000  |
| 1803   | 86,291 | 6,209,000  |
| 1815   | 85,337 | 8,235,000  |
| 1816   | 69,241 | 12,809,000 |
| 1822   | 82,169 | 6,222,000  |
| 1823   | 99,009 | 6,282,000  |

Virginia, which, more than any other state in the union, deserves to be called the "land of steady habits," may long extensively continue the cultivation of tobacco, though cotton is rapidly superseding it in the eastern part of that commonwealth, of which we shall more particularly speak below. The product of tobacco has declined in Kentucky, the Carolinas, Georgia and Louisiana, not being found so profitable as other agricultural pursuits; and, perhaps, when the labor and capital employed are considered, it is the least profitable of any other business in the United States, as it is carried on in Maryland and Virginia, because of the costly labor of slaves; and it has also powerfully tended to retard the progress of population and wealth in these states, by exhausting the soil and driving away free laborers. Virginia, late in the *first* rank of the states, stands the *fourth* in effective population, and, by the census of 1840, will probably be thrown into the *sixth* grade; and in regard to actually operating wealth (which begets wealth), much further behind than that, unless her policy is changed, though her territory is so very extensive and much of her land is of the best quality. But truths like these are offensive; and we wish to appeal to the reason of persons without exciting their passions; and, after one or two further remarks on the cultivation of tobacco, we shall immediately speak of Maryland, our own state.

The following shews the value of tobacco exported in the years given:

|      |             |
|------|-------------|
| 1822 | \$6,222,000 |
| 1824 | 4,855,000   |
| 1826 | 5,215,000   |

The annual average value for the last five years was about \$5,500,000—a less sum than that of the *manufactured* articles exported in the year just ended.\* The first is stationary or declining, the latter rapidly advancing, and very soon to become, after cotton, *much the largest item in our foreign trade*. The simple mention of these facts, exposes the fallacy of the arguments made against the protective system, which, after supplying the demand at home, as to its chief amount for such goods as are protected, has, already, a worth in like articles exported, (to meet the competition of all nations), surpassing that of one of our great staple commodities, and of which, by soil and climate, and through custom, we have something like a monopoly!

But it is to the planters and people of *Maryland* that we would now directly address ourselves. In 1790, we had 319,000 inhabitants and one *eleventh* of the whole population of the United States; in 1820 we had 407,000, and a *twenty-fourth* part of the whole population—in 1830 we shall not shew a *thirtieth* part of such population, unless because of the increase in Baltimore and the other manufacturing districts. Indeed, if these be left out, our population is probably decreasing. In the first congress we had six members out of 65—now we have nine out of 215; and, if the present whole number of members is preserved after the next census, we shall have but seven; and so, from the possession of one *eleventh* part of the power of representation, we have passed to a *twenty-fourth* part, and are just passing into a *thirtieth*. [The same operation has taken place and will act upon our neighbor Virginia—though her western grain-growing and grazing and manufacturing district is doing much, indeed, to keep up her standing, and would have a mighty effect, if less restricted opinions prevailed, and a really representative government were allowed.] Truth thus speaks to us "trumpet tongued"—yet we seem neither to hear or heed it; and what *has been* our chief commodity for export, and furnished the chief means of purchasing foreign goods, (which we have so much preferred, and which the people still blindly wish to see introduced), is about to fail us altogether! Ohio has already materially interfered with our tobacco, and, raised by free labor, can afford to transport it 300 miles by land, and yet undersell our planters in Baltimore, their own local and natural market! See the article from the "American Farmer" which is annexed. The fact is, that most of our intelligent planters regard the cultivation of tobacco in Maryland as no longer profitable, and would almost universally abandon it, if they knew what to do with their slaves, for many reject the idea of selling them: others, however, are less scrupulous, and the consequence is, that great numbers of this unfortunate class are exported to other states, the cost of their subsistence being nearly or about equal to the whole value of their production in this. But Maryland is abundant in resources, if casting away her *prejudices*, "the old man and his deeds," she will profit by her natural advantages. We have good lands, and

|                               |             |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| *They are thus stated—in 1821 | \$2,754,000 |
| 1822                          | 3,120,000   |
| 1823                          | 3,139,000   |
| 1824                          | 4,480,000   |
| 1825                          | 5,700,000   |
| 1826                          | 6,000,000   |

much water power on the western shore.\* The last is considerably improved in Cecil, Baltimore, Frederick and Washington counties, and manufacturing establishments are pretty numerous and respectable; in all these the population is increasing—the farmers have large barns and well filled granaries, and with markets at their doors, as it were, for the chief part of their surplus products, including butter, eggs, vegetables—the hundred little things which the good farmer and prudent housewife collects and saves, and in many cases they, alone, because of the market for them, sell for more money in a year than the whole surplus crops of wheat and corn raised on plantations cultivated by eight or ten slaves, for they themselves eat much, waste more and work little. The whole crop of Maryland tobacco may have an average annual value of \$1,500,000—and this is below the clear product of labor employed in the factories of Baltimore alone! We do not include the employment of mechanics, properly so called; and thus, aided by some foreign commerce and navigation and a large home trade, we have, in this small spot, collected and subsisted more than one sixth part of the gross population, or about a fifth of the whole people of the state—and created a market for the products of the farmers, daily extending in the quantity required and prices given, and to go on as our manufacturing establishments prosper and persons are gathered together to consume the products of the earth. But to the success of these, and the consequent well-being of our farmers, a liberal encouragement of them, and a manly support of internal improvements, must be afforded. Whoever stands opposed to them, is opposed to the best interests of Maryland—for increased attention to both is the only means that we have to prevent ourselves from sinking yet lower in the scale of the states. Maryland, without any sort of interference with other pursuits, might subsist two millions, or more, of sheep, and the product of these would compensate any loss to be caused by ceasing to cultivate tobacco; and besides, and what is more important, most important, indeed, it would prevent the actual or comparative decrease of our people, keep the free laboring classes at the homes of their fathers, and mightily advance the price of lands and add to the general wealth of the state. Real property, of every description, except in the districts spoken of, has exceedingly declined in value, and, indeed, in some parts of the state, is seemingly "without price." If slave-labor ever was profitable with us, it no longer is so—it does not yield more than 3 or 4 per cent. for the capital per capita employed, if even that—this is clearly proved by the export of slaves to the more southern states; a cruel practice, and which we hope may be arrested by the introduction of new articles of agriculture, such as the breeding of sheep, and the cultivation of flax and cotton, and the rearing of the silk worm. These would afford employment to many thousands, and employment begets employment, and money begets money, for prosperity begets prosperity.

But let us further, and for a moment, regard Baltimore as a market for the farmers of Maryland—for we wish the home market clearly understood; most persons know no more of its real value than they do of what is happening in the interior of the earth—and it is the interest of others to prevent inquiry or mystify facts. We are about 70,000. Allow to each person vegetable food equal only to "a peck of corn per week," and we shall appear to consume 910,000 bushels of grain; if we add what is required for the support of horses used for draft, &c. the whole may be moderately estimated as equal to one million of bushels of wheat, per annum. Then suppose we admit that each person wastes or consumes half a pound of animal food per day, as we think that they do and more, and we shall have 25 millions of pounds a year. We also annually require for our families, work shops and factories, more than 100,000 cords of wood. Let us see what these three articles, these three only, will amount to—

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 1,000,000 bushels grain at 1 dollar        | 1,000,000 |
| 25,000,000 lbs. of animal food at 4 cents. | 1,000,000 |
| 100,000 cords of wood (sold at) \$2 25     | 225,000   |
|  | 2,225,000 |

And, at these very low estimates, it appears that the Baltimore market, because of the bread-stuffs, animal food and fuel consumed therein, annually amounts to more than two millions and a quarter of dollars; or one fourth of the whole value of all the bread stuffs and meats exported from all the United States.

Previous to entering upon a more general and particular examination of our great staple for export, cotton, we shall notice one product of agriculture which has a most extraordinary character and operation, indeed—not on exports, but on consumption; we mean sugar.

We see it lately stated in the papers that col. Dummett, of Florida, has made thirty hhd. of sugar from cane raised on thirty five acres of land—say, only 30,000 lbs. The duty, or tax, upon which, if imported, would be \$900; and this a Pennsylvania farmer would, of itself, esteem a neat little profit on the cultivation of a whole farm, for a year. But such are not so favored by soil and climate, and the bounty of the general government.

The sugar crop of Louisiana is about 40,000 hhd. (less than 10,000 in 1810), or, say 44,000,000 lbs. the duty on which, if imported, in exchange for bread-stuffs, &c. would be one million three

\*We have also many valuable mines and minerals, which, though rapidly coming into use, are yet only partially worked. Large quantities of iron ore are carried from the neighborhood of Baltimore to the New England states, there manufactured, and probably brought back again and sold here to purchase or pay for more ore!

hundred and twenty thousand dollars, and this is probably divided between less than two hundred persons—or, if we allow it to benefit all the *people* of Louisiana, is more than *sixteen dollars per head*, for every man, woman, and child, of the state, as a “*bounty*.” Now, a *tax* equal to this on all the people of the United States, would produce a *revenue* of nearly one hundred and sixty millions of dollars a year! Verily, verily, this is “taxing the many for the benefit of the few”—and yet, wonderful to be told, Louisiana is opposed to the tariff and the protection of other branches of domestic industry, as called for by the farmers and others, who make up nearly three fourths of the whole people of the United States. But this is not all.

Sugar has become almost a necessary of life—it certainly is one of its comforts, desired and used by the rich and the poor. The whole amount *consumed* in the United States may be about 120,000,000lbs. say 76 imported and 44 of domestic production. The duty on the former is 3 cents per lb. and amounts to 2,280,000 dollars, on what *costs* about five millions in the foreign islands and places wherein it is obtained; so that the tax is very nearly *fifty per cent. ad valorem*, which is *actually* collected on two thirds of the whole quantity used, to the benefit of those of our own countrymen who produce the other third. And yet Louisiana declaims against “monopolies” and the tariff, which supplies her with such cotton goods for 12½ cents per yard, as lately cost her 20 or 25 cents per yard!

The duty on sugar is *too high*, and it would have been reduced but for the encouragement of the agriculture of Louisiana—and that which is for her peculiar and *selfish* advantage, if the term may be allowed, while it deprives the treasury of 1,320,000 dollars a year, taxes the people in the sum of 1,140,000 dollars annually, more than they would pay, if the duty was reduced only to two cents *per lb.* which would still be a high one. As it is, the poor black wood-sawyer, purchasing only two pounds per week for his family, pays a tax of three dollars and ten cents a year on this solitary article. It is the most onerous tax that we have, and bears particularly hard upon the laboring classes, especially the farmers, mechanics and manufacturers. We ourselves use as much of it, in proportion to the number of our family, as the richest persons among us, in the ordinary way.\* It is true, we might dispense with it—the tax paid is “voluntary,” in the impudent cant of purse-proud dealers in *foreign* merchandize, who are daily, using *our* money, obtained through credits at the custom house for the support of *their* trade! So, as the Indians dispense with the use of shirts, might we—and it is “voluntary” to prefer the snug and comfortable clothes that we wear to the sheep-skin dresses of the Hottentots—it is “voluntary” even that we live and pay taxes at all, for we might escape them by suicide! But the freeman who labors industriously and attends to business faithfully, has a right to be enabled to use sugar, wear shirts, have decent clothing and enjoy life, the gift of the common Creator of us all; aye, and such will defend that right: and, what is worth a whole volume of speculations, they have the means of doing it! The time being fitted for it, we will confidently make it known to the sugar planters and ship-owners, that, if the tariff bill of 1824 had not passed, the tax upon imported sugar would have been reduced to two cents per lb. and that any deficiency in the revenue which might have arisen from that proceeding, (though we believe that it might have *increased* the revenue by *increasing* the consumption of sugar), would have been more than compensated for by withdrawing the fleets of men-of-war that are kept abroad for the *protection* of property in ships and their cargoes. These things would not have taken place wholly on the retaliatory principle, though the very worm that is trodden upon is allowed to turn, but because of the special rightfulness of them, circumstanced as the grain growing and manufacturing interests were. If refused the means of paying taxes,† it was their bounden duty to reduce the amount of taxes demanded. There is a *quid pro quo* which operates in every condition of life; and, as the saying is, every prudent man will “cut his coat according to his cloth.” Look at it!—here was Louisiana receiving a “hot-bed protection” of 1,320,000 dollars a year, in a bounty paid by the people on her sugar, and there were the ship owners defended at the cannon’s mouth, at the cost to the people of a much larger sum—the *whole trade* to the Mediterranean, for example, not taking off so much of gross value in our products as the cost of the fleet amounts to; and yet both these were against the tariff bill of 1824, intended for the encouragement of our *farmers* and manufacturers, and supported by their representatives in congress, as the votes will yet shew! We would not either “razee” the duty on sugar, or “toma-hawk” the navy—but those who “live should let live.” No state in the union profits like Louisiana by the tariff—the price of her cotton is assisted by it, as we shall shew when we speak about that article, though she is supplied with cotton goods at from 40 to 50 *per cent.* cheaper than before the act of 1824 was passed; but the direct and *actual* protection or bounty which she receives, is equal to sixteen dollars per head for every one of her people—and were all the people of the United States so protected, the amount of protection would be in the sum of one hundred and sixty millions of dollars a year! as before stated, and repeated that it may not be forgotten. No one can dispute this. And further, is a “monopoly” because of climate in the south, less odious than

\*The family of the writer of this, consisting of nine persons, consumes not less than 450 lbs. a year. The tax that he pays then on sugar is thirteen dollars and a half a year.

†It is a notorious fact, that every profitable manufacturing establishment increases the consumption of foreign luxuries or comforts. A manufacturing village of 3 or 400 people, consumes more coffee, tea, sugar, silks, &c. than five times as many persons of the same class, employed in agriculture.



a "monopoly" because of climate in the north, or the west, or the east? What is the sugar-planter better than the wool-grower? Is it not quite as necessary to have clothes to shield us from the cold of our winters, as sugar to sweeten our coffee? But we desire both, and only ask, while the production of the last is *protected*, that the growth and manufacture of wool for the other may be *encouraged*; and Louisiana, who receives so liberally, should instruct her senators and representatives to give a little. It is by mutual concessions and accommodations that the peace of families and societies is maintained; but there is a disposition wisely implanted in the human mind, to *require* such concessions and accommodations between persons possessing equal rights, and it operates in great things as the writer of this really put it into practice about two years ago in a small affair: in returning from my dinner, I was accustomed, almost every day, to meet a dandy Englishman just imported, (or eloped, as the case might be), who majestically strutted along the middle of the pavement. I gave way, and went unthinkingly to the right or the left, for a considerable time; but, at last, was satisfied that he demanded this homage to his puppyism. The next time when we were about to pass, I kept the middle of the pavement—he came on rapidly as usual, with his head up and eyes raised, and wholly unprepared to receive my *elbow*, which he run *afoul* of, (having turned myself half-round to *accommodate* him with it), and he nearly fell down in consequence—being a lighter man than myself. He looked wildly for a moment at me, I looked calmly at him, but not a word was said—we passed, and ever after that he conceded a part of the pavement to me, as I had been quite willing to yield a part of it to him, or any other person, though black and a slave. This familiar case, will serve as well as the most elaborate one that could be stated, to shew the principle on which society is sustained.

We shall now present some facts and opinions bearing upon the present great staple of our country, *cotton*; whatever belongs to it is full of interest and highly important to every section of our country and all descriptions of persons. And on this occasion, it may be proper to express our serious belief, that, if the doctrines which we have supported for so many years, have been beneficial to any one class of the people more than another, *that class is the cultivators of cotton*. It is with much satisfaction, indeed, we observe that many of the planters begin to discover this, and that a radical change of opinion may be speedily hoped for. A little while ago, or three or four years since, the people of the eastern states, devoted to commerce and navigation, were as much opposed to a tariff for the encouragement and protection of domestic manufactures as those of the southern states now are. It has been *demonstrated*, that success in manufactures has increased the commerce and navigation of the east, and *was*, also, adding powerfully to the wealth and population of these states. But with how much more reason may it be expected that they will assist the southern states, seeing that they even now and already consume *one-fourth* of the whole crop of cotton raised in them!

We have been lately honored with many letters containing sentiments similar, to those in the extract we are about to introduce, which is from one of the most highly honored and worthy gentlemen of the south, and which came to hand since this article was in preparation for the press. He says—

*"There is a perfect coincidence of opinion between us on the subject of protecting home manufactures. Bad as the times are for the cotton planters, (of whom I am one in a small way), they would be much worse, but for the demand of our manufactories for the raw article. I should like to see more efficient protection extended to the growth and manufacture of wool. These and such like measures will in time make us independent."*

The preceding is a literal extract, and the particular words are marked as by the writer himself: and such, we repeat it, is a rapidly growing opinion among the people of the south. *The time will come*, when cotton planters shall be many times more anxious for a protective tariff than the cotton spinners! To the last, indeed, it is *now* of little importance, except to maintain *steadiness* in the home market; for they meet the British in fair and manly competition *abroad*, and undersell them in every market which is equally free to our fabrieks and their's.\* This is "*confirmation strong as proofs from holy writ*," that, while they consume so large a portion of the products of our planters, they neither demand or receive any advance from the said planters on the manufactured article, over and above what would be paid to foreigners, whether the cotton was of American product or not; but furnish them with cotton goods at much reduced prices.

The progress of the cultivation of cotton in the United States, is, every way, wonderful. If any person had predicted, 35 years ago, that the crop of 1826 would have amounted to 720,000 bales, or about 250 millions of pounds, we should have put him down for a madman or a fool—saying "go to the hospital, go;" if any one had asserted only fifteen years ago, that North Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, &c. should now produce what they do, we *could* not have believed him; if it had been said only five years ago, that Virginia would cultivate and send into the market nearly 40,000 bales in 1826, we should have laughed at the proposition: and if it had been sug-

\*A commercial letter from Lima dated Oct. 1, 1826, says—"Our unbleached 3-4 and 7-8 domestics are gaining ground here daily, and in all cases preferred to English or India cottons. They generally command a living profit at least. There have been samples of them sent to England for imitation, but whether they have succeeded we are not able to say."

Many like letters might be quoted from other parts. But what a volume of instruction is obtained in the few lines we have given!

gested, that a *crop* of cotton should be made in Maryland in the last year, many would have smiled at the "notion." How much further *worth* the cultivation will go—no one can venture to assert; but Maryland, Delaware, New Jersey, and Illinois and Missouri, and perhaps, other states, may, very possibly, furnish considerable supplies of cotton; and Arkansas and Florida will certainly cultivate the plant as extensively as it is cultivated any where, if profitable. The cotton-producing region of the United States thus embraces a vast tract of land—capable, in itself, if cultivated as it easily may be, sufficient to supply the *whole world* with that valuable commodity. Of this, and of the progress of its cultivation, the planters should take most serious notice. Egypt is pouring out *new* and large supplies for the European market, and that country and Greece and the Greek islands, are capable, in themselves, of supplying all Europe—and probably will do it, should the latter be emancipated and have peace. Labor is *much* cheaper in those countries than in our southern states. A freeman may be hired for a little more than the annual interest on the money vested in the person of a slave in this country; and it is cost of labor and subsistence, with the requisitions of government, that must forever establish the comparative prices of commodities, not confined to the production of *peculiar* climates. The immense island, or continent, of New Holland, also begins to furnish supplies—and the land on the globe fitted to the growth of cotton, is competent to furnish a thousand times more than its people can consume; and besides, the cotton of many countries (except as to the small quantity of "sea island" which we raise) is better than our own. It is impossible then, that we can have and preserve a "monopoly" in the production or sale of this staple. *Our cultivation has already passed beyond the profitable demand.* The crop of 1826, compared with that of 1825, shows an increase of 150,000 bales, or more than one fourth of the whole quantity produced in 1825! *Can this increase continue?* No—no—no—indeed, no!

Cotton first began to be raised in 1789 or 1790, except as a *garden* product. In 1791, we exported 189,816 lbs. 1,691,000 in 1794, 20,911,000 in 1801, a part of which was of foreign growth, for it was not till 1802 that a discrimination was made as to its origin. And out of these small beginnings we have risen up to the production of 250 millions of pounds in 1826. The quantity and value of cotton exported has exceedingly fluctuated, and the remarks which are applied above to tobacco are also applicable to it, respecting scarcity and supply. The following items are interesting.

| Years.  | Pounds.     | Value—Dollars. |
|---------|-------------|----------------|
| 1791    | 189,800     |                |
| 1796    | 6,100,000   |                |
| 1800    | 17,789,000  |                |
| 1802    | 27,501,000  | 5,250,000      |
| 1807    | 66,212,000  | 14,332,000     |
| 1810    | 93,874,000  | 15,108,000     |
| { 1815. | 82,998,000  | 17,529,000     |
| { 1816  | 81,747,000  | 24,106,000     |
| { 1819  | 87,937,000  | 21,031,600     |
| { 1820  | 127,860,000 | 22,308,000     |
| { 1823  | 173,723,000 | 20,445,000     |
| { 1824  | 142,369,000 | 21,947,000     |

The years connected with a brace (—) and several other *pairs* of years that might be offered from the table, shew that *quantity* and *value* have no certain relation one with the other: 87 millions of pounds, exported in 1819, were nearly as valuable as 127 millions in 1820; and 173 millions in 1823, produced 1,500,000 dollars less than 142 millions in 1824. These facts certainly shew that the foreign demand may be exceeded—or rather, that an excess quantity cannot be sold except at a reduced price.

The whole crop of 1826 is estimated at

1825 720,027 bales. 560,249

Increase in one year

150,778


Of the 720,000 bales, we suppose that about 175,000 will be consumed in the United States, and that 545 millions of pounds may be left for exportation, if the foreign market will receive it; but when the annual commercial tables are published from the treasury department, we shall be able to speak more fully on this interesting point. It is well known that our own manufacturers were the *chief purchasers* in the early part of last season. We may expect that they will require 250,000 bales, in from six to ten years, unless destroyed by some *suicidal* policy. When they shall reach that quantity, about 150,000 bales will be made into goods for the *foreign* market; for it is just as certain to our mind as any almost every other future event can be, that the British manufacture of cotton must decline, and many people will depend upon *this*, instead of *that* country, for their supplies of *cotton goods*. Some of the reasons for this belief we set forth in the article published in the REGISTER of the 27th January, ult.\* Let us however look to the *present* only.—

\*We have since met with the following, from a London paper, which is not less applicable to the relation in which England stands to our country than to France.

Mr. Macdonell, in his "treatise on Free Trade," gives a comparative statement of the expen-

Can any one fail to suppose that the domestic demand for *one fourth* of the whole quantity produced, has no effect on the price? We think that every reflecting calculating merchant or dealer, every one who has thought of what belongs to scarcity and supply, production and demand, would estimate this demand as equal to 10, 15 or 20 per cent. advance. Indeed, the price of cotton exported in 1822, 1823 and 1824 shew this—for in these years our manufacturers were exceedingly depressed, and many of them *absolutely ruined*. Stop their mills and looms *now*, and cotton, if worth eight cents, would tumble down to six; and the price of cotton goods would as suddenly rise, at the same or a greater ratio, and thus make a *double loss to the American people*, and a *double gain to foreigners*. No business-man will contest the *principle* of this proposition—it rests upon the *natural and unavoidable* rules of trade, and is applicable to all sorts of commodities. But admit that the present domestic demand has effect to raise the price of cotton only *half a cent per lb.* or *five per cent.* on its value, and this we think that the most obstinate and resolutely blind opponent of the tariff will be compelled to allow as being very reasonable: then, if the crop be 250 millions of pounds, the gain to the planters, because of *this demand*, is \$1,250,000. This item we wish especially recollected—for it will be referred to below.

These results, simple as they are, will not fail to excite surprise in many persons. "*Who would have thought it?*" But such is the result of almost every investigation, or comparison, of things at home with things abroad. Let us usefully shew this, in a case that is exactly in point. If the *importations* of the United States amount to about 75 or 80 millions, (which may be taken as an average official value of them), the *woollen, cotton, flaxen and hempen* goods, including ALL manufactured articles of these, used for the clothing of persons, and for all family or other purposes in which such goods are required, will make up 21 or 22 millions of the amount. Now, if these cloths and cassimeres, worsteds and stuffs, blankets and rugs, cotton piece goods, printed, colored or white, nankeens, woollen and cotton hose, flaxen and hempen goods—worth, in the whole 22 millions of dollars, be divided among the people of the United States, each person might receive almost *two dollars worth of such goods in a year*—some of which, however, are not consumed, being exported. Who cannot "draw an inference" from this?—that our people would be "*clothed with nakedness*," if they depended on the *foreign supply*? The probable value of such goods consumed cannot be less in the whole, than 120 millions, which is about ten dollars only for every person, including what is required for family and other purposes, *never excepting cotton bagging!!!* But such is the effect of scarcity and supply, as before several times alluded to, that the small value imported interferes with the whole quantity consumed— and ten millions worth thrown into the market over the amount of the needful supply, will effect that supply more than the ten millions, extra, are worth in themselves, and paralyze the *whole business*. "*Every good rule works both ways*"—if this foreign excess in articles manufactured produces such imposing effects on ourselves, what would be the state of the European market for our cotton, if we exported *one-fourth* more than we now do? Let cotton planters calculate it! Again, and further to demonstrate this operation, and shew the importance of activity in the market—when the late news arrived as to the transportation of British troops to Portugal, flour momentarily advanced one dollar per barrel. Now, we could not expect to send to Portugal more than 2 or 300,000 barrels, in the present year, under any probable circumstances. The difference of value would have been only 300,000 dollars; but that difference might have affected the whole value of all the bread stuffs in all the United States—the annual consumption of which, we are morally certain, is equal to 30,000,000 barrels of flour; so there would have been a generally increased value on every barrel of flour or bushel of grain which yet remained in the United States for consumption, had the rise caused by the expected demand in Portugal been maintained, which was only in the sum of \$300,000! "He that runs may read" and understand this; no proposition in Euclid is more capable of unerring solution. And who would regret this advance in price to the farmers? Supposing they consume one half of all which they produce, it would have added several millions of dollars to the *active circulating medium* of the country, and every man, because of the increased facility with which he might obtain money, would very gladly pay his own advance on the cost of a barrel of flour. The *cash* would all be among ourselves—not a cent would be *lost* by it. For our own part, we are perfectly satisfied that we can well afford to pay 10 dollars for a barrel of flour (that being the common selling price), better than five, and fifty cents per lb. for the cotton used in the goods which we purchase better than ten, unless the appreciated prices shall grow out of actual scarcity in the domestic production. Either would make money "*plenty*," and, in the general stir of it, we should pick up *extra* sums, and receive *extra* subscribers, the *extra* profits by which would pay our own advances on the articles named an hundred times over. And thus it is with every person engaged in business. Our *draymen* would be glad of it, and make a large profit out of such a state of things.

But further—we assert, and  appeal to the documents,\* that the whole value of all the

diture of a London mechanic, with a wife and four children, and that of a Parisian mechanic with the same family. That of the one he estimates at 78*l* per annum, and of the latter at 45*l*. 10*s*. Of the excess of expenditure in the case of the English laborer, (viz: 32*l*. 18*s*.) he attributes one eighth, (or 4*l*. 1*s*. 3*d*.) to the greater amount of taxation which is paid, directly or indirectly, by the English mechanic, as compared with the taxation borne by the French artisan.

\*Referring to those of 1823—the year preceding the adoption of the present tariff.

woollen, cotton, flaxen, or hempen goods, imported, and of all the mixtures of them, of all sorts, sizes, shapes, colors—from the dimensions of the finest thread, to carpets many yards wide, has an average annual value of about twenty two millions a year. Well—by the census of 1820 there were, say, 8,000,000 of the *people* and 10,000,000 *persons* in the United States. We shall, however, use the latter number to avoid the shadow of offence on any account whatever. The whole population of the cotton growing states and *districts*, (without reference to the amount of persons employed in the cultivation of the plant), may be thus roughly shewn:

|                           |           |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| One eighth of Virginia    | 133,000   |
| One fourth North Carolina | 160,000   |
| All South Carolina        | 490,000   |
| All Georgia               | 340,000   |
| All Alabama               | 127,000   |
| All Louisiana             | 153,000   |
| All Mississippi           | 75,000    |
| Half Tennessee            | 221,000   |
|                           | <hr/>     |
|                           | 1,699 000 |

"All told" 1,700,000 *persons*, or 1,000,000 of the *people* of the United States. Now let us suppose that the duties levied on the goods above described are really [*yes, really*] paid to the amount of thirty per cent. on the reported cost, and it will appear that the whole revenue derived from them may be 6,600,000 dollars; and then, if we admit the 1,700,000 *persons* to pay their full and equitable share of the whole, (which is admitted only for the sake of the *argument*, for slaves are not made to contribute, through their masters, as freemen do), we have 1,122,000 dollars paid by the cotton growing states and *districts*, on all the goods above described; and, if we allow that one fourth of the duties collected is more for the *protection* of our manufactures than the general revenue of government, the amount will be 280,500 dollars a year, one fourth only of the increased value on cotton because of the tariff, at the exceedingly moderate rate supposed above, and one fifth only of what Louisiana directly and certainly obtains on her sugar, through the tariff—"the accursed tariff"—or an eighth part of the duties paid on that article imported and consumed by the people of the United States, which is about the sum of \$2,280,000 and would be \$3,600,000 were not the sugar of the state just named duty free! Who is not surprised at these results? The subject might be further pursued, and we shall probably hereafter publish a statement to shew the operation of the new tariff, and the *extra* amount APPARENTLY paid under it, on all sorts of articles. It will amount to a small sum, indeed; but the REALITY is, taking all the articles together, that those which have been protected are cheaper because of that protection. So much for the law which an "honorable gentleman" in his place in congress, swore "*by Heaven, Georgia would never submit to!*"

We shall now hasten to bring this essay to a conclusion.

The cultivation of cotton is not now at all a profitable business—the capital vested is large, and the product, in money, comparatively small. A Huntsville paper of the 26th January says, "*the planters of North Alabama will readily agree that the present price of cotton will not defray the expense of cultivation, rent free.*" Another paper of the same place, of the 19th, speaking of the prospects of the cotton planters, says—

"These are gloomy beyond all former example, and the price is depressed below the wishes or expectations of our worst enemies." No sensible man would have ventured, five years ago, to predict, that upland cotton of fair quality, would ever fall below six cents per pound; but this sad reverse we have witnessed and felt to our astonishment and mortification. It is well understood, in cotton growing countries, that the article cannot be grown and yield a reasonable interest on the capital employed, at less than eight cents per pound, and that the actual disbursements, independent of the interest on the capital employed, nearly equal the present price of cotton."†

"Who are those "enemies?" They who predicted the present state of things, and warned the planters against it?—who exhorted a consumption at home, to prevent so great a glut in the market abroad? ED. REG.

†The following is from the same paper:

The leading agriculturalists of South Carolina are awake to the importance and necessity of adopting some new culture in that state. The different agricultural societies have formed a United Agricultural Society for the state, composed of delegates from the local societies. At a recent meeting, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Resolved, That it be recommended to every member of this society, to use his best efforts for promoting, in his respective district, the culture of some staple, suited to our climate, and which may divert the attention of planters from the culture of cotton, now produced in excess.

Resolved, That a premium of forty dollars be awarded to any experimentalist who shall succeed in introducing such new culture, on a space of ground not less than one acre."

This last resolution is evidently intended to encourage experiments with the vine and the mulberry.

It is stated, that superior specimens of domestic wines and of homespun osnaburges, were pro-

Then follow some excellent remarks on the fluctuations in the price of cotton, and the excess of quantity raised, which, if much more augmented, it is stated, will cause plantations and slaves to be a tax on proprietors, for that "the proceeds will not defray the disbursements," &c. all which is very probable or very true, and we, indeed, exceedingly regret it: but "bad as the business of growing cotton may be at the present time, it would be much worse" except for the home manufacture of it—it would not yield so much by *one cent per lb.* though we have only supposed *half a cent* in the preceding speculations on this point of our subject. We feel confident of this, and so the difference to the cotton-growers would amount to \$2,500,000 in the year! Examine it—it is so. The home-market too, is extending. A steam boat arrived at *Pittsburg*, a few days since from Nashville, laden with six hundred and thirteen bales! The home consumption is about 175,000 bales—or one fourth of the whole product. The whole amount of domestic cottons sold in Philadelphia, in the years 1804, '5 and '6, were valued at only \$17,670: those sold the last year were worth *four millions*. We as sincerely sympathise with our brethren, the cotton growers, as with the grain growers and wool growers. Whatever depresses either, injures the whole country. There is no incompatibility in the prosperity of all these interests and of the manufacturing and commercial, for all operate to a common object. But I repeat it—except the sugar planting interest, there is no other interest in the country more benefitted by the tariff than the cotton planting. The duty is three cents per lb. which several times has, and in future will be, a *protection*, notwithstanding the export of that article, because of the very *inferior* qualities that might be imported and interfere with those grown by us. And to terminate this long essay, with observing, that the time is close at hand when the cotton planters of the United States will be no less the open and avowed friends of the "American system" than are the manufacturers of cotton, of wool, or iron: and expressing a hope, that the three hundred subscribers in the south which we lost, within a few years past, because of our perseverance in respect to that system, (though our list is still respectable and now on the *increase* in that part of our country), will produce the gain of six hundred, because of the good that we honestly endeavored to do, and sincerely believed that we were doing, to our fellow citizens of the south; to whom, as to all others, we wish peace and prosperity—and shall always esteem ourselves happy, indeed, if, while suffering what at a certain period appeared like a *persecution*, we can benefit those who have persecuted us, even in the least degree, through our humble exertions in behalf of domestic industry, as the chief agent to render these United States really independent of the old world, and to knit them together in the bonds of a common interest and feeling, for the accomplishment of great national purposes, and the advancement of individual enjoyment, personal security, and the—"general welfare!"

---

NOTE—TOBACCO.

[It will be observed that this article was written before our *rail-road* project was on foot. The books were opened on Tuesday last, and though not to be closed for ten days, and subscriptions were received at other places, the amount of shares taken, (and by those who will pay for them, and generally keep them), already much exceeds the number allowed in the charter. ED. REC.]

In a late number of the "American Farmer," the intelligent editor, speaking of *tobacco*, says—

Little or none of the article, the growth of 1826, has as yet come to this market, *except from Ohio*. From that state several crops have been inspected, and sold for high prices. One lot of six hogsheads sold yesterday for from 12 to 13 dollars round, and the whole crop of the same planter, eighteen hogsheads in number, has passed inspection in the finest order, and has averaged nearly, if not quite, 14 dollars per hundred. The perfection to which the Ohio planters, have already attained, in what has been deemed difficult in the culture, and yet more in the process of preparing for market, is a remarkable proof of the superiority to be expected in every case where the actual produce is under the constant influence of self-interest and the prospect of immediate personal profit. That influence, united with the fertility of the soil, and the extraordinary adaptation of their new lands to tobacco of the finest quality, is raising up a competition to which the planter of the seaboard, slave-labor district, will have to yield, notwithstanding his greater facilities of transportation to markets; and if this transatlantic rivalry be at this time so formidable, how much more irresistible when, by means of the Ohio and Chesapeake canal, the only advantage in favor of the slave-holding planter, shall have been removed, and upon how many more articles will that rivalry bear? The Ohio planters, who visit our market, aver that whilst they can get four dollars per hundred on their farms, or what is the same thing, clear of expenses in this market, they will regard it as a profitable object for the employment of their labor and capital. The particular crops of which we have spoken were transported from more than fifty miles beyond Wheeling, for \$1 75 per cwt, and it may probably be assumed that the average cost of transportation from the state of Ohio not now more than \$2 50, or \$25 per 1,000 lbs. When the canal shall have been finished, the cost, according to the anticipations of its friends, will not exceed five, perhaps three dollars per hogshead. May it not, then, be predicted, that Ohio tobacco, of the *finest quality*, will be brought here and sold for less than we can make Maryland of the worst? And what must be the effect of this upon the price of Maryland lands? This side of

sent to the society. The planters of Alabama should follow this example, for surely in no part of the union is cotton such a drug as in this state.

the picture wears truly a gloomy aspect in the eyes of Maryland planters: but are there not countervailing advantages in store for them? And, were there not, do they not find in their *public spirit*, and their devotion to the general good, an unfailing *salvo* for any personal sacrifice? It is known, in proof of their patriotism, that the planters of Prince George's have disputed for nothing but the honor of who should be the first to break ground in this great national work.

*From Niles' Register, of June 3, 1827.*

The following account of certain flannel manufactories is added, to shew their effect upon the agricultural interests of the country.

"Between Salisbury and Amesbury, and about three miles above Newburyport, (says the N. York American), the river Powow discharges itself into the Merrimack. On the Salisbury side of this stream is a flannel factory that employs 80 hands, and manufactures weekly 100 pieces flannel, and pays yearly \$20,000 for labor. On the Amesbury side of the Powow is a factory that employs 180 workmen, manufactures 200 pieces of flannel per week, and pays annually \$40,000 for labor. A new building is erecting which will contain 10,000 spindles, and manufacture 400 pieces of flannel per week."

From the *data* thus given we gather, or assume, the following facts:

|  |          |           |
|--|----------|-----------|
| The persons employed.....                      | No.      | 620       |
| Wages paid.....                                | dollars. | 140,000   |
| to each person, per annum.....                 | "        | 225       |
| Pieces of flannel, weekly.....                 | No.      | 700       |
| ditto annually.....                            | "        | 36,400    |
| Yards made annually, (46 each piece).....      | "        | 1,674,400 |
| Wholesale price, average 35 cts. per yard..... | dollars. | 586,000   |
| Wool consumed*.....                            | pounds.  | 900,000   |
| Value of wool, at 18 cents per lb.....         | dollars  | 162,000   |

¶The preceding, we believe, may be accepted as a tolerably correct statement of the operations of the three flannel factories alluded to, on the *data* furnished. The wages paid shew that a large part of the persons employed must be adults, and these are always numerous in and about woollen factories. Many must be heads of families, and it seems not unreasonable to conclude that their subsistence, fuel, &c. the products or property of farmers, may amount to 100,000 dollars a year.† The wool is worth about 160,000 dollars, and the miscellaneous articles consumed in or at the factories, such as fuel, food for horses, &c. must amount to many thousand dollars more. At any rate, it is quite safe to conclude, if our information be at all worthy of reliance as to quantities, and our averages are pretty nearly right, that these three factories furnish a direct market for the annual consumption of agricultural products to the value of 260,000 dollars a year. Then, there are supplies of brick, stone and lime, timber, glass, &c. &c. for the factory-houses and the many other *new* buildings necessary to accommodate so many people—then come the masons and carpenters, &c. to erect and furnish them, the iron makers, &c. to supply materials, and the workers in metal and wood to make the machinery; and all these, and their families, are fed, and enabled to pay for articles consumed by them, through the capital invested and employment supplied at these establishments. Further, the transport of the various necessaries for these people and the materials used by them, with that of the goods manufactured, must constantly employ many tons of shipping and many wagners, wagons and horses, &c. and these again must be supported and subsisted, and are so by means of these factories, for which it will appear there must be sufficient resources, because the work-people and wool-growers being paid, there will yet remain 282,000 dollars a year for *other* expenses and profit on capital. But it would require a minuteness of detail that might be tedious, (if we felt able to give it), to shew the *whole extent of the business and profit accruing on account of these works*: sufficient, however, has been said to assist those who are pleased to *think* on subjects of this sort, to discern what a range of business grows out of such establishments. Now, if those flannels were made in Old England instead of New England, this whole business would be lost to us, and we should have to pay to Englishmen the whole value of the goods in cash, while losing the whole value of them at home—as, because of this operation, England would not receive of us one dollar's worth more of *any* of the productions of our country, not even of cotton, than she now does—for she takes nothing which actual undiguised *necessity* does not impose upon her; no one thing that she can make or procure within herself, though at much higher prices than we could and gladly would supply it at.

We think it probable that the three factories spoken of subsist in wages paid, compensations allowed for services variously rendered, or interest on capital, more than two thousand persons; and the whole product, (586,000 dollars), will allow for each of the 2000, adults and children, an average sum of 293 dollars: and we conclude that at least *one half* of the whole sum would not have been earned but because of these factories, as numbers that are made producers would have remained among the consuming classes, and the value of many of the materials used would not *otherwise* have been ascertained. Mines of gold or of coal, are both and equally valueless without labor—which is the first principle of all creations, save by ALMIGHTY POWER; by whom things are commanded into existence, and they exist.

\*Furnished in the rough, or but partially cleaned. We do not pretend that this item, or that which follows, is entirely accurate, not having practical men to consult—but they are sufficiently near it, for general purposes. The difference between the *weight* of parcels of wool purchased of the farmers and of the cloth made out of it, is very large. The waste, we are told, often exceeds *fifty per cent*.

†The people employed in these works would be subsisted though the works themselves were not—but not so plentifully; and the benefits derived from the *circulation* of the money earned and expended by them would be materially affected. Besides, and which is most important in the special consideration of this subject, but, for this employment, many of them would be engaged in the production of agricultural articles, and increase instead of consume the surplusses wanting a market, and reduce the value of the whole of them.

From Niles' Register, of June 9, 1827.

**VIRGINIA VERSUS PENNSYLVANIA** The great cause of "Virginia doctrines" vs. "Pennsylvania practices," is again to be argued before the people of the United States. By adhering to the former, Virginia has advanced the number of her people 160,000 in 30 years, from 1790 to 1820; and by the latter, Pennsylvania has increased her people 625,000 in the same time, or more than all Virginia contains; and the wealth\* of the latter has proportionably advanced. Thus—

|              | 1790.   | 1820.     | 1830.     |
|--------------|---------|-----------|-----------|
| Virginia     | 442,117 | 602,974   | 690,000   |
| Pennsylvania | 429,099 | 1,049,398 | 1,340,000 |

The first period shews a difference in favor of Virginia of 13,000—the second in favor of Pennsylvania of 447,000; and the next census will increase this balance to 650,000, or more—and the people of the United States, located in Pennsylvania, will be more than twice as numerous as those who shall be located in Virginia—yet the latter has fifty per cent. more territory, and a much larger quantity of good land than the former, and is, in every respect, as well fitted by Providence for the comfortable subsistence of a dense population of industrious and enlightened citizens. But our present intention is only to mention these things. We design soon to publish certain tables to bring out the statistics of the two states in bold relief—that "he who runs may read" the difference between "Virginia doctrines" and "Pennsylvania practices." We are not, however, disposed to quarrel with Virginia because her great men prefer words to works—being more willing to make a long speech than dig a long canal, or make a long road—to argue about the thickness of a hair, and prove that a minority ought to rule the state to preserve its "republican" character, instead of producing any thing of the value of a hair, or in any wise shewing what good the minority does in virtue of the sovereign power possessed: but we are not content that these "doctrines" shall be forced on others, and that Pennsylvania shall give up her "practices" to them; for, with her adhesion to the "rules of the Virginia school," misery will abound every where, and free laborers be compelled to go supperless to bed, because of the disposition rather to encourage the importation of British goods than to protect the manufacture of like goods at home, though the British people will not consume of all the products of labor in Pennsylvania the value of one hundred dollars a year.

The doctrines of one state and the practices of the other, are well manifested in the following resolutions, which we offer in contrast.

The third resolution of the series offered by Mr. Giles, now governor of Virginia, and passed at the last session of the legislature, runs as follows:

Resolved, In like manner [that is, "in behalf of the people and government" of Virginia], that this general assembly does most solemnly protest against the claim or exercise of any power, whatever, on the part of the general government, to protect domestic manufactures, the protection of manufactures not being amongst the grants of power to that government, specified in the constitution of the United States;—and also, against the operation of the act of congress, passed May 22d, 1824, entitled, "an act, to amend the several acts imposing duties on imposts," generally called the tariff law, which vary the distributions of the proceeds of the labor of the community, in such a manner as to transfer property from one portion of the U. States to another; and to take private property from the owner for the benefit of another person, not rendering public service,—as unconstitutional, unwise, unjust, unequal and oppressive.

Other like opposing proceedings might be shewn in regard to internal improvement; and as that subject together with the protection of domestic industry, are, indeed, the only great matters now at issue before the American people, it remains to be seen whether Pennsylvania will adopt the "doctrines" of Virginia or continue steadfast to her own principles and practices. The policy of the two states are at variance as much as light is with darkness; and it is impossible that both can be gratified. One must give way to the address or power of the other. There is no middle ground; no "combination" can reconcile the existing differences of opinion, in matters of political faith and practice, as prevailing in them. The policy of Virginia, as it was in the last war with England, would deny, even to our soldiers and sailors a sufficiency of clothing to defend them from the inclemency of the seasons when fighting our battles; but that of Pennsylvania will furnish them

The following preamble and resolution were adopted in the legislature of Pennsylvania in the session of 1823-4, and intended to have effect in obtaining the passage of the act of May, 1824, which is protested against as "UNCONSTITUTIONAL, UNWISE, UNJUST, UNEQUAL and OPPRESSIVE."

"Whereas manufactures have been established in Pennsylvania, by the enterprising patriotic and laudable spirit of individuals and companies, at a vast sacrifice of money and time; as they are in a suffering condition, and as congress can alone apply the remedy; and as their encouragement would facilitate the employment of the indigent, and afford a market for the surplus produce of the farmer; and it being the interest of Pennsylvania that domestic manufactures should be cherished and fostered: therefore,

Be it resolved, by the senate and house of representatives of Pennsylvania, that the senators of the United States, be and they are hereby requested, to advocate, support and procure the adoption of any measures having a tendency to increase, foster or protect the manufacturing establishments of Pennsylvania.

\*Of one of the war loans, Pennsylvania had \$2,340,000—and Virginia 30 228

abundantly, and every where cause "the wilderness to blossom as the rose," and rear a home-made standard of saucy independence!

We shall only add the following extract of a letter lately received from a correspondent in Virginia, who had had a conversation with the present "head man" of the learned interpreters of the constitution in that state. This distinguished individual asserted, that, "if the the wool bill had passed, or any further restrictions shall be made on foreign goods, that Virginia and all the southern states would [or will] prohibit *New England* goods, or lay a duty on them equal to that laid by the *United States* on the foreign." We believe this, for we have personally heard the same thing said, by a Virginian, and laughed heartily at it, three or four years ago; except that the disciple then went further, and swore most lustily, that Virginia would forbid the introduction of any article manufactured north of the *Potomac*! This is literally the truth. Virginia make a law to "regulate commerce" between the states, because of a law of the *United States*! What a "construction of the constitution" would that be! It is too ridiculous for serious reprehension. It is the frog blowing itself to equal the size of the ox.

\*"Head man." We use this appellation in a serious manner, and with reference to the character it implies, because of the effect that would follow the policy supported. We speak with authority before us. In Dec. 1815, that late excellent whig, *Benjamin Austin*, addressed a letter to THOMAS JEFFERSON, requesting his opinions on the propriety and necessity of encouraging domestic manufactures. The latter, under date of Jan. 9, 1816, fully and frankly replied to his friend, and, after revoking the opinions he had expressed in his "Notes on Virginia," in 1785, said—

"We have experienced what we did not then believe, that there exists both profligacy and power enough to exclude us from the field of interchange with other nations; that to be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturalist. The former question is suppressed, or rather assumes a new form. The grand enquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures, must be for reducing us either to a dependence on that nation, or be clothed in skins, and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am proud to say, I AM NOT ONE OF THESE. Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort—and if those who quote me as of a different opinion, will keep pace with me in purchasing nothing foreign, where an equivalent of domestic fabric can be obtained, without regard to difference of price, it will not be our fault if we do not have a supply at home equal to our demand, and wrest that weapon of distress from the hand which has so long wantonly wielded it."

Every word in this extract "tells." It is the voice of him who drafted that "fanfaronade of nonsense," as John Randolph calls the declaration of independence, pleading to the people that independence may be preserved! Rather than be a SAVAGE—"live like a wild beast in dens and caverns," he would purchase home-made goods, "without regard to difference of price." What would he then not have done when the fact is manifested to the American people, that PROTECTED MANUFACTURES are all at LESS PRICE than the FOREIGN ONES were before that protection was extended? This is the truth: Even Mr. Cambreleng will not deny it.

#### NOTES.

(A.) The reader will please bear in mind that the amount of our agricultural productions consumed by the people of Great Britain and Ireland, is always regarded. In the year stated, we exported to that country \$108,142 worth of flour, \$364 worth of corn, and some other articles of small amounts—but the British people were not allowed to eat even these little things, which must have been bonded for "exportation," if exceeding the quantities required for ship stores. Flaxseed, however, to the value of about 310,000 dollars was exported and used in the United Kingdom—which returns to us again in the shape of linens, which we ought to make for ourselves.

(B.) It is estimated that the value of the property which descended the Susquehanna to the tide, in the last year was 5,430,000 dollars: a value greater than that of all the flour exported to foreign places during the year—nearly equal to that of all the tobacco—greater than that of all the beef and pork, butter, lard, cheese, horses, mules and sheep—equal to that of the whole product of the forest, and three times as large as that of the product of the sea. Who would have thought this? And yet it is so.

FINIS.

















LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 003 189 110 3





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 003 189 110 3