

**REPLY TO AUGUSTUS
MONGREDIEN'S
APPEAL TO THE WESTERN
FARMER OF AMERICA**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649273782

Reply to Augustus Mongredien's Appeal to the Western Farmer of America by Thomas H. Dudley

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

THOMAS H. DUDLEY

**REPLY TO AUGUSTUS
MONGREDIEN'S
APPEAL TO THE WESTERN
FARMER OF AMERICA**

1050 1-5

PLEASE READ AND CIRCULATE.

10/50

REPLY TO

AUGUSTUS MONGREDIEN'S APPEAL

TO THE

WESTERN FARMER OF AMERICA.

77

SHOWING THE PROSPERITY OF AMERICA UNDER PROTECTION
AND THE DECLINE OF ENGLAND UNDER HER
SO-CALLED FREE-TRADE SYSTEM.

BY

HON. THOMAS H. DUDLEY.

(LATE UNITED STATES CONSUL AT LIVERPOOL.)

PRINTED BY

J. B. LIPPINCOTT & CO., PHILADELPHIA.

1880.

HF
1755
.M74
D8

✓
Dir.
Franklin
3-31-48
62243

REPLY TO
AUGUSTUS MONGREDIEN'S APPEAL
TO THE
WESTERN FARMER OF AMERICA.

TO AUGUSTUS MONGREDIEN, ESQ. :

SIR,—I visited Europe some few weeks ago, and a day or two before I left, your pamphlet, issued under the auspices of the "Cobden Club," and addressed to the Western Farmers of America, was placed in my hands. I was aware that great efforts were to be made by the English people to repeal our Tariff system, and in this way break down our manufacturers, but I did not suppose that England, or the "Cobden Club," would openly make an attempt to control our elections, even to accomplish this object; but it seems I was mistaken, and it is reserved for you to make an open attempt, the first I have seen. It is a bold move on your part, but the stake you are playing for is an important one for England, and I suppose you think the end justifies the means. The first and primary object of your book is to show the farmers in the United States how badly they are treated by their own Government; how grossly they are robbed and swindled, and in this way to prepare them or induce them to vote at the elections for certain candidates with the view of redressing these wrongs and grievances, but in reality to break down the manufacturers and transfer the business of this country to England. This is your object. If you

can poison their minds sufficiently to induce them to vote as you propose, you will accomplish this end.

After reading the copy placed in my hands, I made this endorsement on its back: "I have never been more pained in reading any book than this one, at the reckless and extravagant statements, and the apparent deliberate and premeditated attempt to misrepresent and deceive. It is a one-sided and pettifogging argument, unworthy of any one who pretends to be a man of science, or a searcher after truth, and I am astonished that the Cobden Club should have lent itself to sanction or disseminate such a pamphlet."

I propose now to examine your book and compare it with the facts, after which I shall leave it for others to judge as to the correctness of my criticism. You state that the census of 1870 shows 5,922,000 persons engaged in agriculture, and you take this for your basis, and assume that from this there must now be not less than seven millions of persons so engaged, "*nearly all of them having wives and children*;" and then you ask what are the annual expenditures on all articles of consumption, except food and drink, of each of these "*families*," and you fix the annual expenditures for each of their "*families*" at two hundred dollars. You then, after computing the number of persons so engaged to be *seven millions, nearly all of whom have families*, and assuming two hundred dollars per annum as the amount expended by each of such persons so engaged as have families, proceed and multiply the whole of the seven millions by the two hundred dollars, without making a single exception for those who have no families; charging every man, woman, and child—those who have no families as well as those who have families, those who earn no wages as well as those who earn wages, those who are infants as well as those of more mature years—with consuming or using annually two hundred dollars' worth of products, besides their food and drink. Now, by the census of 1870 there were only 2,659,985 farms in the

whole country, and very nearly half a million of these were under twenty acres. According to your calculation there must have been a little less than three farmers with their families running each farm in the United States. You ought to have mentioned this fact, for I am quite sure our farmers were not aware of it. They generally think they run their own farms, and it would have been quite as new and astonishing to them as most of the other things in your book. You found by our census in 1870 there were 5,922,471 persons engaged in agricultural pursuits. Do you not think it would have been just as well for you, and more just to your readers, to have told them that of this number there were 396,968 females, nearly all in the Southern States, and colored women, who, in the days of slavery, had been compelled to work as field-hands, and that there were 739,164 children under fifteen years of age, not one-tenth of whom, including the women, probably ever earned so much as one hundred dollars in a year, and the average wages of the other nine-tenths probably would not amount to fifty dollars a year? This, of course, would have spoiled your figuring a little, but it would have been more just to your readers. But then you could not have made the large show so necessary for your purpose; hence you take the whole number, men, women, and children, work-hands as well as farmers, those without families as well as those with families; women and children; those who do not earn fifty dollars a year, and who never had so much as two hundred dollars in their lives; as well as those who only worked for their bread without wages, and then add one million more of the same kind, and call it seven millions of farmers with families; then multiply it by two hundred dollars, and subtract from this four hundred millions of dollars which, you assert, have been wrongfully taken from the farmers,—robbed or stolen from them, and then wasted and thrown away without doing any good to anybody. Having taken a look at your figures, and seen on what

basis you rest your book, we will take another step in its examination.

1. You state that the Western farmer neither receives nor seeks any legislative protection ;

2. That the farmer in America sells in the cheapest and buys in the dearest markets, and for what he raises he gets a lower price and for what he consumes he pays a higher price than the land-tillers get and pay in any other country in the world ;

3. That by reason of our Tariff laws the farmers have to pay the manufacturers in Eastern States four hundred millions of dollars every year more than they would have to pay the English people for the same goods if they were permitted to buy them in England and import them free of duty ; that for what they now have to pay one hundred and forty dollars they could buy of a Britisher for one hundred dollars, and that this vast sum of money, to wit, four hundred millions of dollars, year after year, is unnecessarily and wantonly thrown away and wasted, without the least benefit to anybody. You make all these statements without reservation or exception, unless it be some sixty millions of dollars which possibly may go to the legitimate purpose of National Revenue.

Are these statements true or are they false ? We have seen that there is no reliance on your figures or statements so far as the number of our farmers and the four hundred millions of dollars are concerned.

Let us now examine these last statements and see how much truth there is in them, and first that "the Western farmer neither receives nor seeks any legislative protection ;" and if the Western farmer gets no protection then the Eastern farmer gets none, for there is no discrimination between one farmer and another.

You are good enough to give us your definition of a farmer, and what you mean when you use the term : "the producer of "all articles derived from the cultivation of the soil, whether

"grain or cotton, meat or tobacco." Now, if the farmer receives protection whether he asks for it or not, your statement is untrue. Is it possible that you were so ignorant of the subject you pretend to write about, or were the facts concealed on purpose to misrepresent and deceive?

You admit that rice is protected to ninety-three per cent. ; the duty is two and a half cents per pound on cleaned rice, and two cents on the uncleaned article, and is imposed especially to protect the rice-growers in the South.

The duty on wheat is twenty cents per bushel ; Indian corn or maize, ten cents per bushel ; oats, ten cents per bushel ; rye, fifteen cents per bushel ; barley, fifteen cents per bushel ; butter, four cents per pound ; cheese, four cents per pound ; potatoes, fifteen cents per bushel ; poultry, ten per cent. on value ; peas, from ten to twenty per cent. ; beans, from ten to twenty per cent. ; tobacco-leaf, unmanufactured, thirty-five cents per pound ; on stemmed and manufactured, fifty cents, in addition to a revenue duty of twenty-four cents per pound ; sugar, from two to five cents per pound, to protect sugar-growers in the South ; on all animals, horses, cows, bulls, oxen, steers, calves, sheep, lambs, goats, hogs, and pigs, except for breeding purposes, twenty per cent. ; those for breeding purposes are admitted free to benefit the farmers ; beef and pork, one cent per pound ; mutton, ten per cent. ; wool, from ten to twelve cents per pound, and from ten to twelve per cent. added ; hay, twenty per cent.

These duties are one and all protective, and were imposed on purpose to protect the farmers, those in the West as well as those in the East ; to keep the home market, where ninety-two per cent. of all they produce is consumed, exclusively for their benefit, free from competition. But for this protection Canadian, and other farmers, would now be supplying the Eastern manufacturers, competing with our farmers in their home market. No persons have ever been more clamorous for protection