

COLUMBIA TELESCOPE.

AND SOUTH-CAROLINA STATE JOURNAL.

[XII.]

COLUMBIA, (S. C.) TUESDAY MORNING, JUNE 20, 1826.

[NO. 25.]

Columbia Telescope;

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY BY

D. S. SWANN,

Printer to the House of Representatives of South-Carolina.

TERMS:—THREE DOLLARS per annum, payable in advance, or FIVE DOLLARS payable at the end of the year.

Advertisements are inserted at the rate of seventy-five cents for every twenty lines, or a less number, for the first insertion, and forty cents for each continuance.—Those from non-subscribers must be accompanied by the cash, or a responsible reference, or they will receive no attention.

Poetry.

THE VALE OF LOVE.

I know a dear and lovely spot,
A scene of sunshine and of flowers,
And inly would I fix my lot
Amid its smiling lawns and bowers.

There rippling waters softly play,
Telling to blossomed banks their tale,
And Nature's notes and Pleasure's lay
Glide gently through that joyous vale.

Yet think not in bowers and brooks,
Its best and dearest charm is found;
Oh! tis the beams of one whose looks
Shed light, and hope, and spring, around.

And where it changed to trackless sand,
Love's magic wand the course would ball;
And flowers and fruits, the fair land,
Would flourish in that desert vale.

LINES WRITTEN AT SEA.

BY AN EMIGRANT.

O'er the wide waves I seek the kindly shore,
Where Priests, friend of Man, is gone before;
Blow ye propitious winds a saving gale,
And eastern breezes fill each swelling sail.
Wait me where Freedom, nymph of rosy hue,
With baskin' feet imprints the peary dew—
Where no proud Tyrant with unpunished sway,
Nods his commands, and trembling slaves obey.

No swarm of pensioners, a rorid band,
Those starving locusts of a starving land;
No spendthrift Lords, the Monarch's supple tools,
Dandied on Fashion's lap and turned out fools:
No hireling spies, a despicable race,
Mealy to mingle in each public place,
To mar the glowing charms of social life,
Break friendship's bonds, and set the world at strife.

Hail! happy clime, to thee from every land
Where cruel despots rule with iron hand,
Virtue oppress'd shall from corruption fly,
To state the blessings of thy genial sky.
The sportive zephyr, ten that delights to rove,
Free as the songster of the vocal grove—
On the gay plains her ocean rood shall sit,
Sing the broad rivers and the lowing hill;
The united friends in faithful notes rehearse,
And chaunt the virtues in immortal verse.

BETTER MARRY THAN BURN.

BY SUREX OSBOR.

In India, one day, an American said,
With a smart native lass at a window,
Do your widows burn themselves? pray tell me
That.

Said the pretty, inquisitive Hindoo,

Do they burn? that they do! the American said,
And that was the case with my mother;
Our widow, the moment her husband is dead,
Immediately burns—for another!

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

In the debate on the 23d Feb. Mr. Ellice, Member for Coventry, presented petitions from the Silk-weavers, and moved an inquiry into the expediency of prohibiting the importation of foreign Silk; which motion he supported by a speech and was followed on the same by Mr. Williams, the lawyer who distinguished himself by the acuteness of his cross examination on the late Queen's trial. It was in reply to them that the following admirable speech was delivered.

Richmond Enquirer.

The question being put—

Mr. Huskisson rose, and addressed the house to the following effect: The honorable member for Coventry, in the arguments he has just advanced, may naturally be supposed to be influenced by his connection with that city, but I felt ready to meet that circumstance, in the consideration of his speech. In order not to retract from the weight of what he has said in support of his motion. With respect to the last gentleman who has spoken, the second of the motion, I must suppose that he is under the influence of some connection more recently formed than that of the honorable member for Coventry. (Hear and laughter.) Possibly the honorable and learned gentleman may be in expectation of succeeding to the post of the former honorable member's colleague. I will, however, examine more minutely into the speech which I have just heard. I confess with astonishment, from the honorable and learned gentleman who has just sat down. That honorable and learned gentleman has allowed himself to say, that he was not authorized to make certain statements—not at liberty to make certain admissions—in a word, he seemed to address the house as though he came specially instructed for the occasion; holding such language as was usual and customary in the courts of justice, but which sounded now and striking in the mouth of a member of that house. With regard to the character which marked the other portion of his speech, the vehemence of his heated declamation, his unqualified con-

sure and sarcasm—I say, that as respects those features of his, I can with perfect sincerity assure the house, and the honorable and learned gentleman himself, that I entertain no sentiment of anger, nor any other feelings than those in which I am sure I carry with me the sympathy of all who entertain sound views on this interesting question; and who now, for the first time, hear that honorable and learned gentleman launching forth his denunciations against the maintenance and advocacy of general principles—against the adoption of philosophical theory—against receding after delay and circumspection, to the universal desire of every honest and intelligent man in the country, and yielding to the opinion of every enlightened man in Europe.—(Loud cheering.) I leave him then, for, in the full enjoyment of all the new light that has so recently and so suddenly broken in upon him. I leave him and his honorable friends around him to digest the taunts and sneers which, on the present occasion, it has been his pleasure to pour forth—against a course of measures which his friends profess to have been the first to recommend, and for which they claim the merit.—[Cheers.] Now, Sir, I beg to say, that in whatever quarters the statements of the honorable member for Coventry may have originated, and more especially if they be from individuals now suffering distress from the want of employment, and which want of employment they may conceive may have been caused by the measures of this house; from whatever quarters, I say they may come, they are entitled to our indulgence. I feel, sir, the difficulty in which I am placed, in rising to address the house in opposition to what it has heard from the mover and seconder of the motion. In opposing it, I may seem insensible or indifferent to the distress which now bears upon so large a portion of the manufacturers, not only in this branch, but in others. The honorable and learned gentleman has affirmed, that I was not only mistaken in my views, but that I am insensible to the distresses now prevailing among the manufacturing classes.

Mr. J. Williams denied having applied the term insensible to the right honorable gentleman.

Mr. Huskisson—Most certainly I understood it to be so applied. I appeal to the house, whether the honorable and learned gentleman did not, in the whole course of his speech, speak of me as one lost to every thing but a desire of maintaining consistency, and the principles I formerly professed, at all sacrifices. I appeal to the house, whether he did not use a quotation applying to me the malignant qualities of a demon. It is for him to reconcile his opinions expressed at different times in Parliament, and for me to entertain my feelings of utter scorn for the accusation. Charges have been made against me from other quarters, and before I sit down I shall be able to repel them, and show the house that my conduct, and that of my friends around me, has not been represented by the honorable and learned member; who has, by some strange perversion of understanding, and, indeed, the honorable member for Coventry has done the same, addressed the house upon the subject as if we now heard of it for the first time. They have gone on in a manner which would lead any one to suppose that this very measure was not the result of an act of Parliament passed 18 months back, and which has, in fact, become part of the law of the land. I own that, in the view I take of the speech of the honorable member for Coventry, of which I do not complain, and of the speech of the honorable and learned member who last sat down, of which I do complain, upon the view I take of them, they seem to me to go entirely upon this, viz. that the principles of commercial policy which have prevailed for the last two or three years in Parliament, and which tend to remove all restrictions on commerce, and to give every facility, consistent with vested interest, to the extension of manufactures, industry, and the full employment of capital, have been the cause of the present condition of the country.—What other view can be taken of them, after all we have heard about reciprocity, which applies to every measure which relates to the different circumstances under which manufactures and trade were carried on, now and heretofore. I therefore consider the present question is, whether we shall, by re-enacting these prohibitions, re-establish the system of restriction generally? Whether we shall tread back all the steps we have made in advance towards a better system of commercial policy? [Cheers.] If we retreat in this instance, we must in consistency retrace all our other steps; nay, we must go further, and under prohibitions such as have never been heard of before. [Hear, hear.] We shall be obliged to go upon a system of almost total exclusion. Therefore, do

I say, that the question is not now simply the motion before the house, but, as I said before, of totally changing its commercial policy. It becomes the house before it decides this important question, to look a little at what has been the cause of the measures adopted by government. I shall be sorry to detain the house; but from the importance of the subject, I feel called upon to ask permission to call its attention to a petition presented to the house in May 1820, which was like the present—a time of great distress and difficulty.—I assure the house, that those honorable members who may favor me with their attention, will be rewarded by hearing principles laid down in the clearest manner, not by theorists, not by philosophers—[cheers]—not by abstruse metaphysicians with the malignity of demons in their hearts, but by merchants and traders, and those principles expressed in terms so much more perspicuous than those in which I could expound them, that I shall read it to the house. It is the petition of the merchants and traders of the city of London; it states—

"That foreign commerce is eminently conducive to the wealth and prosperity of a country, by enabling it to import the commodities for the production of which the soil, climate, capital, and industry of other countries are best calculated, and to export in payment those articles for which its own situation is better adapted.

"That freedom from restriction is calculated to give the utmost extension to foreign trade, and the best direction to the capital and industry of the country.

"That the maxim of buying in the cheapest market and selling in the dearest, which regulates every merchant in his individual dealings, is strictly applicable, as the best rule for the trade of the whole nation.

"That a policy founded on these principles, would render the commerce of the world an interchange of mutual advantages, and induce an increase of the wealth and enjoyments among the inhabitants of each state.

"That unfortunately, a policy, the very reverse of this, has been, and is more or less, adopted and acted upon by the government of this and of every other country, each trying to exclude the productions of other countries, with the spacious and well meant design of encouraging its own production; thus inflicting on the bulk of its subjects, who are consumers, the necessity of submitting to privations in the quantity and quality of commodities; and thus rendering what ought to be the source of mutual benefits, and of harmony among states, a constantly recurring occasion of jealousy and hostility.

"That the prevailing prejudice in favor of the protective or restrictive system, may be traced to the erroneous supposition that a monopoly of foreign commodities occasions a diminution or discouragement of our own production to the same extent; whereas it may be clearly shown, that although the particular description of production which could not stand against unrestrained foreign competition would be discouraged, yet as no importation could be continued for any length of time without a corresponding exportation, direct or indirect, there would be an encouragement for the purpose of that exportation, of some other production to which our situation might be better suited; thus affording at least an equal, and probably a greater, and certainly a more beneficial employment to our own capital and labour."

I shall not trouble the House with reading the whole of this document. (Cries of read, read.) I will then read the whole, for I really think it is a most valuable document; and, indeed, it was thought so at the time, for it is one of a few, if not the only one, which is given at length in the reports of our debates:—

"That of the numerous protective and prohibitory duties of our commercial code, it may be proved, that while all operate as a very heavy tax on the community at large, very few are of any ultimate benefit to the classes in whose favor they were originally instituted, and none to the extent of the loss occasioned by them in other classes.

"That among the other evils of the restrictive or protective system, not the least is, that the artificial protection of one branch of industry, or source of production, against foreign competition, is set up as a ground of claim by other branches for similar protection; so that if the reasoning upon these restrictive or prohibitory regulations are founded, were followed up consistently, it would not stop short of excluding us from all foreign commerce whatsoever."

This the House will observe, is the very point in question.

"And the same train of argument, which, with corresponding prohibitions, and protective duties, should exclude us from foreign trade, might be brought forward to justify the re-annulment of restrictions upon the interchange of productions (unconnected with public revenue) among the Kingdoms composing the Union, or among the counties of the same Kingdom.

"That an investigation of the effects of the restrictive system, at this time, is peculiarly called for, as it may, in the opinion of your petitioners, lead to a strong presumption, that the distress which now so generally prevails, is considerably aggravated by that system." [Great cheering.]

The reasoning upon which our restrictions have been defended is worth any thing, it will appear in behalf of the regulations of foreign states against us. They insist upon our superiority in capital and machinery, as we do upon their comparative exemption from taxation, and with equal foundation."

It then proceeds with similar arguments against all restriction, except what may be essential to the revenue, &c., and it concludes by praying the House to take the subject into consideration, and adopt such measures as may be calculated to give greater freedom to foreign commerce, and thereby to increase the resources of the state. It will be clear to all who have listened to the reading of this petition, that the same principles are there laid down which have since led to the passing of the bill I have alluded to. Why have I laid so much stress upon this petition? Sir, for two reasons; first, in order to show that if we have pursued this course, we have done so, not on the theories of visionaries, but on the opinions of merchants and men of business; secondly, to show that the merchants of the city of London, the great seat of the commerce and pecuniary wealth of the country, felt convinced that at that period of distress in 1820, that the distress was aggravated by the restrictive system. We are told that, by pursuing this system, we think of nothing but aggravating the distress and treating human feeling as if we were beasts. What then shall we think of the parties who could send such a petition as this—what is the list of names? I took the trouble to look them over this morning, and find among them the names of some of the most wealthy, and intelligent men in London. The first is one of the most distinguished merchants in the city of London. He has been a Governor of the Bank of England, and is now a Director of that body, and has been long a member of this house—(hear, hear.)—his name also will protect him from all suspicion of his being among the theorists—I mean Mr. S. Thornton. The list included the names of other Governors of the Bank of England. I do not offer the petition to the notice of the house by way of an apology for my friends or myself, or by way of extenuation of any thing we may have done to have raised the wrath of the honorable and learned gentleman opposite, (Mr. Williams;) for I say now, as at first, that what we have done, is calculated to promote the prosperity of the country; and all those who have brought the public to look with favor upon these principles, have done great service to their country. I do not avoid making an apology when necessary; nor do I wish to gain credit, if none be due. We followed the impulse of public opinion; we did not foresee, or anticipate it. I do not think it the duty of Ministers at any time to anticipate public opinion. I think it the duty of those in responsible situations to be cautious how they make any changes in policy; to be slow not to conviction of the truth, but in deliberation, before giving effect to plans with the results of which they ought to be previously satisfied. I do not, as accused by the learned and hon. Member, think that it requires the good to give an impulse to the machine, but rather to drag, that it might have an equable and uniform motion. And this has been the system constantly adopted by Government. Year after year have we been urged to adopt those measures which have been urged upon us, and I do not dispute the merit of those who were the first to suggest them; but when I now find arrayed against these principles those who once so strongly urged them, I must inquire into the conduct of some of those whom I find arrayed against me. By whom will I ask was the petition presented?—Was it not brought forward after a great deal of preparation, by the Honorable Member from Taunton.

He introduced it to the house in a most elaborate speech. He stated that the security of property was the foundation of all manufacturing greatness. Now, though Sir we are laboring under similar distress to what then existed, yet I hope I can say, not the same danger to which property was then exposed. The Hon. Member for Taunton went on in his speech to accuse the ministry of not feeling for the losses of the merchants, and the distress of the people. Those people to whom I now allude will remember the sufferings they then underwent by listening to agitators. And I sincerely hope, that although similar distress exists at present, that, taught by experience, they will have learnt to turn their ears from them and confine themselves within the bounds of moderation and common sense. But, Sir, the Hon. Gentleman (Mr. Baring) then told us, that freedom of trade was essential to greatness and prosperity, and he pressed us to pursue the system we have since adopted. Sir, when the Hon. Gentleman presented the petition which I have read to the house, he stated, that next to security of property, "was as great freedom of trade as was compatible with other important considerations."

(Hear, hear.)

In the opinion of the Hon. Member for

Taunton, a free trade was the very source of commercial prosperity. Yet now he appears disposed to tax my Right Honorable friend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, (who at that period held the situation which at present is so unworthily filled by the individual addressing the house,) with blameable conduct in the measures he has adopted, and culpable apathy and indifference to the distressed state of the manufacturing interests. Then his majesty's ministers were blamed for not removing the restrictions under which trade laboured; and they were called on to set their shoulders to the wheel, in order to place the commerce of the country on a liberal and enlarged system. The great error was when every country determined to live on its own productions, and resolved to avoid a free and mutual intercourse. This, I admit, is a most fallacious doctrine, and a false position of things. (Cheers.) It has been urged, indeed, and the sentiments are to be found openly promulgated by means of the press, that there are no two countries, the circumstances of which do not vary from month to month—that the operations of the seasons, and a hundred other causes, are sufficient to occasion these alterations, which unfix and alter the mutual relations of different nations. The inference intended to be drawn from all this is, that we ought to shut ourselves up in our islands—(hear)—and as far as in us lies, by restrictions and prohibitions, prevent all intercourse with other countries. (Cheers.)—At least the prohibitionists say to foreigners—You shall not send us any thing; but we are willing to send you as much as you please." This is the restrictive system; but to be efficient and true to itself, it must go still further. For instance, with respect to Ireland: in that country labor is cheaper than in this, on account of a lower taxation, and from many other causes; and will any body say we should adopt the restrictive system as it regards our commercial intercourse with that country. I reply, we should, if we mean to act strictly on the prohibitive system. But there was fortunately, or unfortunately, he could not say which, for the system now propounded, one country in which it had been carried to its utmost extent; in which prohibition had been added to prohibition and restriction to restriction, and where all the fruits of that blessed system were to be seen, not perhaps in full maturity, but sufficiently mature to enable any one to judge of their qualities—Spain. That is the country which has a good prohibitory system—a laugh—and appears resolved to admit nothing extraneous into its ports but what the smuggler carries into them. (Hear, hear.) I beg pardon of the House for wandering so widely from the subject in hand; but I have been, and shall be, still further, compelled to do so, in following the Honorable Gentleman, who is so great a practical authority on the point: indeed, perhaps, he is the greatest this country can afford. On the occasion alluded to, the Honorable Member did not content himself with general principles; he referred to details, and proposed measures of a specific and particular nature. The first of these measures proposed by the Hon. Member for Taunton, and in the warmest terms recommended to the attention of ministers on that occasion, was one of specific relief.—"What, so absurd," said the Hon. Member "as a duty on the raw material of our woollen manufacture?" Accordingly, he recommended the abolition of the duty on the importation of foreign wool, and such drugs and dyeing materials as were used in the staple manufacture of this country. In answer to this we said, "let our wool be exported, and we will take the duty off of foreign wool." But what was the reply? "Take the duty off the importation of foreign wool if you please, but keep in force the restrictions on the exportation of British wool from this country." To this proposal we would not agree, and I am prepared to express my sincere conviction, that Government acted wisely in refusing to adopt one measure without the concession of the other. (Hear, hear.) After years and years of struggle, we succeeded in causing both these measures to be adopted; and what is the ruin that has ensued to this branch of our manufactures? Instead of our manufactures being ruined, the consumption increased to such a degree, that we imported no less than forty millions pounds of foreign wool, while the whole of our export only amounted to 100,000 lbs. This is the way in which the wool and the woollen manufacture have been sent out of the country; we removed the restrictive and prohibitory duties; and the consequences were, we imported an excess of the foreign commodity, while we exported, comparatively speaking, none of native growth, because we had a better market for it at home. Good or bad, therefore, the first measure on which the Hon. Member (Mr. Baring) laid so much stress, had been carried into effect. (Hear, hear, hear.)

(To be continued.)