Of Restraints upon the Importation from Foreign Countries of such Goods as can be Produced at Home

By restraining, either by high duties or by absolute prohibitions, the importation of such goods from foreign countries as can be produced at home, the monopoly of the home market is more or less secured to the domestic industry employed in producing them. Thus the prohibition of importing either live cattle or salt provisions from foreign countries secures to the graziers of Great Britain the monopoly of the home market for butcher's meat. The high duties upon the importation of corn, which in times of moderate plenty amount to a prohibition, give a like advantage to the growers of that commodity. The prohibition of the importation of foreign woollens is equally favourable to the woollen manufacturers. The silk manufacture, though altogether employed upon foreign materials, has lately obtained the same advantage. The linen manufacture has not yet obtained it, but is making great strides towards it. Many other sorts of manufacturers have, in the same manner, obtained in Great Britain, either altogether or very nearly, a monopoly against their countrymen. The variety of goods of which the importation into Great Britain is prohibited, either absolutely, or under certain circumstances, greatly exceeds what can easily be suspected by those who are not well acquainted with the laws of the customs.

That this monopoly of the home-market frequently gives great encouragement to that particular species of industry which enjoys it, and frequently turns towards that employment a greater share of both the labour and stock of the society than would otherwise have gone to it, cannot be doubted. But whether it tends either to increase the general industry of the society, or to give it the most advantageous direction, is not, perhaps, altogether so evident.

The general industry of the society never can exceed what the capital of the society can employ. As the number of workmen that can be kept in employment by any particular person must bear a certain proportion to his capital, so the number of those that can be continually employed by all the members of a great society must bear a certain proportion to the whole capital of that society, and never can exceed that proportion. No regulation of commerce can increase the quantity of industry in any society beyond what its capital can maintain. It can only divert a part of it into a direction into which it might not otherwise have gone; and it is by no means certain that this artificial direction is likely to be more advantageous to the society than that into which it would have gone of its own accord.

Every individual is continually exerting himself to find out the most advantageous employment for whatever capital he can command. It is his own advantage, indeed, and not that of the society, which he has in view. But the study of his own advantage naturally, or rather necessarily, leads him to prefer that employment which is most advantageous to the society.

First, every individual endeavours to employ his capital as near home as he can, and consequently as much as he can in the support of domestic industry; provided always.
that he can thereby obtain the ordinary, or not a great deal less than the ordinary
profits of stock.

Thus, upon equal or nearly equal profits, every wholesale merchant naturally prefers
the home-trade to the foreign trade of consumption, and the foreign trade of
consumption to the carrying trade. In the home-trade his capital is never so long out
of his sight as it frequently is in the foreign trade of consumption. He can know
better the character and situation of the persons whom he trusts, and if he should
happen to be deceived, he knows better the laws of the country from which he must
seek redress. In the carrying trade, the capital of the merchant is, as it were, divided
between two foreign countries, and no part of it is ever necessarily brought home, or
placed under his own immediate view and command. The capital which an
Amsterdam merchant employs in carrying corn from Konigsberg to Lisbon, and fruit
and wine from Lisbon to Konigsberg, must generally be the one half of it at
Konigsberg and the other half at Lisbon. No part of it need ever come to Amsterdam.
The natural residence of such a merchant should either be at Konigsberg or Lisbon,
and it can only be some very particular circumstances which can make him prefer the
residence of Amsterdam. The uneasiness, however, which he feels at being separated
so far from his capital generally determines him to bring part both of the Konigsberg
goods which he destines for the market of Lisbon, and of the Lisbon goods which he
destines for that of Konigsberg, to Amsterdam: and though this necessarily subjects
him to a double charge of loading and unloading, as well as to the payment of some
duties and customs, yet for the sake of having some part of his capital always under
his own view and command, he willingly submits to this extraordinary charge; and it
is in this manner that every country which has any considerable share of the carrying
trade becomes always the emporium, or general market, for the goods of all the
different countries whose trade it carries on. The merchant, in order to save a second
loading and unloading, endeavours always to sell in the home-market as much of the
goods of all those different countries as he can, and thus, so far as he can, to convert
his carrying trade into a foreign trade of consumption. A merchant, in the same
manner, who is engaged in the foreign trade of consumption, when he collects goods
for foreign markets, will always be glad, upon equal or nearly equal profits, to sell as
great a part of them at home as he can. He saves himself the risk and trouble of
exportation, when, so far as he can, he thus converts his foreign trade of consumption
into a home-trade. Home is in this manner the centre, if I may say so, round which
the capitals of the inhabitants of every country are continually circulating, and
towards which they are always tending, though by particular causes they may
sometimes be driven off and repelled from it towards more distant employments. But
a capital employed in the home-trade, it has already been shown, necessarily puts
into motion a greater quantity of domestic industry, and gives revenue and
employment to a greater number of the inhabitants of the country, than an equal
capital employed in the foreign trade of consumption: and one employed in the
foreign trade of consumption has the same advantage over an equal capital employed
in the carrying trade. Upon equal, or only nearly equal profits, therefore, every
individual naturally inclines to employ his capital in the manner in which it is likely
to afford the greatest support to domestic industry, and to give revenue and
employment to the greatest number of people of his own country.

Secondly, every individual who employs his capital in the support of domestic
industry, necessarily endeavours so to direct that industry that its produce may be of

The greatest possible value.

The produce of industry is what it adds to the subject or materials upon which it is employed. In proportion as the value of this produce is great or small, so will likewise be the profits of the employer. But it is only for the sake of profit that any man employs a capital in the support of industry; and he will always, therefore, endeavour to employ it in the support of that industry of which the produce is likely to be of the greatest value, or to exchange for the greatest quantity either of money or of other goods.

But the annual revenue of every society is always precisely equal to the exchangeable value of the whole annual produce of its industry, or rather is precisely the same thing with that exchangeable value. As every individual, therefore, endeavours as much as he can both to employ his capital in the support of domestic industry, and so to direct that industry that its produce may be of the greatest value; every individual necessarily labours to render the annual revenue of the society as great as he can. He generally, indeed, neither intends to promote the public interest, nor knows how much he is promoting it. By preferring the support of domestic to that of foreign industry, he intends only his own security; and by directing that industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and he is in this, as in many other cases, led by an invisible hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention. Nor is it always the worse for the society that it was no part of it. By pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it. I have never known much good done by those who affected to trade for the public good. It is an affectation, indeed, not very common among merchants, and very few words need be employed in dissuading them from it.

What is the species of domestic industry which his capital can employ, and of which the produce is likely to be of the greatest value, every individual, it is evident, can, in his local situation, judge much better than any statesman or lawgiver can do for him. The statesman who should attempt to direct private people in what manner they ought to employ their capitals would not only load himself with a most unnecessary attention, but assume an authority which could safely be trusted, not only to no single person, but to no council or senate whatever, and which would nowhere be so dangerous as in the hands of a man who had folly and presumption enough to fancy himself fit to exercise it.

To give the monopoly of the home-market to the produce of domestic industry, in any particular art or manufacture, is in some measure to direct private people in what manner they ought to employ their capitals, and must, in almost all cases, be either a useless or a hurtful regulation. If the produce of domestic can be brought there as cheap as that of foreign industry, the regulation is evidently useless. If it cannot, it must generally be hurtful. It is the maxim of every prudent master of a family never to attempt to make at home what it will cost him more to make than to buy. The taylor does not attempt to make his own shoes, but buys them of the shoemaker. The shoemaker does not attempt to make his own clothes, but employs a taylor. The farmer attempts to make neither the one nor the other, but employs those different artificers. All of them find it for their interest to employ their whole industry in a way in which they have some advantage over their neighbours, and to purchase with a part of its produce, or what is the same thing, with the price of a part of it, whatever
else they have occasion for.

What is prudence in the conduct of every private family can scarce be folly in that of a great kingdom. If a foreign country can supply us with a commodity cheaper than we ourselves can make it, better buy it of them with some part of the produce of our own industry employed in a way in which we have some advantage. The general industry of the country, being always in proportion to the capital which employs it, will not thereby be diminished, no more than that of the above-mentioned artificers; but only left to find out the way in which it can be employed with the greatest advantage. It is certainly not employed to the greatest advantage when it is thus directed towards an object which it can buy cheaper than it can make. The value of its annual produce is certainly more or less diminished when it is thus turned away from producing commodities evidently of more value than the commodity which it is directed to produce. According to the supposition, that commodity could be purchased from foreign countries cheaper than it can be made at home. It could, therefore, have been purchased with a part only of the commodities, or, what is the same thing, with a part only of the price of the commodities, which the industry employed by an equal capital would have produced at home, had it been left to follow its natural course. The industry of the country, therefore, is thus turned away from a more to a less advantageous employment, and the exchangeable value of its annual produce, instead of being increased, according to the intention of the lawgiver, must necessarily be diminished by every such regulation.

By means of such regulations, indeed, a particular manufacture may sometimes be acquired sooner than it could have been otherwise, and after a certain time may be made at home as cheap or cheaper than in the foreign country. But though the industry of the society may be thus carried with advantage into a particular channel sooner than it could have been otherwise, it will by no means follow that the sum total, either of its industry, or of its revenue, can ever be augmented by any such regulation. The industry of the society can augment only in proportion as its capital augments, and its capital can augment only in proportion to what can be gradually saved out of its revenue. But the immediate effect of every such regulation is to diminish its revenue, and what diminishes its revenue is certainly not very likely to augment its capital faster than it would have augmented of its own accord had both capital and industry been left to find out their natural employments.

Though for want of such regulations the society should never acquire the proposed manufacture, it would not, upon that account, necessarily be the poorer in any one period of its duration. In every period of its duration its whole capital and industry might still have been employed, though upon different objects, in the manner that was most advantageous at the time. In every period its revenue might have been the greatest which its capital could afford, and both capital and revenue might have been augmented with the greatest possible rapidity.

The natural advantages which one country has over another in producing particular commodities are sometimes so great that it is acknowledged by all the world to be in vain to struggle with them. By means of glasses, hotbeds, and hot walls, very good grapes can be raised in Scotland, and very good wine too can be made of them at about thirty times the expence for which at least equally good can be brought from foreign countries. Would it be a reasonable law to prohibit the importation of all foreign wines merely to encourage the making of claret and burgundy in Scotland?
But if there would be a manifest absurdity in turning towards any employment thirty times more of the capital and industry of the country than would be necessary to purchase from foreign countries an equal quantity of the commodities wanted, there must be an absurdity, though not altogether so glaring, yet exactly of the same kind, in turning towards any such employment a thirtieth, or even a three-hundredth part more of either. Whether the advantages which one country has over another be natural or acquired is in this respect of no consequence. As long as the one country has those advantages, and the other wants them, it will always be more advantageous for the latter rather to buy of the former than to make. It is an acquired advantage only, which one artificer has over his neighbour, who exercises another trade; and yet they both find it more advantageous to buy of one another than to make what does not belong to their particular trades.

Merchants and manufacturers are the people who derive the greatest advantage from this monopoly of the home-market. The prohibition of the importation of foreign cattle, and of salt provisions, together with the high duties upon foreign corn, which in times of moderate plenty amount to a prohibition, are not near so advantageous to the graziers and farmers of Great Britain as other regulations of the same kind are to its merchants and manufacturers. Manufactures, those of the finer kind especially, are more easily transported from one country to another than corn or cattle. It is in the fetching and carrying manufactures, accordingly, that foreign trade is chiefly employed. In manufactures, a very small advantage will enable foreigners to undersell our own workmen, even in the home-market. It will require a very great one to enable them to do so in the rude produce of the soil. If the free importation of foreign manufactures were permitted, several of the home manufactures would probably suffer, and some of them, perhaps, go to ruin altogether, and a considerable part of the stock and industry at present employed in them would be forced to find out some other employment. But the freest importation of the rude produce of the soil could have no such effect upon the agriculture of the country.

If the importation of foreign cattle, for example, were made ever so free, so few could be imported that the grazing trade of Great Britain could be little affected by it. Live cattle are, perhaps, the only commodity of which the transportation is more expensive by sea than by land. By land they carry themselves to market. By sea, not only the cattle, but their food and their water too, must be carried at no small expence and inconveniency. The short sea between Ireland and Great Britain, indeed, renders the importation of Irish cattle more easy. But though the free importation of them, which was lately permitted only for a limited time, were rendered perpetual, it could have no considerable effect upon the interest of the graziers of Great Britain. Those parts of Great Britain which border upon the Irish Sea are all grazing countries. Irish cattle could never be imported for their use, but must be driven through those very extensive countries, at no small expence and inconveniency, before they could arrive at their proper market. Fat cattle could not be driven so far. Lean cattle, therefore, only could be imported, and such importation could interfere, not with the interest of the feeding or fattening countries, to which, by reducing the price of lean cattle, it would rather be advantageous, but with that of the breeding countries only. The small number of Irish cattle imported since their importation was permitted, together with the good price at which lean cattle still continue to sell, seem to demonstrate that even the breeding countries of Great Britain are never likely to be much affected by the free importation of Irish cattle. The common people of Ireland, indeed, are said to
have sometimes opposed with violence the exportation of their cattle. But if the exporters had found any great advantage in continuing the trade, they could easily, when the law was on their side, have conquered this mobbish opposition.

Feeding and fattening countries, besides, must always be highly improved, whereas breeding countries are generally uncultivated. The high price of lean cattle, by augmenting the value of uncultivated land, is like a bounty against improvement. To any country which was highly improved throughout, it would be more advantageous to import its lean cattle than to breed them. The province of Holland, accordingly, is said to follow this maxim at present. The mountains of Scotland, Wales, and Northumberland, indeed, are countries not capable of much improvement, and seem destined by nature to be the breeding countries of Great Britain. The freest importation of foreign cattle could have no other effect than to hinder those breeding countries from taking advantage of the increasing population and improvement of the rest of the kingdom, from raising their price to an exorbitant height, and from laying a real tax upon all the more improved and cultivated parts of the country.

The freest importation of salt provisions, in the same manner, could have as little effect upon the interest of the graziers of Great Britain as that of live cattle. Salt provisions are not only a very bulky commodity, but when compared with fresh meat, they are a commodity both of worse quality, and as they cost more labour and expence, of higher price. They could never, therefore, come into competition with the fresh meat, though they might with the salt provisions of the country. They might be used for victualling ships for distant voyages and such like uses, but could never make any considerable part of the food of the people. The small quantity of salt provisions imported from Ireland since their importation was rendered free is an experimental proof that our graziers have nothing to apprehend from it. It does not appear that the price of butcher's meat has ever been sensibly affected by it.

Even the free importation of foreign corn could very little affect the interest of the farmers of Great Britain. Corn is a much more bulky commodity than butcher's meat. A pound of wheat at a penny is as dear as a pound of butcher's meat at fourpence. The small quantity of foreign corn imported even in times of the greatest scarcity may satisfy our farmers that they can have nothing to fear from the freest importation. The average quantity imported, one year with another, amounts only, according to the very well informed author of the tracts upon the corn trade, to twenty-three thousand seven hundred and twenty-eight quarters of all sorts of grain, and does not exceed the five hundred and seventy-one part of the annual consumption. But as the bounty upon corn occasions a greater exportation in years of plenty, so it must of consequence occasion a greater importation in years of scarcity than in the actual state of tillage would otherwise take place. By means of it the plenty of one year does not compensate the scarcity of another, and as the average quantity exported is necessarily augmented by it, so must likewise, in the actual state of tillage, the average quantity imported. If there were no bounty, as less corn would be exported, so it is probable that, one year with another, less would be imported than at present. The corn merchants, the fetchers and carriers of corn between Great Britain and foreign countries would have much less employment, and might suffer considerably; but the country gentlemen and farmers could suffer very little. It is in the corn merchants accordingly, rather than in the country gentlemen and farmers, that I have observed the greatest anxiety for the renewal and continuation of the bounty.
Country gentlemen and farmers are, to their great honour, of all people, the least subject to the wretched spirit of monopoly. The undertaker of a great manufactory is sometimes alarmed if another work of the same kind is established within twenty miles of him. The Dutch undertaker of the woollen manufacture at Abbeville stipulated that no work of the same kind should be established within thirty leagues of that city. Farmers and country gentlemen, on the contrary, are generally disposed rather to promote than to obstruct the cultivation and improvement of their neighbours' farms and estates. They have no secrets such as those of the greater part of manufacturers, but are generally rather fond of communicating to their neighbours and of extending as far as possible any new practice which they have found to be advantageous. Pius Questus, says old Cato, stabilissimusque, minimeque invidiosus; minimeque male cogitantes sunt, qui in eo studio occupati sunt. Country gentlemen and farmers, dispersed in different parts of the country, cannot so easily combine as merchants and manufacturers, who, being collected into towns, and accustomed to that exclusive corporation spirit which prevails in them, naturally endeavour to obtain against all their countrymen the same exclusive privilege which they generally possess against the inhabitants of their respective towns. They accordingly seem to have been the original inventors of those restraints upon the importation of foreign goods which secure to them the monopoly of the home-market. It was probably in imitation of them, and to put themselves upon a level with those who, they found, were disposed to oppress them, that the country gentlemen and farmers of Great Britain in so far forgot the generosity which is natural to their station as to demand the exclusive privilege of supplying their countrymen with corn and butcher's meat. They did not perhaps take time to consider how much less their interest could be affected by the freedom of trade than that of the people whose example they followed.

To prohibit by a perpetual law the importation of foreign corn and cattle is in reality to enact that the population and industry of the country shall at no time exceed what the rude produce of its own soil can maintain.

There seem, however, to be two cases in which it will generally be advantageous to lay some burden upon foreign for the encouragement of domestic industry.

The first is, when some particular sort of industry is necessary for the defence of the country. The defence of Great Britain, for example, depends very much upon the number of its sailors and shipping. The act of navigation therefore, very properly endeavours to give the sailors and shipping of Great Britain the monopoly of the trade of their own country in some cases by absolute prohibitions and in others by heavy burdens upon the shipping of foreign countries. The following are the principal dispositions of this Act.

First, all ships, of which the owners and three-fourths of the mariners are not British subjects, are prohibited, upon pain of forfeiting ship and cargo, from trading to the British settlements and plantations, or from being employed in the coasting trade of Great Britain.

Secondly, a great variety of the most bulky articles of importation can be brought into Great Britain only, either in such ships as are above described, or in ships of the country where those goods are purchased, and of which the owners, masters, and three-fourths of the mariners are of that particular country; and when imported even in ships of this latter kind, they are subject to double aliens duty. If imported in ships
of any other country, the penalty is forfeiture of ship and goods.\footnote{52} When this act was
made, the Dutch were, what they still are, the great carriers of Europe, and by this
regulation they were entirely excluded from being the carriers to Great Britain, or
from importing to us the goods of any other European country.

Thirdly, a great variety of the most bulky articles of importation are prohibited from
being imported, even in British ships, from any country but that in which they are
produced, under pains of forfeiting ship and cargo.\footnote{53} This regulation, too, was
probably intended against the Dutch. Holland was then, as now, the great emporium
for all European goods, and by this regulation British ships were hindered from
loading in Holland the goods of any other European country.

Fourthly, salt fish of all kinds, whale-fins, whale-bone, oil, and blubber, not caught
by and cured on board British vessels, when imported into Great Britain, are
subjected to double aliens duty.\footnote{54} The Dutch, as they are they the principal, were
then the only fishers in Europe that attempted to supply foreign nations with fish. By
this regulation, a very heavy burden was laid upon their supplying Great Britain.

When the act of navigation was made, though England and Holland were not actually
at war, the most violent animosity subsisted between the two nations. It had begun
during the government of the Long Parliament, which first framed this act,\footnote{55} and it
broke out soon after in the Dutch wars during that of the Protector and of Charles the
Second. It is not impossible, therefore, that some of the regulations of this famous act
may have proceeded from national animosity. They are as wise, however, as if they
had all been dictated by the most deliberate wisdom. National animosity at that
particular time aimed at the very same object which the most deliberate wisdom
would have recommended, the diminution of the naval power of Holland, the only
naval power which could endanger the security of England.

The act of navigation is not favourable to foreign commerce, or to the growth of that
opulence which can arise from it. The interest of a nation in its commercial relations
to foreign nations is, like that of a merchant with regard to the different people with
whom he deals, to buy as cheap and to sell as dear as possible. But it will be most
likely to buy cheap, when by the most perfect freedom of trade it encourages all
nations to bring to it the goods which it has occasion to purchase; and, for the same
reason, it will be most likely to sell dear, when its markets are thus filled with the
greatest number of buyers. The act of navigation, it is true, lays no burden upon
foreign ships that come to export the produce of British industry. Even the ancient
aliens duty, which used to be paid upon all goods exported as well as imported, has,
by several subsequent acts, been taken off from the greater part of the articles of
exportation.\footnote{56} But if foreigners, either by prohibitions or high duties, are hindered
from coming to sell, they cannot always afford to come to buy; because coming
without a cargo, they must lose the freight from their own country to Great Britain.
By diminishing the number of sellers, therefore, we necessarily diminish that of
buyers, and are thus likely not only to buy foreign goods dearer, but to sell our own
cheaper, than if there was a more perfect freedom of trade. As defence, however it is
of much more importance than opulence, the act of navigation is, perhaps, the wisest
of all the commercial regulations of England.

The second case, in which it will generally be advantageous to lay some burden upon
foreign for the encouragement of domestic industry is, when some tax is imposed at
home upon the produce of the latter. In this case, it seems reasonable that an equal
tax should be imposed upon the like produce of the former. This would not give the monopoly of the home market to domestic industry, nor turn towards a particular employment a greater share of the stock and labour of the country than what would naturally go to it. It would only hinder any part of what would naturally go to it from being turned away by the tax into a less natural direction, and would leave the competition between foreign and domestic industry, after the tax, as nearly as possible upon the same footing as before it. In Great Britain, when any such tax is laid upon the produce of domestic industry, it is usual at the same time, in order to stop the clamorous complaints of our merchants and manufacturers that they will be undersold at home, to lay a much heavier duty upon the importation of all foreign goods of the same kind.

This second limitation of the freedom of trade according to some people should, upon some occasions, be extended much farther than to the precise foreign commodities which could come into competition with those which had been taxed at home. When the necessaries of life have been taxed any country, it becomes proper, they pretend, to tax not only the like necessaries of life imported from other countries, but all sorts of foreign goods which can come into competition with anything that is the produce of domestic industry. Subsistence, they say, becomes necessarily dearer in consequence of such taxes; and the price of labour must always rise with the price of the labourers' subsistence. Every commodity, therefore, which is the produce of domestic industry, though not immediately taxed itself, becomes dearer in consequence of such taxes, because the labour which produces it becomes so. Such taxes, therefore, are really equivalent, they say, to a tax upon every particular commodity produced at home. In order to put domestic upon the same footing with foreign industry, therefore, it becomes necessary, they think, to lay some duty upon every foreign commodity equal to this enhancement of the price of the home commodities with which it can come into competition.

Whether taxes upon the necessaries of life, such as those in Great Britain upon soap, salt, leather, candles, &c. necessarily raise the price of labour, and consequently that of all other commodities, I shall consider hereafter, when I come to treat of taxes. Supposing, however, in the meantime, that they have this effect, and they have it undoubtedly, this general enhancement of the price of all commodities, in consequence of that of labour, is a case which differs in the two following respects from that of a particular commodity of which the price was enhanced by a particular tax immediately imposed upon it.

First, it might always be known with great exactness how far the price of such a commodity could be enhanced by such a tax: but how far the general enhancement of the price of labour might affect that of every different commodity about which labour was employed could never be known with any tolerable exactness. It would be impossible, therefore, to proportion with any tolerable exactness the tax upon every foreign to this enhancement of the price of every home commodity.

Secondly, taxes upon the necessaries of life have nearly the same effect upon the circumstances of the people as a poor soil and a bad climate. Provisions are thereby rendered dearer in the same manner as if it required extraordinary labour and expence to raise them. As in the natural scarcity arising from soil and climate it would be absurd to direct the people in what manner they ought to employ their capitals and industry, so is it likewise in the artificial scarcity arising from such taxes. To be left
to accommodate, as well as they could, their industry to their situation, and to find
out those employments in which, notwithstanding their unfavourable circumstances,
they might have some advantage either in the home or in the foreign market, is what
in both cases would evidently be most for their advantage. To lay a new tax upon
them, because they are already overburdened with taxes, and because they already
pay too dear for the necessaries of life, to make them likewise pay too dear for the
greater part of other commodities, is certainly a most absurd way of making amends.

Such taxes, when they have grown up to a certain height, are a curse equal to the
barrenness of the earth and the inclemency of the heavens; and yet it is in the richest
and most industrious countries that they have been most generally imposed. No other
countries could support so great a disorder. As the strongest bodies only can live and
enjoy health under an unwholesome regimen, so the nations only that in every sort of
industry have the greatest natural and acquired advantages can subsist and prosper
under such taxes. Holland is the country in Europe in which they abound most, and
which from peculiar circumstances continues to prosper, not by means of them, as
has been most absurdly supposed, but in spite of them.

As there are two cases in which it will generally be advantageous to lay some burden
upon foreign for the encouragement of domestic industry, so there are two others in
which it may sometimes be a matter of deliberation; in the one, how far it is proper to
continue the free importation of certain foreign goods; and in the other, how far, or in
what manner, it may be proper to restore that free importation after it has been for
some time interrupted.

The case in which it may sometimes be a matter of deliberation how far it is proper
to continue the free importation of certain foreign goods is, when some foreign
nation restrains by high duties or prohibitions the importation of some of our
manufactures into their country. Revenge in this case naturally dictates retaliation,
and that we should impose the like duties and prohibitions upon the importation of
some or all of their manufactures into ours. Nations, accordingly, seldom fail to
retaliate in this manner. The French have been particularly forward to favour their
own manufactures by restraining the importation of such foreign goods as could
come into competition with them. In this consisted a great part of the policy of Mr.
Colbert, who, notwithstanding his great abilities, seems in this case to have been
imposed upon by the sophistry of merchants and manufacturers, who are always
demanding a monopoly against their countrymen. It is at present the opinion of the
most intelligent men in France that his operations of this kind have not been
beneficial to his country. That minister, by the tariff of 1667, imposed very high
duties upon a great number of foreign manufactures. Upon his refusing to moderate
them in favour of the Dutch, they in 1671 prohibited the importation of the wines,
brandies, and manufactures of France. The war of 1672 seems to have been in part
occasioned by this commercial dispute. The peace of Nimeguen put an end to it in
1678 by moderating some of those duties in favour of the Dutch, who in consequence
took off their prohibition. It was about the same time that the French and English
began mutually to oppress each other's industry by the like duties and prohibitions, of
which the French, however, seem to have set the first example. The spirit of hostility
which has subsisted between the two nations ever since has hitherto hindered them
from being moderated on either side. In 1697 the English prohibited the importation
of bonelace, the manufacture of Flanders. The government of that country, at that
time under the dominion of Spain, prohibited in return the importation of English
woollens. In 1700, the prohibition of importing bonelace into England was taken off upon condition that the importance of English woollens into Flanders should be put on the same footing as before. 241

There may be good policy in retaliations of this kind, when there is a probability that they will procure the repeal of the high duties or prohibitions complained of. The recovery of a great foreign market will generally more than compensate the transitory inconveniency of paying dearer during a short time for some sorts of goods. To judge whether such retaliations are likely to produce such an effect does not, perhaps, belong so much to the science of a legislator, whose deliberations ought to be governed by general principles which are always the same, as to the skill of that insidious and crafty animal, vulgarly called a statesman or politician, whose councils are directed by the momentary fluctuations of affairs. When there is no probability that any such repeal can be procured, it seems a bad method of compensating the injury done to certain classes of our people to do another injury ourselves, not only to those classes, but to 241 almost all the other classes of them. When our neighbours prohibit some manufacture of ours, we generally prohibit, not only the same, for that alone would seldom affect them considerably, but some other manufacture of theirs. This may no doubt give encouragement to some particular class of workmen among ourselves, and by excluding some of their rivals, may enable them to raise their price in the home-market. Those workmen, however, who suffered by our neighbours prohibition will not be benefited by ours. On the contrary, they and almost all the other classes of our citizens will thereby be obliged to pay dearer than before for certain goods. Every such law, therefore, imposes a real tax upon the whole country, not in favour of that particular class of workmen who were injured by our neighbours prohibition, but of some other class.

The case in which it may sometimes be a matter of deliberation, how far, or in what manner, it is proper to restore the free importation of foreign goods, after it has been for some time interrupted, is, when particular manufactures, by means of high duties or prohibitions upon all foreign goods which can come into competition with them, have been so far extended as to employ a great multitude of hands. Humanity may in this case require that the freedom of trade should be restored only by slow gradations, and with a good deal of reserve and circumspection. Were those high duties and prohibitions taken away all at once, cheaper foreign goods of the same kind might be poured so fast into the home-market as to deprive all at once many thousands of our people of their ordinary employment and means of subsistence. The disorder which this would occasion might no doubt be very considerable. It would in all probability, however, be much less than is commonly imagined, for the two following reasons:

First, all those manufactures, of which any part is commonly exported to other European countries without a bounty, could be very little affected by the freest importation of foreign goods. Such manufactures must be sold as cheap abroad as any other foreign goods of the same quality and kind, and consequently must be sold cheaper at home. They would still, therefore, keep possession of the home-market, and though a capricious man of fashion might sometimes prefer foreign wares, merely because they were foreign, to cheaper and better goods of the same kind that were made at home, this folly could, from the nature of things, extend to so few that it could make no sensible impression upon the general employment of the people. But a great part of all the different branches of our woollen manufacture, of our
tanned leather, and of our hardware, are annually exported to other European
countries without any bounty, and these are the manufactures which employ the
greatest number of hands. The silk, perhaps, is the manufacture which would suffer
the most by this freedom of trade, and after it the linen, though the latter much less
than the former.

Secondly, though a great number of people should, by thus restoring the freedom of
trade, be thrown all at once out of their ordinary employment and common method of
subsistence, it would by no means follow that they would thereby be deprived either
of employment or subsistence. By the reduction of the army and navy at the end of
the late war, more than a hundred thousand soldiers and seamen, a number equal to
what is employed in the greatest manufactures, were all at once thrown out of their
ordinary employment; but, though they no doubt suffered some inconveniency, they
were not thereby deprived of all employment and subsistence. The greater part of the
seamen, it is probable, gradually betook themselves to the merchant-service as they
could find occasion, and in the meantime both they and the soldiers were absorbed in
the great mass of the people, and employed in a great variety of occupations. Not
only no great convulsion, but no sensible disorder arose from so great a change in the
situation of more than a hundred thousand men, all accustomed to the use of arms,
and many of them to rapine and plunder. The number of vagrants was scarce any-
where sensibly increased by it, even the wages of labour were not reduced by it in
any occupation, so far as I have been able to learn, except in that of seamen in the
merchant-service. But if we compare together the habits of a soldier and of any sort
of manufacturer, we shall find that those of the latter do not tend so much to
disqualify him from being employed in a new trade, as those of the former from
being employed in any. The manufacturer has always been accustomed to look for
his subsistence from his labour only: the soldier to expect it from his pay.
Application and industry have been familiar to the one; idleness and dissipation to
the other. But it is surely much easier to change the direction of industry from one
sort of labour to another than to turn idleness and dissipation to any. To the greater
part of manufactures besides, it has already been observed, there are other
collateral manufactures of so similar a nature that a workman can easily transfer his
industry from one of them to another. The greater part of such workmen too are
occasionally employed in country labour. The stock which employed them in a
particular manufacture before will still remain in the country to employ an equal
number of people in some other way. The capital of the country remaining the same,
the demand for labour will likewise be the same, or very nearly the same, though it
may be exerted in different places and for different occupations. Soldiers and
seamen, indeed, when discharged from the king's service, are at liberty to exercise
any trade, within any town or place of Great Britain or Ireland. Let the same
natural liberty of exercising what species of industry they please, be restored to all
his Majesty's subjects, in the same manner as to soldiers and seamen; that is, break
down the exclusive privileges of corporations, and repeal the statute of
apprenticeship, both which are real encroachments upon natural liberty, and add to
these the repeal of the law of settlements, so that a poor workman, when thrown out
of employment either in one trade or in one place, may seek for it in another trade or
in another place without the fear either of a prosecution or of a removal, and neither
the public nor the individuals will suffer much more from the occasional disbanding
some particular classes of manufacturers than from that of soldiers. Our
manufacturers have no doubt great merit with their country, but they cannot have

more than those who defend it with their blood, nor deserve to be treated with more delicacy.

To expect, indeed, that the freedom of trade should ever be entirely restored in Great Britain is as absurd as to expect that an Oceana or Utopia should ever be established in it. Not only the prejudices of the public, but what is much more unconquerable, the private interests of many individuals, irresistibly oppose it. Were the officers of the army to oppose with the same zeal and unanimity any reduction in the numbers of forces with which master manufacturers set themselves against every law that is likely to increase the number of their rivals in the home-market; were the former to animate their soldiers in the same manner as the latter enflame their workmen to attack with violence and outrage the proposers of any such regulation, to attempt to reduce the army would be as dangerous as it has now become to attempt to diminish in any respect the monopoly which our manufacturers have obtained against us. This monopoly has so much increased the number of some particular tribes of them that, like an overgrown standing army, they have become formidable to the government, and upon many occasions intimidate the legislature. The Member of Parliament who supports every proposal for strengthening this monopoly is sure to acquire not only the reputation of understanding trade, but great popularity and influence with an order of men whose numbers and wealth render them of great importance. If he opposes them, on the contrary, and still more if he has authority enough to be able to thwart them, neither the most acknowledged probity, nor the highest rank, nor the greatest public services can protect him from the most infamous abuse and detraction, from personal insults, nor sometimes from real danger, arising from the insolent outrage of furious and disappointed monopolists.

The undertaker of a great manufacture, who, by the home-markets being suddenly laid open to the competition of foreigners, should be obliged to abandon his trade, would no doubt suffer very considerably. That part of his capital which had usually been employed in purchasing materials and in paying his workmen might, without much difficulty, perhaps, find another employment. But that part of it which was fixed in workhouses, and in the instruments of trade, could scarce be disposed of without considerable loss. The equitable regard, therefore, to his interest requires that changes of this kind should never be introduced suddenly, but slowly, gradually, and after a very long warning. The legislature, were it possible that its deliberations could be always directed, not by the clamorous importunity of partial interests, but by an extensive view of the general good, ought upon this very account, perhaps, to be particularly careful neither to establish any new monopolies of this kind, nor to extend further those which are already established. Every such regulation introduces some degree of real disorder into the constitution of the state, which it will be difficult afterwards to cure without occasioning another disorder.

How far it may be proper to impose taxes upon the importation of foreign goods, in order not to prevent their importation but to raise a revenue for government, I shall consider hereafter when I come to treat of taxes. Taxes imposed with a view to prevent, or even to diminish importation, are evidently as destructive of the revenue of the customs as of the freedom of trade.