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Chapter I.
Introduction.

In the history of the United States the question of how best to protect and promote our home manufactures, has been considered along with the question of how best to raise the revenue necessary for the maintenance of the government. But while these two subjects have been considered together, they have not always been considered of equal importance; sometimes one, sometimes the other, has forged to the front.

The tariff history of our country may be divided into two main periods, before and after the Civil War; the first of these great divisions may again be divided into three sub-periods, the first extending from 1789 to 1816, the second from 1816 to 1846, the third from 1846 to and including 1860.

The reasons for these divisions and subdivisions may be seen from the character of the various tariff acts. The first, passed in 1789, although protective in spirit imposed such low duties that to the twentieth century American it seems very like free trade. The other tariff acts up to that of 1816 were only slightly protective, but the acts of 1816, 1824, 1828, 1832, 1833, and 1842, were— with the possible exception of the act of 1833— distinctly protective, while the acts of 1846 and 1857, the latter especially, gave only very moderate protection indeed. The turn in the tide comes with the Morrill Bill, proposed in 1860 but not passed till in 1861, when the current turned in the direction desired by all good Pennsylvanians— high protective tariff.

In discussing the tariff history of Pennsylvania the sub-periods
from 1616 to 1860 are considered somewhat differently from those of the country taken as a whole as each state, Pennsylvania especially, has a movement all its own.

Because of its great natural resources Pennsylvania is a great manufacturing state. The greater part of its surface was originally covered with timber, which furnished charcoal for smelting iron in the days before the discovery that coal could be used for that purpose. When this discovery was made, Pennsylvania still had the advantage of all the other states in the Union for in the eastern part of the state is found almost the whole supply of anthracite to be found within the borders of the United States; while in the western part are the thickest veins of bituminous coal of the best quality. There are large deposits of iron ore within the state, although not of the first quality, but the fine ore deposits of the Lake Superior region are easily accessible. Then in both the eastern and the western parts of the state is to be found a fine quality of glass sand; the Allegheny region is rich in natural gas, and oil wells abound in various parts. Add to all these advantages the fact that Pennsylvania is the "keystone" of the thirteen original states, that its manufactures could be sent north or south, by water or by land, and it may easily be seen why from the very beginning of our national history Pennsylvania has ever been in the van of the battle waged for the protection and promotion of manufactures within the borders of the United States.

The manufacture of iron had been begun away back in the days when Pennsylvania had been a colony; as early as 1716-1718 the manufacture had been on a commercial basis, but an English Parliament Act of 1719 had made it unlawful to set up in any colony furnaces for the production of iron, because "the establishment of manufactories in the
colonies tends to make them more independent of Great Britain."

The Revolutionary War, by cutting off the importations from Great Britain, gave a great impetus to the manufacture of iron, paper, glass, and other articles; therefore at its close, the state government found it necessary to impose import duties in order to save these manufactures from destruction. "Pennsylvania began with low duties, but soon adopted the protective principle; and established higher rates and levied duties on a longer list of articles than did any other state. In 1785 it gave to its tariff law the title; 'An act to encourage and protect the manufactures of this State by laying duties on certain manufactures which interfere with them.'"

The first Congress under the Constitution at once began to consider ways and means to obtain a much-needed revenue. Mr. Madison introduced the subject as one "of the greatest magnitude." He suggested a plan based upon a measure passed by the Congress of 1783 and agreed to by nearly every state; this, he thought, could become the basis of a temporary system. But Mr. Fitzsimons, of Pennsylvania, at once protested against too much haste in the adoption of a system. He wished to adopt "such a one which, in its operation, will be some way adequate to our present situation, as it respects our agriculture, our manufactures, and our commerce." Mr. Hartley ably supported his colleague and urged that measures be taken "to protect and promote our domestic manufactures."

Mr. Madison, by the stand taken by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, was "led to apprehend we shall be under the necessity of travelling further into an investigation of principles" than he had supposed would be necessary. He proceeded to make a most excellent tariff-for

2 Annals of Congress, I, p. 103
-revenue-only"speech, but then conceded that other considerations than revenue would have to be considered. One of these was: "The state and that are most advanced in population, ripe for manufactures, ought to have their particular interests attended to in some degree. While these states retained the power of making regulations of trade, they had the power to protect and cherish such institutions; by adopting the present constitution, they have thrown the exercise of this power into other hands; they must have done this with an expectation that those interests would not be neglected here." Other Pennsylvania members joined in the demand for the protection of manufactures, not for those of their own state alone, but, in the words of Mr. Fitzsimons, laying aside local distinctions, what operates to the benefit of one part in establishing useful institutions will eventually operate to the advantage of the whole. "There was but one dissenting voice in the Pennsylvania representation—that of Mr. Scott, who made the remarkable statement that "our circumstances do not admit us to become an extensive manufacturing state." But even he wanted a duty on hemp.

Between the years 1789 and 1816 there were various measures but they were of little importance. In 1790 a tariff act carried into effect the recommendation of Secretary of Treasury Hamilton for the imposition of somewhat higher duties and the vote of Pennsylvania stood 7 to 0 in its favor. Again in 1792 the Pennsylvania representation was a unit in favor of the measure which levied an import duty on cotton and raised the duty on hemp and iron products. On all other measures prior to the year 1816, Pennsylvania's voice was heard in favor of protecting all articles of home manufacture. After the War of 1812 was over, when importations were threatening death to the "infant industries" of other states as well as to its own

1 Annals of Congress, I, pp. 110, 111.
the voice of Pennsylvania was again heard in the halls of Congress in favor of protection to and for all alike.
Chapter II.
1816-1824.

The War of 1812 acted with the force of a prohibitive tariff. It compelled the United States to expand the home manufacturers already in existence and to begin others which necessity alone caused to be originated. For cheap and practically unlimited areas of land, and the lack of capital to invest in extensive manufactories, would have made this, in the beginning, an agricultural country even if Great Britain had not refused to allow her colonies to expand in that direction. Woollens had been brought from the mother country in colonial times and the states continued what the colonies had begun. Now there was such dire need of this product of the British looms that the government actually had to connive at smuggling in the clothes needed for our soldiers, just as Napoleon had done a short time before in order to clothe his soldiers for their march to Warsaw. When the war was over great quantities of British manufactures flooded our markets, threatening to ruin our new manufactories. A cry went up to Congress for help. President Madison, as was the case with Jefferson and Monroe, had become a protectionist; all three had accepted the views formerly held by the Federalists with Hamilton at their head. So a Republican president now summoned Congress to make a protective tariff, and almost every one was a good protectionist differing only in degree.

Mr. Clay was Speaker of the House and he worked manfully to give the degree of protection necessary to save the manufactures of the United States from destruction. The Speaker was strongly supported by
Mr. Ingham of Pennsylvania, a member of the Ways and Means Committee. It is interesting to note, in the light of subsequent events, Mr. Ingham's position at this time. He expressly stated that the great object of the bill was to "give the necessary and proper protection and support to the agriculture, manufactures, and commerce of the country. The revenue was only an incidental consideration and it ought not to have any influence in the decision upon the proposition before the committee."

Other Pennsylvania members worked hard to obtain sufficient protection for their industries. Mr. Ross was the striking exception. This gentleman was very evidently a believer in "tariff for revenue only" as he expressed himself as opposed to the principle of protection and said: "If the extravagant duties proposed were not necessary he could see no strong necessity for them, because some individuals of all professions were unfortunate in the best times, and no sympathy was felt for the merchants who failed." Mr. Scott may have been a gentleman of leisure, or perhaps an agriculturist, as he seemed to consider work in factories almost beneath contempt for he expressed the opinion that "the occupation had a tendency to degrade and debase the human mind."

The final vote on "Shall the question pass?" showed the same division of sentiment on the protective policy as had the debates. — Commercial New England and the agricultural South standing together against the manufacturing Middle States. In New England the vote was 2 to 1 against the measure; in the South, 5 to 1 against; in the Middle States 4 to 1 in its favor.

1 Annals of Congress, XXIX., p. 1240.
2 " " p. 1272, 1273.
3 " " p. 1285.
Although in 1816 the Pennsylvania members of Congress had exerted their utmost efforts to give needed protection to iron manufactures, they had failed for the reason that the other members did not see the great need of help in this direction. Iron manufactures had grown considerably from 1808 to 1816 as this was a period of great restriction to our commerce; for as iron could not be brought in from abroad and they had an abundance of iron ore, and an abundance of timber for charcoal, the Pennsylvanians proceeded to invest in extensive manufactories. At the close of the war iron importations like other products had greatly increased, prices had fallen, and the iron manufacturers suffered financial distress. By 1818, however, Congress saw that iron products had not received sufficient protection and therefore raised the duties considerably.

From 1816 to 1824 was a time of active propaganda for higher protective duties. Societies for the promotion of American industry were formed in Philadelphia and New York, which did excellent work for the cause of protection. Adams, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe were elected members of the New York society, and President Monroe had become such an enthusiastic protectionist that he went to New York to accept his election in person. But the society which seems to have become most widely known and to have rendered most effective service to the cause of protection was the Pennsylvania Society for the Promotion of Manufactures and the Mechanic Arts."

When the sixteenth Congress met in its first session, 1819-1820, it was confronted with a deficit in the treasury. The House was strongly protectionist; Henry Clay, the father of the "American System," was elected Speaker. It was at this time that separate committees were appointed for commerce and manufactures. Mr. Baldwin, of Pennsylvania, was appointed Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures which
soon reported a strongly protective tariff bill. Mr. Baldwin opened the debate in favor of the bill in "one of the weightiest speeches on the subject of the tariff ever delivered in Congress." 

Making mention of the fact that Great Britain had recently imposed a duty on wool and cotton, and a prohibitive duty on wheat, Mr. Baldwin appealed to the agriculturists to stand by the manufacturers when he said: "Let those who complain so much that the agricultural interest will suffer by this bill, reflect on these facts. Let the farmer decide whether it is most for his interest to purchase his clothing from the foreign manufacturer, who will purchase neither his wool nor his provisions; or the domestic one who will give him a market for both."

Other Pennsylvania representatives supported this bill which passed the House by a vote of 91 to 78. In all the Middle States there was but one vote against the bill. It is interesting to note that New England was no longer so strongly opposed to protection as its vote was 19 in favor, 18 opposed, and 4 absent. The West—Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois—voted unanimously in its favor, while—as usual—the South was strongly opposed, its vote showing 18 in favor and 63 opposed.

In the Senate this tariff bill was rejected by the close vote of 22 to 21. The divisions by Sections was almost the same as was shown in the House. Senators Findlay and Lowrie, of Pennsylvania, voted for the measure, as did every other senator from the Middle States.

At the meeting of the next Congress, December, 1821, the sentiment in favor of protection seems to have much weaker, for Mr. Baldwin, again Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, had to report that the majority of the committee considered legislation on the tariff inexpedient at this time.

1 Stanwood, Tariff Controversies, I., p. 182.
By the reapportionment made in 1823, in accordance with the census of 1820, the protectionist states gained 23 members which gave them a larger proportional representation in the House. By this time President Monroe saw that the sentiment of the country favored tariff revision, so in his December message of this year he made the following recommendation: "I recommend a review of the tariff for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture, or which are more immediately connected with the defense and independence of the country."

This part of the President's message was referred, in the House, to the Committee on Manufactures of which Mr. Tod, another Pennsylvanian, was chairman. Mr. Tod reported a tariff bill on January 9, 1824, and when it was attacked by the enemies of protection he very ably defended it. He said, in discussing the bill, that "there was nothing here proposed that was new in principle—nothing but to extend and equalize a system which experience had shown to be most beneficial, and to give other departments of domestic industry, and other oppressed portions of the community, something of that protection which our laws had so liberally and wisely given to the cultivators of cotton, of sugar, and to all the interests of navigation."

Mr. Buchanan, who had been a member of the House as a representative from Pennsylvania since 1821, made a speech on this bill in which he appeared as a "mild protectionist" on all manufactures except those made in Pennsylvania. He was "in favor of the general system proposed by the bill—it was the settled policy of the country—we had advanced from one tariff to another on that principle, and we now had a third, but we should advance with cautious steps, and not injure the kindred interests of agriculture and commerce." By strenuous efforts

1 Annals of Congress, XLI., p. 20.
2 " " " " p. 1471.
3 " " " " p. 1565.
Mr. Buchanan succeeded in reducing the duty on cotton bagging in order to help the South and was earnestly desirous of raising the duty on hemp to help Kentucky. He was very eloquent indeed when discussing the iron interests of his native state. He presented a picture of the distressed condition of this industry which, he said, must be ruined under the then existing tariff. Could any statesman regard this with indifference? "Is it the policy of this nation to suffer the manufactures of iron to be destroyed?"

The Mr. Buchanan of 1824 was certainly father to the Mr. Buchanan of 1860. Mr. Clay thus characterized his position: "But what, sir, is the principle on which the gentleman from Pennsylvania means to go? He will protect our manufactures as soon as we are able without protection to go on with the manufactures."

Mr. Ingham who had labored earnestly for the Tariff Act of 1816 was again found in the protectionist ranks, and much valuable assistance was rendered the cause by Mr. Stewart from the same state who made his first appearance in Congress in 1823.

This bill passed the House by a vote of 107 to 102. The debate in the Senate presented no new points of interest. The bill passed here by a vote of 25 to 21. An examination of the vote on this bill shows that the two agricultural sections, the West and the South, were arrayed against one another; as were the two manufacturing sections, although not so unanimously. The West and the Middle States favored the bill; the former to gain a market for their products, the latter for much needed protection to their manufactures. The New England States cast a majority of their votes against the bill; partly for the reason that the cotton manufacturers did not need protection, and partly because the woollen manufacturers who did need it, failed to obtain it.

1 Young, Customs-Tariff Legislation, pp. XLIII, XLIV.
The South, of course, expected to sell the greater part of its main product (cotton) abroad and wished to buy its manufactured articles in the cheapest markets.

The vote of Pennsylvania was almost unanimous for the bill; the name of but one of its representatives, Samuel Breck, is recorded against it; the House Journal does not give the vote of Sam. D. Ingham.

1
Note: Dewey gives the following analysis of the vote in the House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest(Tenn. and Ky.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2
Stanwood gives the following analysis of the vote in the Senate--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>9(one vacancy)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Stanwood, Tariff Controversies, I., p. 239.
Chapter III.
1825-1833

In 1824, although sectional clashes were apparent, it could not be said that the tariff question played any part in the presidential election. The protective idea was so popular that all candidates were, or were said to be, in favor of it. Mr. Clay had championed the various protective measures in the House; General Jackson had repeatedly voted for protective measures in the Senate and was considered second only to Mr. Clay in devotion to the cause, although in his public utterances he was careful to insert "judicious" before the word tariff; Mr. Adams, while not very communicative on the subject, was known not to be opposed; and some of Mr. Crawford's friends asserted that he had favored the Tariff Act of 1824.

Immediately after the presidential election of 1824, it was seen that the contest in 1828 would lie between President Adams and General Jackson. The friends of both candidates immediately began to prepare for the fray. Adams made the mistake of not coming out squarely for a protective tariff, probably taking it for granted that everyone knew that he favored a reasonable degree of protection. General Jackson's friends knew that it would be necessary to get the vote of the South and a part of the Middle States; so the General's "judicious" tariff had to be interpreted in New York and Pennsylvania as giving all necessary protection, and in the South as giving just as little as the manufacturing states would put up with.

The results of the Tariff Act of 1824 seem to have been fairly satisfactory except to those engaged in the woollen industry which
had not received sufficient protection. The woollen manufacturerers and their friends soon began agitating the question of the needed duties on these products. Counties, districts, and state legislatures sent in petitions and memorials to Congress asking for legislation; they came from Pennsylvania, from New Jersey, from New York, and especially from New England. In response to all these demands on January 10, 1827, Mr. Mallary, of Vermont, Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, reported the famous Woollen Bill. Now it was that the hand of national politics was first seen in the tariff question.

The votes on the various motions to amend soon showed that the Adams men favored the bill and that the Jackson men opposed it. In order that the latter might win, help had to be obtained from some of the manufacturing states and it was obtained from Pennsylvania. Mr. Cambreling, of New York, a free trader, in a speech against the bill made the remark that "there would be quite as much reason for Pennsylvania to ask for an increase of the duty on bar iron, and if he were a Representative from Pennsylvania, upon the principle of 'reciprocity of injuries'—if this prohibition of woollens were persisted in by New England, he would propose doubling the duty on bar iron—there was full as much reason, if there were any at all in either, in the one as in the other proposition."

Messrs. Buchanan and Ingham, now thought it best to look after the interests of their own state and, incidentally, of those of Kentucky. Mr. Buchanan did not accept the hint given him by the gentleman from New York on the subject of bar iron; on the contrary he stated that he was a friend of the tariff but "upon broad national principles" and

2 Register of Debates, III., p. 745.
statement that he was a friend of the tariff upon broad national principles and objected to this bill as being unjust and partial as it protected the woollen manufacturer of New England while it left the agriculture of Pennsylvania to perish. Besides Pennsylvania had much greater interest in increasing the duty upon foreign spirits and foreign hemp than it had on foreign wool and woollens. Mr. Buchanan was careful to insist that his opinion on the tariff question had not changed, that he was still friendly to the protection of home industries, and that, at the proper time, he would manifest this friendship in the proper manner.

"The protestations by Mr. Buchanan himself, and by many other members who joined him in mischief-making, that they were warmly in favor of protection, would be most edifying if it were not so plainly evident that they were bending all their energies to the defeat of the only measure of protection which the circumstances of the time rendered important."

Mr. Ingham added himself to the Laodiceans by a speech in which he was unwilling to "trespass upon the time or patience of the Committee by discussing the policy of encouraging the domestic industry of this country by what are called protecting duties—he considered that a settled point, from the repeated decisions of Congress, and, as he believed, from a large majority of the country. The only difference of opinion now to be settled was, as to the degree of protection, and the manner of it."

On the other hand, a number of representatives from Pennsylvania made a strong fight for the bill, among them Messrs. Stewart, Miner,

1 Register of Debates, III., p. 747.
2 Stanwood, Tariff Controversies, I., p. 257.
3 Register of Debates, III., p. 830.
Mr. Stewart gave his support to the bill on the ground that it was for the benefit of agriculture—a position directly opposite to that taken by Mr. Buchanan. "In supporting this measure he regretted to find himself placed in opposition to two of his most distinguished colleagues, with whom he had co-operated with great pleasure, in support of the tariff of 1824. That bill was no more important in his judgment, to the agricultural interests of Pennsylvania than the bill under consideration."

Messrs. Buchanan and Ingham did not succeed in getting a majority of the Pennsylvania members to vote against this bill but these two gentlemen with five others from their state are recorded in the negative on the final vote when the bill passed the House by 106 to 95.

The Woollens Bill was sent to the Senate but three weeks before the end of the short session. There was little debate but much postponement. The bill was finally laid on the table by the casting vote of Vice President Calhoun. The bill could have been passed had Mr. Van Buren voted on its favor; the gentleman was present and had always claimed to be a protectionist, so his refusal to vote at this time proclaimed that General Jackson had a friend in the senator from New York. Senators Findlay and Marks, of Pennsylvania, voted in favor of the bill.

This action of Congress in regard to the Woollens Bill caused much excitement, North and South. The close vote in the Senate and its passage by the House, showed that the struggle would be renewed in the next Congress. The friends and foes of protective tariff began to rally their forces. Meetings were held, memorials adopted, and editorials written pro and con.

Niles, April 7, 1827, after giving an account of various meetings that had been held in Pennsylvania, that these meetings and private

1 Niles' Register, XXXII., p. 170.
and private letters, too, show that much feeling has been excited by late votes and proceedings in Congress, concerning the tariff and internal improvements, and assert that Pennsylvania will support no one for public office who questions her policy; or hesitates to forward it on all proper occasions. And concerning the rumor that "combinations" were forming to abandon the policy of Pennsylvania that Virginia might be gained, he writes: "It is very certain that the people of the former will not ratify any contract or concession made which has for its object an obstruction of the progress of the "American System."

The famous Harrisburg Convention of 1827 was called into being by the Pennsylvania Society for the Promotion of Manufactures and the Mechanic Arts at a meeting held in Philadelphia on May 14th of that year. It was here resolved to call a meeting of delegates of "farmers, manufacturers, and the friends of both branches of industry" to elect delegates to a general convention to be held at Harrisburg on the 30th of July next following. This convention was "to take into consideration the present state of the wool-growing and the wool-manufacturing interests and such other manufactures as may require encouragement."

All northern states, with the exception of Indiana and Illinois, and Virginia, Delaware, Maryland, and Kentucky, elected delegates to this convention. Many distinguished men attended. — There were several members of Congress, Hezekiah Niles and Matthew Carey, the veteran workers in the cause of protection, and many others. There were present, as was to be expected, a large number of farmers and manufacturers.

There was little, if any party politics.

1 Niles' Register, XXXII. p. 103.
2 " " p. 103.
3 " " p. 383.
4 Ibid.
This convention drafted a memorial to Congress concerning the condition of various industries and made recommendations for a proper remedy. Resolutions were passed favoring further protection on manufactures of iron, on hemp and flax, printed cottons, an increase of duty on wool, specific duties and the establishment of minima upon woollen goods. The memorial to Congress was signed by every member present except two United States senators who, from motives of propriety, did not put down their names.

The Twentieth Congress met in December, 1827. The contest for the speakership resulted in the election of Mr. Stevenson, of Virginia, a Jackson man and an opponent of the protective tariff. He appointed a majority of the Committee on Manufactures hostile to protection, although Mr. Mallary, of Vermont, a protectionist, was chairman of the committee. The protectionists soon saw that they were "in the hands of the enemy." On December 31st the committee brought in a resolution asking permission to send for persons and papers in order that they might gain necessary information. Permission was granted by a vote of 102 to 88. The yeas showed the combined opposition to the tariff as it was believed that, instead of information, the committee was seeking for material to be used against the measure. Stanwood says that the persons summoned were carefully selected in order to show that manufacturerers were not united in support of the plan recommended by the Harrisburg Convention, and that a set of questions, drawn up beforehand, was put to all; these questions were of such a nature that they furnished desired, and precluded undesired, information.

1 Senator Bell, of New Hampshire, and Senator Robbins, of Rhode Island. For a full report of this Convention vide Niles' Register, XXXII., pp. 388-396.
2 Stanwood, Tariff Controversies, I., p. 269.
In an editorial of January 12, 1828, Niles mentioned the fact that "The legislature of Pennsylvania, almost unanimously, has passed a resolution to instruct the senators and request the representatives from that state in Congress, that an act may be passed for the encouragement of domestic industry, embracing the items recommended by the convention of farmers and manufacturers which met at Harrisburg on the 30th of July last." Mr. Niles then went on to say that while such was the state of things in Pennsylvania, eighteen members had voted with "all the anti-tariff members of the House of Representatives, four only excepted, in favor of the resolution proposed by the Committee on Manufactures, on the suggestion of a decided of the protective system—the member of the committee from North Carolina.'If we live long enough, we shall see the result.'"

Mr. Niles on the same date makes a strong suggestion of a bargain between the politicians of Pennsylvania and Virginia. He wrote: 'There is a valuable old saying, 'tell me what company you keep and I will tell you what you are.' Pennsylvania, hitherto forming the phalanx in favor of domestic industry—18 to 4, joined the members from the South who have always heretofore, as with the heart and soul of one man, voted against her and her favorite principles. Facilis descensus &c. But we trust that step will be recovered. On the tariff question there cannot remain an union between Pennsylvania and Virginia, unless one or the other clearly surrenders principle, in some quid pro quo."

A week later Niles again makes the charge of bargain and corruption, "secret understandings," and said that "every citizen has the right to know the terms on which the 'great states' have settled the
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2 Niles' Register, XXXIII., p. 318.
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tariff question, or any other matter, previous to its presentation to Congress or the people." As proof of an agreement entered into by certain politicians of New York and Pennsylvania "to offer up the protection of domestic industry and furtherance of internal improvements to the 'Virginia school of politicians'" Mr. Niles cites(1) the defeat of the Woollens Bill of 1827,(2) resistance to the recommendations of the Harrisburg Convention "by many who had been loudest in their clamors in favor of a protective tariff and internal improvements", (3) the election of "one of the most anti-tariff gentlemen that ever was in Congress as speaker,(4) the speaker's appointment of an anti-tariff Committee on Manufactures,(5) the long delay of the committee to act and its sending for persons and papers instead of sending in a bill, and (6) the vote in favor of this action, carried by the change in Pennsylvania and New York.

Meantime the Committee on Manufactures had, by means of its carefully selected questions from its carefully selected manufacturers, obtained the information it had desired. This committee then manufactured a bill which suited very few persons in the whole United States. The woollen industry was not given the protection which alone had been necessary to make the Tariff Act of 1824 satisfactory to the manufacturing and agricultural interests. The plan offered by the Harrisburg Convention was utterly rejected. The bill was "framed to satisfy the producers of raw material, wool, hemp, flax, and iron, and to deny the protection desired by New England. Protection was afforded to raw material even where the producers did not seek it; and in some important cases high duties were imposed on raw materials not produced in this country." The bill was evidently framed to get the

1 Niles' Register, XXXIII., pp. 329, 330.
2 Turner, Rise of the New West, p. 318.
votes of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky; it was as evidently framed to make sure of its rejection by New England in which case Mr. Adams' friends would have to bear the blame if the bill failed to pass.

Mr. Stevenson, of Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee, spoke in favor of the bill and made the remarkable statement that its iron clause would transfer to Pennsylvania all the rolling and slitting mills of New England. Mr. Bates, of Massachusetts, asked him sarcastically if his object was to induce the New England members to vote against the duty on iron, so that he could tell his constituents that the New Englanders had caused the failure of the bill.

Mr. Stevenson seemed to know that "politics and combinations" were in the air, for he stated that the committee had wished to do justice to each interest "and if, by doing justice to each interest, they nevertheless failed to separate the unhappy connexion of the question with whom presidential power should be entrusted, from that of legislation as to what articles should be admitted into the present tariff, still the facts on record would prove that the committee had intended justice to all, and had not withheld it in their recommendation." Mr. Stevenson made the additional statement that they had kept in mind the fact there were consumers as well as manufacturers, and buyers as well as sellers.

Mr. Buchanan was still in favor of protection, its constitutionality was unquestioned, and the policy of protecting domestic industry by legislation had long been settled. He made a motion, however, to amend the bill by striking out the minimum clause, in the proposed duty on woollens—which would ruin the protective feature. Mr. Buchanan's part in the debate is thus characterized by Stanwood:

1 Register of Debates, IV., pt. 2, p. 1758.
2 Stanwood, Tariff Controversies, I., p. 275.
against the protection of products in which Pennsylvania was not interested, was as acrid as his powers of speech permitted him to be. He inveighed against the "grasping spirit" of New England, and endeavored to make it appear that there was antagonism between the farmers and manufacturers."

The hope of the anti-protectionists that the bill would be defeated by the vote of New England was disappointed. Enough votes were given it by that section to insure its passage although the bill was satisfactory to no one of them. It was a case of a half-loaf being better than none at all.

The bill was sent to the Senate and was amended to change the woollen duties; most other motions to amend were voted down. The bill finally passed by a vote of 26 to 21; with the exception of five New England senators, all northern senators voted in the affirmative. The House concurred in the amendments of the Senate, and the bill was signed by the President May 19, 1828.

Although an analysis of the vote on the Tariff Act of 1828 does not show conclusively (since some of the Adams men of New England voted against it because of its objectional features), that the Jackson men voted against the bill and the Adams men for it, still "there was something which looked like an approach toward this relation. Certainly the Southern wing of the Jacksonians, or of the Democratic party, as the Jacksonians now called themselves in distinction from the National Republicans, opposed the measure with something like unanimous consent."

1 Dewey gives the following analysis of the vote in the House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>In favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ity. Many of Jackson's Northern supporters, however, voted for the bill, and it may be said that the Democratic party of the North was then in favor of moderate protection to all the interests of the country."

The Middle States, which were really carried the bill, were protectionist in sentiment, but they were not especially fond of Adams and readily believed the assertions of Jackson and his friends that General Jackson was at least as good a friend of protection as was Mr. Adams.

It is from this time that New England and Pennsylvania change places in Congress. Up to the years 1827 and 1828 Pennsylvania congressmen had been in the front rank in the fight for protective duties. It was on the Woollens Bill that the first defection was seen. In discussing this bill Mr. Burgess writes: "The protective phalanx from Pennsylvania was broken by the defection of her two most important representatives, Ingham and Buchanan. The attitude of Buchanan was a matter of especial note. He held that the constitutionality of the tariff and the moderate protection had been completely settled by the founders of the Constitution and by the uniform practice of the government; but that so high a tariff as the one proposed on woollens was impolitic from the point of view of the general welfare, and unjust, from that of an equal distribution of the burdens of taxation. Mr. Buchanan owed much of his subsequent success to the moderate views which he advanced and adhered to at this juncture."

Messrs. Ingham, Buchanan, and Van Buren, received positions under the Jackson administration; Mr. Ingham was appointed Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Van Buren Secretary of State on March 6th, 1829. Mr. Buchanan had to wait until 1831 for his reward; he was then appointed minister to St. Petersburg.

The presidential election of 1828 resulted in Jackson's election.

1 Burgess, The Middle Period, pp. 162, 163
2 " " " pp. 158, 159.
by a large majority. From all New England the Democratic candidates received one electoral vote but the great majority of the votes from the Middle States went to Jackson. Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Kentucky who thought themselves especially favored by the Tariff Act of 1828 went solidly for Jackson—the "old hero" who had been cheated out of the presidency in 1824, and who was a friend of the tariff and of internal improvements. As Mr. Niles put it in an editorial: "Pennsylvania has 'gone the whole', as the saying is, in support of general Jackson. It is believed that not one member of Congress friendly to the administration has been elected, though Mr. Stevenson of Pittsburgh, has been superseded by Mr. Wilkins, after a warm contest."  

President Jackson's message of December 6, 1831, came as a surprise to Pennsylvania. It called the attention of Congress to the fact that the public debt would soon be extinguished and made the suggestion that Congress reduce duties so that no more revenue should be received than would be necessary for the economical administration of the government. He also made the suggestion that the duties should be so adjusted as to give equal justice to all national interests. He said nothing about internal improvements. This message was not so satisfactory to the Pennsylvanians as that of the year before in which the President had defended the constitutionality of the protective system and had made the suggestion that any surplus revenue should be employed in internal improvements. The President's idea of a "judicious" revenue was becoming far removed from the Pennsylvania idea. This difference of interpretation is shown by the message of Governor Wolf to the legislature of Pennsylvania just six days after the President's message to Congress. Governor Wolf, in this message,

1 From Maine.
2 Niles' Register, XXXV, p. 180.
expresses the belief that there is nothing "judicious" in a tariff that is not efficient." The legislature shortly after expressed its views on the subject by passing resolutions—in the house of representatives by a large majority, and in the senate unanimously—in favor of the protective policy in these words:"It is the opinion of this legislature, that any reduction of duty on articles which enter into competition with such as are produced or manufactured in the United States would be inimical to the true policy and best interests of the nation."

No tariff bill was reported in Congress until May 23, 1832, when John Quincy Adams, Chairman of the Committee on Manufactures, reported the bill which was the basis of the Tariff Act of 1832. This bill proposed to reduce some duties and do away with minimal valuations. The loss of the minimal valuations would injure the woollen industry and so Mr. Stewart, of Pennsylvania, offered a substitute for this bill which, he said, would put the knife to the jugular of every sheep in the land and would devote to destruction the whole woollen business of the country.

It was soon seen that the South, aided by the free traders and politicians of the North, intended to make a large reduction in the tariff duties; a scramble immediately ensued—each state tried to get what it could for itself, let others look out for their own interests. "Massachusetts men voted against the iron duties asked for by Pennsylvania, and Pennsylvania men opposed New England wishes in the matter of duties on textiles. After the details of the bill were decided upon the measure was acceptable to no one."

The bill passed the House by a vote of 132 to 65. The majority of the protectionists voted for it because they considered it the best

1 Niles' Register, XLI., p.150.
2 " " p.282.
3 Stanwood, Tariff Controversies, I., p.275.
bill they could obtain; the majority of the anti-protectionists voted for it because it cut down the existing duties.

The bill was sent to the Senate where it was considerably improved in the interests of protection especially on woollens. The bill was then passed by an overwhelming majority and a Conference Committee appointed. This committee, to the surprise of every one, receded from all the Senate amendments. The action of Mr. Wilkins, of Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, was most surprising as he had voted for these amendments throughout. This gentleman occupied rather a peculiar position at this time as he was Pennsylvania's candidate for the vice presidency on the Democratic ticket with General Jackson; and, too, he was much more interested in the iron duties—which were saved than in the woollen duties—which were lost. The Senate, however, in spite of the remonstrances of Messrs. Clay and Webster agreed to the recommendations of the Conference Committee and passed the bill. Both senators from Pennsylvania voted for this measure. In fact Pennsylvania came out of this contest remarkably well, perhaps as a reward for its presidential vote of 1828 and as prepayment for its vote in 1832.

Governor Wolf's idea of what a protective tariff ought to be must have been popular in Pennsylvania as he was unanimously re-nominated for governor by the Democratic party in 1832. Niles' reported that "Wolf and anti-Wolf", are the battle cries of the politicians in

1 Dewey gives the following analysis of the vote in the House:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>In favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pennsylvania. The majority seem to be Wolfites. But some insist that the support of governor Wolf is opposition Jackson. The doctors disagree." Governor Wolf was triumphantly reelected and his efforts together with those of the legislature, and the Society for the Promotion of Manufactures and the Mechanic Arts, resulted in the election of thirteen anti-Jackson men out of a total of twenty-four representatives to the national Congress. Mr. Buchanan's home district went anti-Jackson by a large majority.

1 Niles' Register, XLI., p. 251.
Chapter IV.
1833-1857

The Tariff Act of 1832 had received a large vote from the South, an unanimous vote from the West, and a large majority from the Middle States and from New England. The "abominations" of 1828 had been removed, duties had been lowered, and large additions had been made to the free list. As a step in the right direction, it seems that it should have been fairly satisfactory to the anti-protectionists. But unfortunately nothing less than an abandonment of the principle of protection would satisfy South Carolina, and the Act of 1832 was proclaimed by the protectionists as confirming and establishing the American System as the settled policy of the country. South Carolina took the same view of the case and so nullification followed, and then came the Force Bill and the Compromise Act—together!

When the Compromise Bill was brought before Congress in 1833, it met strenuous opposition from the Pennsylvania contingent in both House and Senate. The reason for this bill's being brought before a Congress which had already legislated on the tariff, and which had removed the "abominations" of 1828, was touched upon by Senator Dallas when he expressed himself as willing to conciliate southern states, but in doing so he would not be representing his state but acting for the general good, and that he would sanction nothing in the bill as an abandonment of the principles of protection. ¹

In the House almost every Pennsylvanian fought against the compromise. Mr. Denny in a strong speech objected to revising a tariff passed only the year before. Mr. Crawford objected strongly to the

¹ Register of Debates, IX., p. 690.
The bill was passed through the House. He disclaimed being a manufacturer or in any way connected with manufactures, "in fact most of the manufacturers were his political enemies." But, said he, "If you break down a large establishment of iron, or wool, or cotton, you prostrate not its owner alone, but you reach every mechanic, every farmer, every laborer, in his neighborhood.... There remains, Mr. Chairman, another reason, which I am conscious should be touched with the most delicate hand, why I would decline legislating on the subject now. Need I say I refer to the situation of a portion of our country? Looking to the permanency of the confederacy, and believing that if any state can assume an attitude which will change the legislation of Congress, the Union is gone, I am compelled to avoid any step which will lead to such result."

Mr. Stewart expressed himself as being as strong a protectionist in 1833 as he had been in 1832, and not in favor of overturning the work of that year "at the demands of a few nullifiers." 1

In spite of the efforts of the Pennsylvanians and the just as strong efforts of the New Englanders, the bill passed the House by a vote of 119 to 85, and the Senate by 29 to 16. Out of twenty-five representatives from Pennsylvania, twenty-one voted against the bill; as did both its senators, Dallas and Wilkins.

1 Register of Debates, IX., pt. 2, p. 990.
2 " " " " " " p. 1118.
3 The vote, by Sections, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>In favor</th>
<th>Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and Southwest</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the Tariff Act of 1833 is known in the history of the United States as the Compromise Act, it is somewhat difficult to see just where the "compromise" lay. It arranged for a gradual reduction in the tariff — but it was a horizontal reduction. It was arranged for, by an agreement the two leaders of the two views — Clay, the exponent of the "American System", and Calhoun, the leader of the anti-protection phalanx. Of this bill Senator Benton, of Missouri, wrote: "The bill was then called a 'compromise' ...... and so-called, it was immediately proclaimed to be sacred and inviolable, as founded on mutual consent, although the only share which the manufacturing states (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Vermont) had in making the 'compromise' was to see it sprung upon them as a surprise, and forced upon them by anti-tariff votes, against the strenuous resistance of their senators and representatives in both Houses of Congress.  

As the vote shows more than 2 to 1 against the bill in the vote of New England and the Middle States, and more than 37 to 1 in its favor in the vote of the South and Southwest, it looks as though Senator Benton was right in his view of the "compromise." The compromising seems to have been all on one side.

It is true that for many years the manufacturing states objected to a change in the terms of this Act. But the reason may have been that they feared any change would be against their interests. — "Sufficient to the day is the evil thereof." It is interesting to note Pennsylvania's attitude toward this act which it had so stoutly resisted. In an editorial in Niles' Register, January 28, 1837, may be found the following: 'Resolutions have been introduced into both branches of the legislature of Pennsylvania deprecating, in strong terms, a repeal of the duties established by the compromise act. They will pass.'

1 Benton, Thirty Years' View, p. 319.
2 Vide note 3, p. 29.
of course, by large majorities—but will be little heeded by those politicians of the day, who considered the triumphs of a party of more importance than the welfare of the country."  

Mr. Niles, however, failed to judge correctly in this case for when soon after this resolution had passed the Pennsylvania legislature, a proposed reduction in the tariff was discussed in the Senate Mr. Buchanan said that "the legislature of Pennsylvania had instructed him and his colleague on this subject ....... that they instructed them to vote against any reduction of the tariff as it was established in March 1833, on the principle that to touch this subject at all might endanger their interests. Mr. Buchanan confessed, though he held the opinions of the legislature in high respect, that, had it not been for these instructions, he should have voted to take off the duties entirely, so far as it would not interfere with protection, and would not violate the compromise act. But now he felt bound to act according to his instructions, and would certainly bow to them with the utmost deference and respect."  

Mr. Buchanan may have been under the "spell of the compromise act" but the Pennsylvania legislature evidently held to it simply because any change "might endanger their interests." Senators Buchanan and McKean obeyed instructions and voted against any change in the tariff.  

The country was long in recovering from the panic of 1837; Congress authorized an issue of treasury notes to the amount of $100,000,000 and the full amount was issued. The election of Harrison and Tyler seemed, at first, to improve the situation. President Harrison called an extra session of Congress to meet on May 31, 1841, but when it met Tyler had become president by the death of Harrison. President Tyler in his message called attention to the fact that there was an esti-

1 Niles' Register, LII., p. 337.
2 " " " p. 414.
mated deficit for the year of $11,406,133; but gave warning that "the compromise act should not be altered except under urgent necessities which were not believed to exist at this time."

Congress seems to have had so many things to look after at this session that it almost entirely neglected to look after the money question. The Pennsylvania members made a strong fight for the hearing and printing of petitions and memorials for an increase of duties on iron manufactures. Mr. Irwin gave notice that the manufacturers, mechanics, and working men of the country, would be heard. "They would never consent that their petitions and memorials praying the consideration of Congress to subjects in which they feel a deep interest should meet the fate of abolition petitions, when their workshops were closed and all branches of domestic industry were languishing for want of the fostering care of the Government."¹

When Congress met in December, 1841, finances, both state and national, were in bad condition. The states of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and Arkansas, had been unable to meet their obligations. The Treasury of the national government had not been able to sell one-half the loan that had been authorized in July; and on January 1st, 1842, the tariff would be lowered by one-half the duties in excess of 20%, and at mid-year the other one-half would be lost. After this time the duties would be at 20%—a rate which would not bring in nearly sufficient revenue for the running expenses of the government.

Meanwhile Pennsylvania was "up and doing". A state convention of coal and iron men passed resolutions which "breathed the spirit and sentiments of home industry." This convention called a state meeting for April 13, 1842, at Harrisburg, of "the people of Pennsylvania.

¹ Congressional Globe, 1st sess. 27th Cong., p. 100.
² Niles' Register, LXII. p. 32.
engaged in manufacturing, agricultural, mining, mechanical, and internal commercial pursuits" that they might take measures "to secure all necessary encouragement of domestic labor." Memorials began pouring in asking Congress for protection to the iron interests, and for "a tariff of sufficient duties." Mr. Buchanan was kept busy presenting these memorials and, as always when the iron interests were suffering, he made a strong plea for their protection.

A temporary measure, called the "little tariff bill" passed both Houses but was returned by the President with a veto message. Two other tariff bills were vetoed by him before the Whigs would include in the proposed law the proviso that "if at any time the duties under the compromise tariff were raised, the distribution of revenue should be suspended." A bill which met the wishes of Mr. Tyler was at last formulated, it passed Congress by a close vote in both Houses, and it was signed by the President on August 30, 1842. This Tariff Act of 1842 was a protective measure passed by the Whigs with a little help from the Democrats. The Whigs who voted against the bill did so because they objected to the land-distribution clause; the Democrats who voted for it gave their vote because of the need of revenue or for its protective features—the second of these reasons accounts for the vote of the Pennsylvanians. The vote in the Senate, 24 to 23, was made up of 20 Whigs and 4 northern Democrats—Buchanan and Sturgeon, of Pennsylvania, Wright, of New York, and Williams, of Maine. Messrs. Buchanan and Wright explained their votes as being cast because of the need of the revenue. This may have been Mr. Buchanan's reason, but his motive may have been the one ascribed by Mr. Calhoun to account for his vote on the Compromise Act. Mr. Calhoun in a letter to Mr. Hammond, dated September 24, 1841, wrote: "The motive of Mr. Buchanan is easily explained. His state is a tariff state, made so by the iron

1Niles' Register, LXII, p. 32. 2Dewey, Financial History of the U.S., p. 238
business, and still more by the want of decision on his part. He had yield, or go out of publick life, and to go out in Pennsylvania is to be lost politically. He chose the former."

The Tariff Act of 1842 was very satisfactory from a revenue point of view and very satisfactory to manufacturers; the only ones who found fault were those opposed to the principle of protection. As early as the Twenty-eighth Congress (1843-1844) an effort was made to reduce the duties, but the Senate was Whig by a small majority and in that body the question did not even come to a vote; but the House was Democratic and the Ways and Means Committee had a majority of free traders. This committee reported a bill which proposed a considerable reduction of duties but the bill was laid on the table with the help of Democratic votes from Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey—states that had had all the low tariff they desired during the last years of the Compromise Act.

As President Tyler had been repudiated by the Whigs and was not trusted by the Democrats, he was out of the presidential race of 1844. The Whig party rallied around Clay. An effort was made by the friends of Mr. Buchanan to make him the nominee of the Democratic party. In a letter from Calhoun to James H. Hammond, dated December 31, 1841, Calhoun wrote: "Mr. Buchanan's friends have made a demonstration in his favour in Pennsylvania, but there has been but feeble response in the State and none out." A letter from Charleston, dated November 19, 1841, to Calhoun from John A. Stuart, said: "The Democrats have as a party so thoroughly committed themselves against a Tariff that to fight on that ground would kill off any Northern Democrat. Mr. Buchanan then is out of the question." In a letter to Calhoun, February 1, 1844,

1 Calhoun Letters, Ed. by Jameson, p. 491.
2 Ibid. p. 502.
3 Ibid. p. 548.
Francis M. Wharton wrote: "The worst sign I see now is now is Mr. Buchanan's equivocations, both about the tariff and the presidency"; and a little later the same gentleman wrote to Mr. Calhoun that Mr. Buchanan was spoken of as a "pro-Texas, pro-Tariff caucus Democrat" than whom "Mr. Clay even would make a better president". Mr. Calhoun and his friends evidently had no desire to see Mr. Buchanan become president of the United States.

In the Democratic Convention of 1844, Mr. Buchanan made but a poor showing, Mr. Van Buren failed to obtain the nomination because of the adoption of the two-thirds rule, and finally James K. Polk, of Tennessee, a very "dark horse" received the nomination for the presidency. The convention showed good judgment in giving the second place on the ticket to George M. Dallas, of Pennsylvania, for even the second place helps in getting votes from a doubtful state.

Polk had been against protection in 1833 but had based his opposition on the one-sided testimony of the manufacturers, given before the Committee on Manufactures in 1828. Clay's devotion to the protective cause was considered not so strong since his compromise measure of 1833. In 1842 he had been asked by Pennsylvanians to present a memorial to Congress in relation to the tariff and the Compromise Act, and, when presenting the memorial, to express his views on the Compromise Act. Mr. Clay did as requested. He explained that he had two motives in promoting the compromise, (1) to keep the country from civil war and (2) "to preserve from utter destruction the system of protection which Pennsylvania favored when the law was passed."

Mr. Clay's explanation seems reasonable and the people of Pennsylvania should have been able to see which candidate better represented their principles. But Mr. Buchanan and some other Pennsy-

1 Calhoun Letters, pp. 920, 958.
2 Niles' Register, LVI., p. 112.
VANIA politicians who wished to hold a leading place in the Democratic party stood good for Polk's protectionist principles. They asserted that he was a better protectionist than Mr. Clay and adduced the celebrated Kane letter as convincing proof of his devotion to the cause of protection. This letter was written by Mr. Polk to John K. Kane, of Philadelphia, and was in part as follows: "I am in favor of a tariff for revenue, such a one as will yield a sufficient amount to the treasury to defray the expenses of the government economically administered. In adjusting the details of a revenue tariff I have heretofore sanctioned such moderate duties as would produce the amount of revenue needed, and at the same time afford reasonable incidental protection to our home industry. I am opposed to a tariff for protection merely, and not for revenue."  

It seems to us now that the Pennsylvanians ought to have seen that Mr. Polk's "reasonable incidental protection" was very like General Jackson's "judicious" tariff. Judging from a letter written on May 31st, 1844, by Francis Wharton from Philadelphia, some Pennsylvanians did have a faint glimmering of light; Mr. Wharton wrote: "The Pennsylvania editors—I mean the editors of the Pennsylvania Newspapers,—have started on the hunt after Mr. Polk's opinions, and have discovered, to their horror, that he is not only pro-Texas, but anti-tariff. So far, so good." But in spite of newspaper opinions the people of the Keystone State, relying on the statement of Messrs. Buchanan and Dallas, that Mr. Polk was a good protectionist, climbed on the Democratic band wagon carrying banners inscribed "Polk, Dallas, and the Tariff of 1842." They seem to have forgotten that the Tariff of 1842 had been a Whig measure and that the Democratic representatives from their own state had voted against it in the House. The only truth in

1 Vide Stanwood, Tariff Controversies, II., p. 40.
2 Calhoun Letters, p.
the claim that this act was a Democratic measure lay in the fact that
four Democratic senators had voted for the bill in the Senate. There
is no doubt that at this time Mr. Dallas was for the tariff of 1842,
but the less that was said of Mr. Polk's attitude on that point, the
better. The Polk, Dallas, and Protection" cry swept Pennsylvania into
the Democratic ranks, and helped to win victory for the party in 1844.

That Mr. Buchanan saw danger ahead is clearly shown in a letter
written by him to Mr. Polk November 4, 1844. After congratulating Mr.
Polk on his prospects, Mr. Buchanan wrote: "From the violence of the
Southern papers & some of the Southern statesmen, I apprehend that
your chief difficulty will be on the question of the Tariff. They
seem to cling with great tenacity to the horizontal ad valorem duty
of the Compromise Act, which, independently of the injury inflicted on
the Country, would in practice prostrate the Democracy of the Middle
& Northern States in a single year; because it would destroy all our
mechanicks who work up foreign materials." Mr. Buchanan seems to have
been trying to make Mr. Polk over into the protectionist which he
(Mr. B.) had proclaimed him to be previous to the election.

That Mr. Polk fully appreciated Mr. Buchanan's services during
the campaign, is shown by the fact that Mr. Buchanan became Secretary
of State under the Polk administration. The appointment of Robert
J. Walker, of Mississippi, a strong advocate of free trade, as Secretary
of the Treasury showed something else, quite different, to Pennsylvania.

The Democratic party in the South had opposed the nomination of
Mr. Buchanan because they did not wish even a "mild protectionist" as
president. They had felt morally sure of Mr. Polk before the election
and his inaugural address, in which he expounded the principles ex-
pressed by him in the Kane letter, made it clear that he was hostile

1 Curtis' Life of James Buchanan, I., p. 525.
to the protective system. The free trade and anti-tariff journals began to exult "in the prospect of a speedy triumph over the protection party. The president's message as interpreted, explained and illustrated by the report of the secretary of the treasury, is now received by the most ultra of the South Carolina journals and straightest of the sect of 'free traders' as fully satisfactory to them."

The Pennsylvanians saw the "handwriting on the wall"; to them it was evident that from the Polk administration there was a very good chance of receiving what they had not intended to vote for. So without waiting for the meeting of Congress, a state convention was held on November 22, 1845, at Hollidaysburg, to discuss the tariff situation. The convention was composed almost exclusively of Democrats as the Whigs stayed away purposely in order that it could in no way be considered a Whig meeting. Various resolutions were passed and among them was: "Resolved, That the state of Pennsylvania is deeply interested in the maintenance and preservation of the protective policy afforded by the existing revenue tariff."

The Harrisburg Union (Democrat) came out in a strong editorial on the subject of the protective tariff: "Nature and Nature's God have intended this to be a manufacturing state", said the editor, and "every measure which tends to develop her resources will meet the support of every Pennsylvanian who is not blinded by ignorance or warped by prejudice.... We take it that this is a question which concerns one party quite as much as another.... Protection is absolutely indispensable to the existence of our manufactures." Referring to the probable attack in the next session of Congress on the tariff of 1842, the Union went on to say that it was not difficult where its

---

1 House Journal, 1st sess. 29th Cong. pp. 30-33.
2 Niles' Register, LXIX., p. 257.
3 Ibid. p. 181.
enemies would stop "if allowed to sack and pillage unrestrained. Therefore these "hostile demonstrations" must meet with prompt re-
sistance "both by our representatives and by loud and emphatic ex-
pression of popular sentiment.....Our senators in Congress are bound
to support the tariff.....As Pennsylvania has spoken in times past,
so let her speak now. It is necessary that her position should be
understood by the whole Union and a determination not to shrink from
it, whatever may be the clamor raised against it from any quarter."

Mr. Buchanan's position at this time may be seen from a letter
written, September 18, 1845, by F.B. Phett to Calhoun: "I passed through
Washington on my way home; and took the occasion to see Mr. Walker,
Mr. Buchanan and the President on the subject of the Tariff." Mr.
Polk went for a reduction but on no principle which Mr. Phett could
understand. "Mr. Buchanan talked fairer. He said he was indifferent
to the principle, believing that a revenue Tariff would afford all the
protection required."

President Polk's first message to Congress, December, 1845, discussed
the tariff question at great length. He was opposed to the tariff
of 1842 as oppressive, and favored no duty above a revenue standard;
he favored a protective tariff, in a measure, but under such restric-
tions that there was little or no protection left to the manufactur-
er. In fact his position seemed to be that Congress might put on all
the protective duties it liked, provided the interests of free trade
were in no way interfered with.

On the resolution referring this part of the message to the prop-
er committee, Mr. Stewart, of Pennsylvania, took the opportunity to
make a strong plea for protection; and in refutation of the doctrine
of unconstitutionality advanced in Secretary of the Treasury Walk-

1 Niles' Register, LXIX., p.142. 2 House Journal, Ys. 29C, p.1029.
3 Calhoun Letters, p.1049.
er's report, Mr. Stewart to the messages of Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, and later to Jackson's as proving their belief in the constitutionality of protection. Mr. Stewart took this occasion to refer to the toast sent "some time since to the manufacturers of Pittsburg by Secretary of State Buchanan to this effect: 'The election of James K. Polk has saved the manufacturers from being ruined and overwhelmed by excessive competition.'"

Before a tariff bill was reported in Congress the Pennsylvanians had done what they could. In January the state legislature passed resolutions, unanimously in the senate and by a vote of 79 to 13 in the house of representatives, instructing its senators and requesting representatives in Congress, to oppose any and all reductions of the existing tariff law.

Commenting on this action of the Pennsylvania legislature, the Register said: "In Pennsylvania the tariff has never been a party question. Pennsylvania supported the tariff acts of 1816, 1824, 1828, and opposed the compromise act of 1833, a measure, which, on the one hand ran down the tariff to 20%, and on the other reduced the government to bankruptcy. — If there are states that desire to bring the government back to such a condition, Pennsylvania will not be among the number."

The tariff bill of 1846, cutting down the duties much more than the Act of 1842, easily passed the House by a vote of 114 to 95. Its way through the Senate was not so smooth as this house was closely divided between the two parties. The Democrats had a majority of 6, but the two Democratic senators from Pennsylvania and one from Con-

1 Niles' Register, LXIX., pp. 343-347.
2 Ibid. pp. 356, 370.
3 House Journal, 1st sess. 29th Cong., p. 830.
necticut, were opposed to a reduction of duties. Pennsylvania had confidently counted on three votes in case of a tie as Vice President Dallas was a Pennsylvanian and a protectionist. On the vote for the engrossment and third reading of the bill there was a tie vote, and Mr. Dallas cast his vote with the free traders and against the protectionists of his own state. Mr. Dallas made an explanation of his vote to the effect that in the election of President Polk and that Congress, he saw evidence that the will of the people wished a change in the tariff policy, and that he could not "justifiably counteract" by a sort of official veto, the general will."

Mr. Dallas may have intended to be honest, but his explanation failed to explain several things, the most important of which was why, if the election of Mr. Polk would be evidence of a desire on the part of the people to change the tariff policy, he had labored so earnestly during the campaign to convince the people of his own state who did not want a change that Mr. Polk was a better friend to protection than was Mr. Clay. On the whole it seems that a better explanation may be found in a letter to Calhoun from J.A. Campbell (Mobile, December 20, 1847), which said: "Dallas loses caste from his connection with Polk. He seems to want position and character."

On the final vote in the Senate Mr. Dallas' vote was not required as the bill passed by a vote of 28 to 27. Senators Cameron and Stur-geon, of Pennsylvania, obeyed their instructions and voted against the bill, as did every member of the House with the single exception of Mr. Wilmot who voted in its favor.

1 For explanation, vide Congressional Globe, 1st sess. 29th Cong. p. 1155
2 Calhoun Letters, p. 1153.

* 3 Miles classifies the Pennsylvania vote as follows:
  Whigs 10
  Locofocos 11
  Natives 2

* Miles Register, LXX., p. 290.
The campaign cry of the Whig party in 1848 was "Hurrah for Taylor!" and nothing was said of the tariff. General Taylor's views on the tariff were not known at the time of his election, but he appointed a strong protectionist, William M. Meredith, of Pennsylvania, Secretary of the Treasury. President Taylor's death gave the presidency to Mr. Fillmore. The new president was a protectionist and had been one of the foremost advocates of the Tariff Act of 1842. In every message to Congress he urged better measures of protection, but no action was taken during his administration.

The year 1853 brought Franklin Pierce to the presidential chair and the Whigs were retired from power. President Pierce appointed Mr. Buchanan, who had been enjoying the pleasures of private life for the past four years, minister to the Court of St. James.

President Pierce made a suggestion to reduce the tariff in each message to Congress; in his third message he said: "It is now so generally conceded that the purpose of revenue alone can justify the imposition of duties on imports, that in readjusting the impost tables and schedules, which unquestionably require essential modifications, a departure from the principle of the present tariff is not anticipated." Finally, in the last week of the Pierce administration, the Tariff Act of 1857 was hurried through Congress and was signed by the President on March 3, 1857.

Of this measure Taussig says: "It was agreed on all hands that a reduction of the revenue was imperatively called for, and, except from Pennsylvania, there was no opposition to the reduction of duties made in it." It seems that there was little opposition, and little politics in any way connected with it. The majority of the Pennsylvania members of the House supported the bill while in the Senate Mr. Bigler voted in its favor and Mr. Brodhead against it. The support from the House Journal, 2nd sess., 34th Cong. 3 Taussig, Tariff Hist. p. 116

Ibid.
Pennsylvania was probably given because the bill, while reducing duties in general, favored manufacturers by reducing duties on raw materials.
Pennsylvania was probably given because the bill, while reducing duties in general, favored manufacturers by reducing duties on raw materials.
Chapter V.
1858-1860.

The Kansas-Nebraska Bill had not yet passed the Senate, the House in which it originated, before a movement was begun in the free states for the organization of a new political party whose issue should be the non-extension of slavery. The first step was probably taken in Ripon, Wisconsin, in February, 1854, where fusion meetings were held; a "fusion committee composed of three Whigs, one Free-Soiler, and one Democrat, was formed; and the name Republican was proposed for the new party." On the day after the passage of this bill by Congress, some members if the House of Representatives met in Washington and decided "that a new party ought to be formed and that it should be called Republican." Opposition to the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was widespread in all the northern states. A Philadelphia newspaper (The Pennsylvanian) said that there were but two parties in the United States; one was the Democratic, the other the Opposition. In the fall elections of 1854 nine states and sixty-two seats in the House of Representatives were lost to the Democracy.

February 22, 1856, the first National Republican Convention met in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. The call for this meeting had been issued by the committees of nine states for the purpose of organizing a national party. The convention adopted an address and resolutions, and issued a call for a convention to meet at Philadelphia on June 17th to nominate candidates for the presidency and vice presidency. In re-

1 Wilson, Rise and Fall of the Slave Power, II., pp. 409, 410.
2 McMaster History of the People of the U.S., VIII., p. 208.
3 For account of this meeting see The Independent, Feb. 28, 1856.
5 For account of this meeting see The Independent, June 19, 1856.
sponse to this call delegates met at the appointed time and place and organized for work. They constructed a party platform which favored internal improvements but said nothing on the tariff question. It is probable, however, thought silence golden when they read, in the National Democratic Platform: "The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas, and progressive Free Trade throughout the world."

The great struggle in the presidential campaign of 1856 was in Pennsylvania. The slave-holding states had 120 votes, California could be counted on for four more, but it took 129 votes to elect. Another state must be secured, and what one so suitable as Pennsylvania, Mr. Buchanan's own state? Eastern Pennsylvania was enthusiastic for Buchanan but western Pennsylvania was just as enthusiastic for Fremont, the Republican nominee. Money was sent into the state to carry the election for the Democratic ticket. As money was not plentiful in the Republican camp, the Republicans had to try other tactics. Greeley said: "We must supply them with documents, canvass them with our best speakers, and pay for the rooms they speak in, for in each state, so far as money is concerned, is utterly miserable." But in spite of all Republican efforts, Pennsylvania went Democratic and Mr. Buchanan was elected president.

The panic of 1857 had caused so much loss in the national revenue that receipts were not sufficient to meet the expenses of the government; but as the Tariff Act of 1857 had been so recently enacted, President Buchanan did not, in his first message to Congress, suggest any change. The fall elections were decidedly adverse to the administration.

1 Tribune Almanac for 1857, p. 42.
2 For substance of platform see Tribune Almanac for 1857, p. 43.
4 Pike, First Blows of the Civil War, p. 246 quoted by McMaster, VIII., p. 275.
tion. In Pennsylvania alone out of twenty-five members elected to
the House of Representatives, but three were Buchanan men. The Pres-
ident ascribed the loss in the eastern part of the state to the sym-
pathy of the Philadelphians for "bleeding Kansas" but said that "in
the interior of the state the tariff was the damaging question." \(^1\)

By the spring of 1859 the Pennsylvanians in Congress became so
urgent for protection to their industries that they were "read out
of the party" by the Washington States (a Democratic periodical). This
however, did not prevent the Pennsylvania Democratic Convention, March
16, 1859, from advocating, in its platform, a revision of the tariff of
1857. When Congress met in December, it was found that the Republi-
cans had 113 out of 239 members in the House and that no party had a
majority. It was not a propitious time for action on the tariff but
after much effort Mr. Morrill, of Vermont, succeeded in getting a bill
before the House on April 6, 1860. Mr. Morrill was a protectionist
but recognized that there was no chance for a bill with a large ele-
ment of protection. His own statement was that "no prohibitive du-
ties have been aimed at; but to place our people upon a level of fair
competition with the rest of the world is thought to be no more than
reasonable." This bill passed the House by a vote of 105 to 64. The
vote was not altogether on party lines; a few Democrats voted in fa-
vor and three Republicans voted against it; the free states generally
favored and the slave states as generally opposed; almost one-third
of the House failed to vote. The bill was reported in the Senate by
Mr. Hunter, Chairman of the Committee on Finance, who moved that con-
sideration of the bill be postponed till the next session. This mo-
tion was carried by a vote of 25 to 23, practically a party vote as
Mr. Bigler, of Pennsylvania, was the only Democrat who voted in the

\(^1\) Euchanan to Miss Lane, Curtis' Life of James Buchanan, II., p. 241.
who voted in the negative.\[^{1}\]

The failure of the Morrill Bill to pass the Senate caused much dissatisfaction in Pennsylvania as the iron and wool business had been greatly depressed since the panic of 1857. The tariff question became the important question that it had been in the early days of the republic. Other states might discuss other questions but for Pennsylvania there was but one question—protection. The Republicans nominated A.C. Curtin, a strong protectionist and a strong man, for governor; the Republican National Convention put a protection plank in its platform and nominated Abraham Lincoln for president; then the campaign cry of "Lincoln, Curtin, and Protection" was raised in Pennsylvania. Many speeches were made in the state in which the only issue discussed was the tariff, and "it is safe to say that no Pennsylvania advocate of Lincoln made a speech in his state without some mention of the question that now dominated all others in the Pennsylvania mind."\[^{2}\]

The Democratic party saw the danger and did its best to stem the current. The New York World is authority for the statement that money was sent in from outside to help carry the election. Stephen A. Douglas even spoke in favor of protection to its industries when he canvassed the state. But Pennsylvania no longer trusted the Democratic party—its trust had been too often betrayed. Mr. Curtin was triumphantly elected in October; in November, Pennsylvania elected twenty-seven presidential electors, an important item in the election of Lincoln in November; finally, the passage of the Morrill Bill by the Senate on February 21, 1861, gave to Pennsylvania the rewards of its hard fought battle—Lincoln, Curtin, and protection.

\[^{1}\] For platform see Tribune Almanac, 1861, p.30.

\[^{2}\] The Washington correspondent of The Independent, May 24, 1860, said: "A good deal of criticism has been expended upon the Platform, some objecting to the so-called high-tariff plank, but which is really a say-nothing clause, for it has no meaning."

\[^{2}\] Rhodes, History of the People of the U.S., II., p.479.
Chapter VI.
Conclusion.

The year 1860 found the Pennsylvania representation in Congress occupying exactly the same position as it had occupied in the year 1816; the Morrill Bill received exactly the same welcome as the tariff bill of 1816. The natural resources of the state plus its geographical position plus the character of its citizens, had made and kept it a manufacturing state. Pennsylvania has often been charged with inconsistency and selfishness; a survey of its tariff history from 1815 to 1861, however, shows little foundation for the charge and reveals that, compared with other states, it had been as consistent and unselfish as the times and the condition of things would allow, since states, like individuals, had not—at least in the years 1816-1860—reached a state of perfection. New England changed its policy as its interests shifted from commerce to manufactures; the South changed as it became convinced that it could not succeed in manufacturing and that its interests would be promoted by free trade with foreign nations; and the West fluctuated as it believed that its interests would be benefitted by a protective tariff or a revenue tariff; Pennsylvania alone stood most consistently and most unselfishly for protection to all and for all alike. When tariff bills were brought before Congress in 1816, 1820, 1824, 1827, 1828, and 1832, Pennsylvania representatives, almost to a man, worked with might and main for their passage. When the Compromise Act was proposed, which in time would give virtual free trade, Pennsylvania was found to be a unit against the measure. In 1842, when a protective measure was before Congress, although some members of the House forgot the interests of
state

while remembering that it was a Whig measure, the senators heed-
their legislative instructions and, Democrats though they were, helped
to carry through the tariff bill of 1842 which would have failed without their assistance. Again in 1846, with but a single exception, the
members from Pennsylvania—Whigs, Democrats, and Native Americans—joined in opposition to the bill which took away the measure of protection furnished by the act of 1842. The great majority of the state delegation voted for the measure brought before Congress in 1857 because, by lowering the duties on raw materials, it assisted the manufacturers and, besides, it was the best measure they could possibly obtain at the time. In 1860, when there was a turn in the tide toward adequate protection for home industries, the Pennsylvania phalanx was found in its old place fighting in the front ranks for the old cause—protection to home industries.

That there were times when the fidelity of Pennsylvania to the cause of protection was doubted, cannot be denied; but in most cases it can be shown that it was not the citizens at home that wavered but that it was those representatives in Congress who were making a bid for positions in the administratives councils, or even for the presidency, who betrayed the interests of their constituents. That the devotion of these to the anti-tariff cause was sometimes questioned, is seen from the Calhoun letters; and that the free traders had some ground for their doubt, is shown by the vote of Mr. Buchanan in 1842 when he obeyed the instructions of Pennsylvania, although he was careful to state that he would have voted differently on some points, had it not for those instructions. In the presidential elections of 1828 and 1832 when Pennsylvania cast its vote for Jackson, it did so with the understanding that he was in favor of a protective tariff. He

1 Mr. Bigler was the only Democratic senator who voted for the Morrill Bill.
2 Vide pp. 34, 35.
had consistently voted for the various tariff bills which had been brought before Congress while he was a member of that body, and how was Pennsylvania to know that Mr. Jackson's idea of a judicious tariff differed from its own? In 1844 the soundness of Mr. Polk on the tariff question was vouched for by Messrs. Buchanan and Ingham both of whom, whatever their other failings might have been, had never failed to fight manfully for the protection of Pennsylvania's interests in Congress. So the campaign cry of "Polk, Dallas, and the Tariff of 1842" was raised; and on the strength of their statement that Mr. Polk was a better tariff man than Mr. Clay, the exponent of the American System, the cause of protection was led to the slaughter by the votes of Pennsylvanians.

The charge that Pennsylvania was selfish in its protectionism is, in the main, disproved by an examination on the various tariff measures. In almost every contest the representatives of Pennsylvania fought side by side with the members from other sections for duties on hemp, sugar, cotton, wool, and the manufactures of wool and cotton, as it fought for duties on iron, coal, and glass. It was only on the bills presented in 1827, 1828, and 1832, that there is any foundation for the charge; here the cause may be found in the political aspirations of some of the Pennsylvania politicians. It was a case of letting the interests of other states go by the board or of letting their own interests go; the politician does not usually hesitate long between the two. Another must be considered in connection with the tariff bills of 1828 and 1832, the fact that a majority of Congress was hostile to the whole protective policy and that it was determined to cut down the protective duties, especially of Whiggish New England; the help of Democratic Pennsylvania was desired for the work and so its industries would be favored in return. In saving its own industries Penn-
sylvania followed the first law of nature, self-preservation; since it could not save both itself and New England, it saved itself.

The sentiment of the state must be judged by the sentiment of its people at home and not by its representatives in Congress. The sentiment in Pennsylvania may be seen from the great mass meetings held at various times in the interests of protection; by the societies formed to promote the interests of manufactures and agriculture; by the efforts of men like Matthew Carey, of Philadelphia, who worked hand in hand with Hezekiah Niles, of Baltimore, for the protection of all interests alike; from the feeling shown by the constituents of men like Representatives Stewart, Lawrence, and others to whom were given resolutions, votes of thanks, and public dinners, in return for their devotion to the cause of protection; and finally, from the instructions and requests of the state legislature at various times to their members of Congress to vote for protective and against free trade measures.

A careful survey, then, of the tariff history of Pennsylvania from 1815 to 1861 shows that, as a whole, it was consistently a protective tariff state and that it has exemplified the principles expressed in 1857 by Senator Brodhead when speaking on the floor of the Senate on the tariff bill of that year: "We of Pennsylvania ask for no special legislation in behalf of any great interest other than that which is accorded to other interests, and that which is good for the whole country."
Pennsylvania and the Tariff, 1816-1860
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