

questions present themselves, whether it would be better to apply the whole proceeds of the sinking fund, to the payment of the public debt, in order to extinguish it immediately, or as speedily as possible, or to apply a portion of it to a general system of internal improvement by roads and canals; and whether it would be better, after the extinguishment of the public debt, to reduce the tariff to a mere revenue system, which should be barely adequate to the ordinary expenditures of the government. This appears to be the opinion of a large majority of the present ruling party in Congress, as well as a majority of the present administration. It has been my misfortune to differ with them on these points, and indeed several others, and it has only been by a division among themselves that we were able to maintain the negative of those great questions in the councils of the Union. It will not be expected of me to discuss these important subjects, within the narrow limits of a circular letter, but I will beg leave to state a few facts, and leave you to draw the conclusion.

As I have never yet timidly withheld my opinions from you in any case in which you were interested, and as a crisis in our public affairs has arisen in which, to vacillate or equivocate, would be criminal, I shall not shrink from that responsibility which every honest statesman feels it a duty to take upon himself. In relation to the first of those questions, whether it would be better to apply the whole proceeds of the sinking fund to the payment of the public debt. As regards the sum of seven millions of dollars due to the Bank of the United States, the President recommends a repeal of the charter of that institution, and if that is to be done, it would seem altogether useless to pay up the money for the stock which the Government holds, merely to draw it out again when the Bank shall wind up its business. It now produces an interest of six per cent. per annum, while the average interest which the Government pays on its debt, is about four or four and a half. And in relation to the three per cent. stocks, it would seem equally useless to pay up that, if the funds could be vested in any object of general utility, or such an one as would yield an interest of more than three per cent. per annum, and which one would think could be done without great difficulty.

The benefits resulting to the Government alone from a general system of internal improvement is incalculable. What was our situation the last war? Our troops on the Northern frontier were in a state of starvation half their time, because of the limited means of transportation. Suppose the New York and Ohio canals had then been open, provisions could have been carried from the interior of those States, sufficient to have supplied plentifully, the whole army at a cost of not more than eight dollars a barrel, when it is a well known fact, tested by the records of the country, that it has cost on the frontier, as high as sixty dollars per barrel, and other weighty articles in proportion. Why, the extra expense of supplying the army during that war alone, occasioned by the lack of their canals, was more than would have made them both. The benefits resulting from those facilities in transporting of troops and munitions of war by land through the interior of the Union, are equal, if not greater than those of the whole navy. The naval establishment costs us about four millions annually, (and money well laid out too.) Let there be the same sum judiciously laid out in a well digested system of general internal improvement, and a three years war, of the grade of the last, could be prosecuted more efficiently with one half the number of men, and instead of costing us nearly four hundred millions, as that did, it will not cost us half the sum, and without interfering with, and almost extinguishing every branch of industry in the country. I think I am not exaggerating when I say, that the aid of those two great works in the States of New York and Ohio, would have saved the government of the United States more than one hundred millions of dollars, while the whole works themselves, have not cost twenty millions. Why, to carry a single piece of artillery, say one ton, from the Eastern to the Western extreme of the Union, in the ordinary mode of transportation by land, would formerly, or during the war, have cost perhaps between three and four hundred dollars, while such a piece, with the small improvements which have been since made, could be carried for less than one hundred. These kind of improvements, viewed simply in the light of civil transportation in times of peace, are of the highest and most transcendent importance, setting aside the moral influence they have upon the community in general, by operating as a facile means of social intercourse. Their benefits in time, and labor saving are inconceivable. For example, the difference between the carriage upon

even a good turnpike and that of a rail road or canal, is about three fourths; that is, when the carriage upon a turnpike costs sixty dollars a ton, the same extent on rail road or canal, will cost about fifteen dollars. If then the carriage of the various articles of importation to, and exportation from the valley of the Mississippi or Western country, cost ten millions of dollars annually, the advantage to the Western people would be seven millions five hundred thousand dollars in one year, or more or less, according to the amount of transportation, which would almost make either a rail road or canal from east to West. I have often said and I firmly believe, that the Western people would find that their interests were promoted by making one or other or both of those modes of conveyance at their own expense—and I have further said and do believe, that the people of the United States would find their interest in making such an improvement out of the public funds, as it would enhance the price of the public lands to a much greater amount than the cost of such an establishment, and if it be thought the funds of the General Government would be too much encroached upon, it would be no more than reasonable and just that the proceeds of the sales of the Western lands should be applied to that object until it was accomplished. Or perhaps a surer, juster, and better mode than any would be, for the United States to cede to the Western States, the balance of the lands which are unsold, upon condition that they should make the improvement. At any rate, it ought to be made upon some terms or other. But the President and a majority of his cabinet say, there is no power in the Constitution of the United States granting to Congress the authority to make such improvements. Without going into the constitutional argument about this right or power, permit me to state a few facts.

It does seem to me that this rigid construction of the Constitution is a part of the great nullifying system which has lately been commenced and will ultimately end, if not checked, in the dissolution of the Union, because it cramps the operations of Congress under the Constitution in such a manner, as to render the one a mere instrument of the executive, and the other almost a dead letter. Let us examine a little, the powers given to Congress by the provisions of the Constitution, and I think all these subtleties will be discarded in a moment.

The constitution gives to Congress the power to establish post offices and post roads. Now suppose Congress should think it proper that the mail should be transported on a rail road from Philadelphia & Baltimore to Cincinnati in a couple of days, instead of sending it by the way of country roads in twenty days, as they used to do; have they not the power? Or in other words, if they have the power, and it is their duty to transport the mail from one point of the Union to another, have they not the power of choosing the means by which they will transport it? Or if they can establish post roads, can they not establish rail roads, and call them post roads? And would they not in fact be post roads? Again, "Congress have power to declare war, to raise armies, to support them, and are bound to defend the Union." Now as they have the power to do these things, and are really under a solemn obligation to protect the people against foreign invasions, and intestine commotions, can they not choose the means by which they shall exercise those powers? If for example, they desired to transport a thousand cannon and a proportional quantity of other arms and munitions of war from their arsenals in the east to Green Bay in the west, could they not make a canal or a rail road for that purpose, or aid the intervening States in doing it? It might not be expedient for Congress to do any of these things, but that they have the power, I have no more doubt than that they have the power to pass a pension law. And here I will ask the permission to use the same argument in their favor, that General Jackson uses in his message, in relation to the tariff laws, for protecting domestic manufactures, for it is totally unanswerable, equally in the one case as in the other.

In relation to that subject he says in substance, (I do not mean to quote him literally,) "the States originally possessed that power, and as it was clearly taken away from them by the Constitution, if the United States have it not, the power is lodged no where—which is not at all admissible." Well, the States originally had all these powers of establishing post offices and post roads, and of defending themselves by such means as they thought best, as much as they had the power to protect their domestic industry, and all these powers are now clearly taken away from them by the Constitution; and it follows, that if Congress do not possess them, they are lodged no where—which is altogether inadmissible, be-

cause the power to protect the country from the invasion of a foreign enemy, or a domestic insurrection, is as important as that of protecting domestic manufactures. Since a majority of the Administration, and that of the prevailing party in Congress, are evidently opposed to the tariff or the protection of our manufactures by duties on foreign articles, the subject has become a topic of no little interest in every part of the Union, including the Western country. It therefore seems proper that I should say something about it, as I am desirous my constituents should clearly understand it.

By our declaration of independence, we have proclaimed to the world that, "all men are by nature free and equal," and upon this principal are founded all our civil and political institutions. This principle implies, that the great, the small, the high, the low, the rich, and the poor, all have originally equal rights and equal privileges, and that all our legislative acts ought to be directed to the maintenance of this glorious principle, and one of the most important auxiliary measures in support of it is, the protection of our own domestic industry. I am no more disposed to argue this point, than that of internal improvements, but as in the other case, I will beg leave to make a few statements in relation to facts, and leave my fellow citizens to draw the conclusions.

The great objection first made to the tariff in this country was, that if we manufacture all our own goods, our revenue arising from importations would cease, and we should have to apply to a direct tax for raising the necessary funds for the support of the Government, and they were supported in this doctrine by their friends in the British Parliament. This alarmed our Southern brethren, as they would in that event, have had to pay a tax for three fifths of their slaves—such proportion being represented in Congress, and the direct tax required to be in proportion to their representation. This prediction, however, has entirely failed, for our revenue is now much more abundant than then. Another objection was made, which was, that manufactured articles would come much higher, and that the duties being laid upon articles which were necessary for the poor, their sympathies were much drawn out in their favor. This prediction, like the other, has failed; and the poor man finds at this day, that he can wear as good a coat as his rich neighbour—made by the hand of his own fellow citizen, and that too, at a much less price than formerly. They have, therefore, abandoned those affirmations, because experience has rendered their maintenance absurd. But they still insist upon it, that all duties operate as a tax upon the people, and that the higher those duties, are, the heavier the tax. This they lay down as a universal principle. Let us test it. If it were really so, manufactured articles would be higher than they were before the tariff principle was adopted. The reverse of which is the truth. Experience is the test of theories, and so far experience has falsified their theories. But let us examine it a little, both practically and theoretically.

Now if it were really true that we had to purchase from abroad all our manufactures, why the duties would inevitably make them come higher, but we have the raw material, and can make them at home; wherefore we are not obliged to purchase them from abroad, and therefore their theory fails. They lay it down as a general rule, that taxing an article makes it come higher to the consumer, or him who makes use of it. Now I would ask these theorists, if taxing grindstones, lumber, indian corn, flour, beef, pork, or potatoes, would raise the price to those who used them. I think almost any one of them would answer in the negative: hence their theory fails them, and why? because those things are easily produced, are in abundance, are made as cheap as they can be any where, and therefore are not subject to be operated upon by any duties which may or can be levied upon them. Then to say that we cannot manufacture those articles, of which we raise the raw material in abundance, as good and as cheap as they can be manufactured anywhere else, is to say that we are more idle and have less genius than those who rival us. This is a charge I am not willing to submit to—it is not true. But although I am not willing to admit that we are more idle, or less ingenious in this country than in England or any other place, I am yet willing to confess for the sake of argument, if it will do our opponents any good, that we do not make those articles of manufacture as cheap as they do in some other countries; and when I make this admission for the sake of argument, which is really not true, I shall lay it down as one of the strongest reasons in favor of the tariff, and shall show, that so far from the duties operating against the interests of the poorer class of our fellow citizens, they are directly in their favour, and that for their comfort, their prosperity, and

their happiness, they ought by all means to maintain them.

In England, in Germany, in China, and some other countries, the people are reduced to the maximum of labour and the minimum of subsistence. That is, they are compelled from the despotisms under which they live, to perform the greatest possible extent of labour, with the least possible amount of subsistence. This is not the case in the United States, and Heaven forbid it ever should be. This is a state which is found to exist only in despotisms, where everything is grasped by the rich and nothing is left for the poor but toil and misery; and in such a country, under such a government, for their rulers to omit to secure to their subjects the benefits of their domestic industry, after loading it with so many exactions, would be the basest and vilest of all injustice. One would think they could, in a country thus situated, manufacture cheaper than in a country like our own, and they could too, were it not that that state of society begets luxury and extravagance, so that before the article manufactured, arrives at the market, it has been loaded with so many taxes, tithes, and exactions, that the manufacturer has to obtain a large price in order to indemnify him against these impositions. But suppose I admit they really manufacture cheaper than ourselves, it only, admits the greater necessity for securing ourselves by restrictive duties, unless these people would come to us and take our produce in exchange for their manufactures at our advanced prices, for it is evident, if we are compelled to carry our produce to their distant country, and exchange it with them at their reduced prices, we are the losers to the amount of the carriage backward and forward, together with the difference of price and all risks and contingencies attending the adventure. Would it not then be better to give a little higher price at home, than to take all that trouble and run all that risk, to get to throw away the difference. If it is to be thrown away, let us give it directly to the poor of that country, for by throwing it into the form of a commercial transaction, it is lost to us, and only adds to the wealth of the wealthy in the country to which it goes. I have said that the restrictive duties, or the tariff, is one of the surest means by which the working class of our fellow citizens could be secured in the maintenance of their liberty, equality, and independence.

In a country where freedom prevails, men will not, they cannot, and they ought not to labour in the same manner that they do, in countries where, by the monopolies and the rigour of the government, they are compelled to labour to the maximum of their strength, and sustain themselves at the minimum of expense. It is one of the best traits in the character of our society in this country, that it is a credit to a man to labour and be industrious. He who does so, is placed in the foremost ranks of the social circle; and the reason is, because he obtains a due portion of the profits of his labour—he feels as he ought to feel, that he is none the less respected because he labours for another; and the amount and efficiency of his labour, is with him, a matter of principle, not of necessity. He is disposed to do a reasonable amount of it, & expects a reasonable compensation for it. To this he is justly entitled, and the larger the compensation which is given to the workman, the higher of course will be the price of the article on which the labour is bestowed. Under such circumstances it would seem reasonable to suppose that we could not manufacture in this country, as cheap as they can in countries where the poor are the mere servants of the rich. Let it be admitted then, that manufactures cannot be carried on as cheap here, as in such countries, and that it is because workmen are better paid for their labour, does it follow that because workman are well paid for their labour whereby the price is enhanced to the purchaser, that we are to quit manufacturing and throw ourselves upon other countries for the necessities of life? This would be to say, that we must abandon the means of securing our independence, because of the equality we enjoy. It would be to say, that it is better to pay foreigners for doing our work, in preference to our own citizens; that it is better to depend upon foreign countries for the necessities of life, than to pay a fair price to the poor man at home for his labour; that because we enjoy freedom, we must necessarily endure poverty; that because we enjoy equality, we must necessarily become dependent. This is a doctrine not to be sanctioned in this glorious and happy Republic.

To be concluded.

Gen. Jackson's method of preserving the Union.—"By arresting the prodigal expenditure of the public money, extinguishing the public debt as speedily as possible, and by restraining the Government to its original simplicity in the exercise of all its functions."

The copy of the following communication having been mislaid, will account for its non-appearance in the regular order of publication.

For the Palladium.

"Laws of Maine"—continued

The laws of Maine provide that each county shall be set off into representative districts, of one representative each; which districts shall have the exclusive right to elect its own representative. To this mode of doing business, I feel quite partial. The county being thus set off into small districts, sends up a representative from every quarter, and may, therefore, safely anticipate a fair representation. And further, it not only does away the necessity of candidates patrolling the county, to make themselves known to the people, but also excludes from the possibility of an election an unprincipled, or unqualified person. None are brought into the field, but such as have long maintained the dignity of "a good, sound, moral, influential character." To such men, and to such only, can the public interest be entrusted with safety.—The above mentioned mode of electing representatives, when contrasted with our's, presents a wide difference. There are in Dearborn county nine townships, all of which have hitherto been entitled to four representatives, to be elected by said county; and for a number of years past there have been no small exertions used to secure the election of all, in what is commonly called, "the upper or the lower end of the county." And last year the point was so far carried, as to elect three of the four in one township. This to me appears morally wrong. As an individual I have always sought for an equal distribution of representation, and have uniformly voted accordingly. But to settle the question fairly, and upon a sure basis, let the county be districted. As it has eventuated, Dearborn is hereafter entitled to three representatives only, so that each commissioner's district need only be designated a representative district. The other counties would require a different arrangement, which, however, may very easily be made. The necessity of thus districting the counties may further be urged, upon the consideration that there are not unfrequently local interests to be attended unto in representation. And should a question of this character arise, (as was the Michigan road,) and should district No. 1, fix upon a suitable person to attend to its concerns, 'tis easy to see that some unqualified person might come out, greedy for office, and in an electioneering tour proclaim to districts No. 2 and 3. I am the man to whom you may confide your interest with safety; and thus might be elected to represent district No. 1. A person altogether incompetent to its vast concerns, and one that it did not want—and vice versa. Then let each district have the exclusive right to elect. But again it has also been intimated that it would do away the necessity of so much electioneering as is common among us. In confirmation of this fact, permit me, sir, to refer to the last August election, at which time I stood before the people as a candidate for the responsible office of associate judge; and notwithstanding the whole concern was managed in my absence, yet so far as it related to Manchester, my place of residence, I was handsomely elected. The foregoing remarks may, with equal force, be applied to the election of commissioners also. This application, in advance, may be considered quite immature and presumptive; but should the late law remain unamended, I venture to predict that its aptitude will be fully realized not many years hence. But should it be objected that they are county officers, and therefore should be elected by the county, it need only be said in reply, that representatives and senators are state officers, and according to this logic, should be elected by the state;—and representatives and senators to congress, being U. States' officers, should consequently be elected by the U. States. The objection therefore will not hold good. But to proceed. "The laws of Maine" farther provide, that each township shall collect its own revenue, whether for state, county, or town purposes; and that it shall at each annual town-meeting be sold to the lowest bidder. Such an amendment in our code could not fail to please a large majority of the people. In the first place it would be a great saving of money. One could certainly collect the revenue of his own township, at a much lower per cent., than he could the whole county; and in the next place it would, in Dearborn, furnish nine persons annually with a short but profitable job. Who, I would ask, among us has not seen and felt the necessity of such an amendment? Our state and county revenues are now collected by a county collector, while the township revenue remains a separate concern, to be collected by each township; and which does not amount annually to more than from 6 1-4 to 25 cents to each person—a sum scarcely