The Bill reported by the Committee on Manufactures, entitled “An act in amendment of the several acts imposing duties on imports,” being under consideration in Committee of the whole—

Mr. MALLARY said he was sensible he addressed the Committee under some degree of embarrassment. The Appropriation Bill, which had been long under discussion, was not settled. He had expected, when he gave the notice, that he should on this day ask for the consideration of the tariff, that the appropriations would have been finished. They had not been, but he could have done no less than submit his motion to the House for a decision. He had been sustained and should now proceed with the remarks he intended to offer:

It is already known that I did not concur with a majority of the Committee on Manufacturers, in several of the important provisions of the Bill reported. To many I have given, and shall give my cordial support. In presenting the bill, as Chairman, I performed a ministerial duty only. This was not considered by any one as involving any opinion I might entertain of its merits. Perfect liberty was left me, as a member of the House, to act as my judgment should direct. The report presented was not from my pen. The credit is due to the hon. gentleman from New York, (Mr. Wright,) It was thought proper, and I cheerfully concurred, that the duty should have been assigned to some member of the Committee who approved of the details of the Bill. As a statement of the proceedings of the Committee in the performance of a must fabulous daily, it meets my approbation. As an argument in favor of the provisions of the Bill, I saw nothing in it unfair or uncandid. As an expression of the views of a majority of the Committee, it was presented to the House by me without hesitation. Of the weight of argument, like every other person, I am my own judge. So far as I can concur with the Committee, it will be done. When I cannot, I shall frankly express my objections. My single motive; my most ardent desire is to lend my feeble aid to obtain a measure which may answer the expectation, and promote the interests of the nation.
I am sensible, Mr. Chairman, that much excitement exists abroad on this subject. It is apparent that it has become, with many, a matter of political speculation.—To such a design, I will not be an accessory. It is a good measure, a wise measure, a solid and effectual measure, that I wish to sustain; one that will have a durable effect in promoting the permanent and wide spread interests of the nation.

It is not my intention to discuss any question arising out of the constitution. I shall not detain the Committee with any remarks on the general policy of giving further aid to domestic manufacture. These questions have been too often debated, and decided, to require any arguments from me.

Manufacturers, we all know, are constantly accused of being governed by sordid and selfish views. They are charged with hostility to all other classes of the people.—They are held up to observation, as a body of iron handed monopolists. From whom do these accusations come? The severest are from sea board merchants and foreign agents. It is true, that a numerous body of American merchants, distinguished for their wealth and talents, are among the warmest and ablest advocates of the American policy.

Sir, in a country like the United States, where all may engage in what employment they choose, there can never be a monopoly by any body of manufacturers. The extent of the country—the favorable positions everywhere afforded—the industry and enterprise of the people, will always, be a safe guard against the least danger. You might as well maintain that the farmers are monopolists—the mechanics are monopolists, as to lay the same charge against the manufacturer.

But, sir, I maintain that the tendency of protecting domestic manufactures, is to prevent a most dangerous and powerful monopoly; a monied aristocracy that would be resistless, overwhelming.

I mean distinctly, the mercantile interest on the sea board. If this nation, great and extensive as it is, and will be, was composed of farmers and merchants alone, what would be the consequence? The board would be the place of exchange for domestic and foreign productions. This would be effected at a few points favored by nature. Profits and gain would from necessity be confined to a few. The farming interest must sustain all the charges and expenses of transportation of its productions—heavy—bulky—while the merchant would at all times secure to himself his reward, whatever may be the sacrifices and losses of the farmer.—On the sea board, therefore, all the monied capital of the nation would concentrate. The interior would be in dependance, debt, and bondage. I am not insensible to the importance of foreign commerce. But that alone never did, and never can, make a nation of extensive territory prosperous. History proved the fact. To be sure, large cities have sprung
into existance by trade. Nations or States possessing small domain like Venice and Genoa, may have become rich and powerful by foreign commerce.

A country as extensive as France or Germany, or Russia, or the United States, never could have wealth, competence, and the ordinary comforts of like universally distributed, without the aid of domestic manufactures. There might be a Hanseatic league of cities, rich and powerful, showing defiance to proudest monarchs, while the countries which supported them would remain poor, depressed and miserable.

There might be a rich and flourishing Dantzie, with wretched Poland in the rear to sustain it.

Sir, we have been presented with arguments from a high commercial source, to prove the fully of the protecting system. No clearer demonstration could be afforded than they give, of the value of domestic manufactures. Take woollens. We have been informed from this source that the consumption of the United States is 72,000,000. On this amount it is said the protection by duties equals $27,000,000. Merchants profits operating also as a further protection to $13,680,000. These charges are pretended to operate on the amount consumed, whether foreign or domestic. If we imported the 72,000,000, duly free $13,680,000, must be left in the hands of the merchant, and those with whom he is immediately connected. Take cottons: We consume perhaps $50,000,000. Here would be $9,000,000 more in profits. Suppose all exchanges of the products of manufacture and agriculture were made by the merchants on the seaboard, perhaps $50,000,000 or a 100,000,000 a year would fall to their share and those concerned. From their own statements and reasonings we can at once see the danger of a most overwhelming monopoly, had the system of protecting domestic manufactures never been adopted, or if it should be abandoned. The charge of monopoly against manufacturers should never spring from such a source. It is therefore sound policy to adopt such measures as will divide the monied capital of the nation. Instead of its remaining confined to few places on the sea board, the good of the nation requires that it should be distributed. The protection and security of domestic manufactures will produce this great beneficial result.

Again, sir, we know that foreign merchants and agents have, in some of our principal cities, at least, the almost entire control of commercial operations. Our own citizens perform a secondary subordinate part. Without any attacments our institutions, they can and will exercise an influence at all times great and dangerous. The profits of trade are gathered up, not to be used for the benefit of this country, but of that to which they belong. The United States becomes an India to every foreign adventurer. He makes his fortune at our expense, and then goes home to enjoy it. By these remarks I do not intend the least disrespect to foreigners. While the policy and laws of this country,
afford them the present advantages; they have a perfect right to enjoy them. It would be unjust and ungenerous to make them the subjects of reproach or censure.

But, Sir, if foreigners choose to embark in the manufacturing establishments of the country, their private interests at once become identified with the general interests of the nation. The capital is fixed. Their profits are not derived from daily adventure and speculation, but from investments more durable than life. The capital of the foreign merchant may be withdrawn on the sailing of any Liverpool or Havre packet. The manufacturer has his capital fastened, firmly in the country.

From a memorial from Charleston, S. C. distinguished for its candor and ability, a rule is laid down, to which I will refer. It is, “that if a nation will not buy, it cannot sell.” It would seem to follow, that if a people cannot sell, they cannot buy. Now, Sir, apply this rule to six or seven millions of the people of this Union. What is the condition of the agricultural States not engaged in the growing of cotton, rice and tobacco? The whole amount exported from the United States in 1826 in Great Britain, was about $200,000. Of this, $19,039,000 was in cotton, rice and tobacco, leaving $1,361,000,000 from those parts of the U. States where those three great articles are not produced. We exported, in all, to France, 9,139,000 dollars. In cotton alone, 8,170,000 dollars, leaving 1,130,000 dollars the United States of every thing else. Now, Sir, if we can: not sell we cannot buy. See the statement which I exhibit.

EXPORTS OF DOMESTIC PRODUCTIONS—1826.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>England</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>North of Europe</th>
<th>Fish</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>$4,980</th>
<th>Lumber</th>
<th>$47,000</th>
<th>33,000</th>
<th>M?sts</th>
<th>&amp;c. 46,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>96,000</td>
<td>655 Hides, cattle</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>Pork, hams, &amp;c. 271 148</td>
<td>Flour</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td>1,240 Corn</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>0 Corn meal, 14 0 Flax seed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPORTS, 1826. To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England, Ire. &amp; Scot.</td>
<td>$20,400,000</td>
<td>$9,300,000</td>
<td>$11,044</td>
<td>$26,130,000</td>
<td>$8,500,000</td>
<td>$2,617,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORTS FOR 1826.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Imported from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England, Ireland, and Scotland, 1826</td>
<td>$26,130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exported, 20,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance against United States, $5,730,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole amount exported to England, Ireland, and Scotland. $20,400,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotton, $15,730,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco, 3,043,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rice, 266,000
19,039,000

From all the rest of the United States, 1,361,000

We exported to France, $9,300,000

In cotton, 8,170,000

Of all other articles, $1,130,000

But, Sir, it is said, that northern navigation enjoys a benefit, equal to 5,000,000 a year, in the transportation of southern productions. This confers but a trifling benefit on the interior. It is valuable to those concerned. I would not expose it to the least danger. It will not be in jeopardy. I would not consent to any measure that would have a tendency to sacrifice any great existing interest of the nation.

I know, Sir, that it is often said and urged with great ardor, and with equal sincerity, that we endanger the market for the great staples of the South, by pursuing the policy of protecting domestic manufactures. Let this be the subject of a fair and candid consideration. Let us look at it with rigid impartiality. England may retaliate, is the proposition. Why? For what reason? It is now seen, that, as a nation, we, in the direct undertake from her five or six millions more than she takes from us. So far there is no reason of complaint. Three fourths of what she does take is a raw material—cotton—without which she could scarcely exist. She takes it from us only because the world besides does not and cannot supply her wants.

In 1825, England manufactured to the value of 8266,000,000; exported $133,000,000. In 1827, the manufacture of cotton fabrics will not fall short of $300,000,000.

By a statement I offer, it appears that in 1827. England used 851,000 balls, 631,000 from the United States. 220,000 from all the rest of the world. To suppose that England would attempt to punish us, for a tariff that might exclude five or six millions of her manufactures, by excluding three-fourths of the whole quantity of the cotton she uses, would be strange indeed.

What was her policy as to wool? This is an article produced by her own people, upon which a multitude of her farmers depend. It is estimated that they annually produce 144,000,000 lbs. She uses 160,000,000 lbs, and exports only $27,000,000 of the fabric. Yet England reduced the duty on

foreign wool to a nominal amount. Why? To aid manufactures. It was to enable her subject to rival all other nations. To refuse to take our cotton then would be a singular contradiction to her whole policy. If then she, to aid an export of $27,000,000 of woollen fabrics, will suffer the wools of other nations to come into her own market, can any one suppose that she would exclude a raw material she cannot produce, when her exports of a fabric amount now to 150,000,000?

Again, Sir, I maintain that the interests of the cotton growing States are doubly secured by promoting the manufacture in the United States. I am sensible that it may seem presumptuous in me to speak on this subject, represented as they are, by the greatest talents and intelligence, but I am confident it will be considered with all the candor that belongs to talents and intelligence. The more rival nations in the manufacture, the better. England now takes the lead. France is advancing, Switzerland and Germany are improving in the manufacture. The United States, having enterprise and skill, are following rapidly on. Mutual competition will compel all to produce the fabric at the lowest possible price. Any attempt, therefore, to exclude the raw material, or the charge it with duties, which would materially advance its price, would be an act of suicide. If but one nation alone was engaged in the manufacture, retaliation might be feared, Policy, sound policy, therefore, would seem clearly to require that the promotion of the manufacture in the United State would be a great security to all engaged in the production of the raw material. In case of war, also, the advantage of a domestic market must be apparent.

I will, sir, present a further view. England, in 1827, took 204,000,000 lbs. Consumed in the United States at least 70,000,000 lbs. Suppose the whole had been thrown into the English market; all the exports of cottons from 1826, to all parts of the world, were 204,000,000 lbs. The value was $25,000,000. The value of the 205,000,000 lbs, sent to England in 1827, was only $20,220,000. Put 70,000,000 lbs. more into the market, with the quantity sent abroad, the effect must have been doubly disastrous.

I am, sir, met with the reply that we should buy more in the United States. This is a mistake. We could not purchase one-half, nor one-fourth of what is now consumed. The manufacture is distributed, and is daily spreading in every part of the Union. The people can buy of the manufacturer, because they can sell. A market is opened for what no foreign nation will take. The consumer can exchange what he produces for the fabric. We now manufacture probably 40 or 50 millions. This is equal to two thirds of all the productions of the United States exported from the country. Where could we buy? how could we pay? The subject is exhaustless—I pass over it.

If we cannot sell, we cannot buy. Apply this to the intercourse between the North and South. What agricultural productions of the North are required by the South? None. We of the North want the cotton, rice, tobacco and sugar. What have we to offer in exchange? Nothing that is derived from the
soil. Should manufactures be suspended, twenty millions worth of commodities now exchanged, must be suspended also.

Again, sir, it is urged that all duties on imports are taxes on consumers. This may be true, as to those articles which we exclusively procure from abroad. It is untrue as to such articles produced by domestic industry, nearly or wholly sufficient to supply the demand. It is said that we consume $72,000,000 of woollens annually. It is pretended, on this amount the consumers pay the sum of $41,000,000, in duties and merchant's profits, which operates also as a bounty to the domestic manufacturer. The effect, the tendency and design, seem to be to produce a decided hostility against the system of protection. Let us see how unfounded are such absurd calculations. $72,000,000 of woollens are used. $10,000,000 are imported. $22,000,000, at most, are produced by manufacturing establishments in the United States. $40,000,000 are the result of household industry. How is the latter amount produced? By farmers, who grow their own raw material; by the labor of their families; by the mechanic in the country, who receives, in compensation for his labor, the productions of the farm. In short, the $40,000,000 are produced by means that would be hardly worth a sixpence in a foreign country. Yet, the great mass of our people who furnish their own domestic supply, is charged with paying a tax of 57 per cent! Such are some of the strange arguments addressed to the farmers, to excite their hostility against the manufacturers.

But if “we do not buy, we cannot sell.” Wool, for instance, is one of the great staples of a portion of the United States. Suppose we were dependent on England for our clothing, and we depended on the produce of our flocks for payment. I have, sir, the most authentic evidence in my possession, of the benefits of the English market to the American wool grower! It is offered for the inspection of any one. An American farmer sold to the American manufacturer a part of his wool at fifty cents per pound. The remainder of the same quality he sent to England to be manufactured, and to be allowed the value of the wool! The returns was 2 cents, for such as the American manufacturer had paid fifty! Suppose wool in Vermont is worth 50 cents, in England $. Suppose also, that the fabric was admitted duty free, and no charges except the merchant's, estimated at 19 per cent, and these must be paid for the good of the nation, what would be the result? 26 pounds of wool would buy a coat in England, and 12 pounds in the United States, of the domestic manufacturer.

But duties on imports are taxes on the consumer. We will see how this operates on other articles of domestic manufacture. It is supposed that we produce in the United Suites, cotton fabrics to the value of $50,000,000. A great proportion are valued at 16 cents, and under, the square yard. The duties and charges would be about 10 cents—Remove the protection, and according to the rule that duties are a tax on the consumer, we should be furnished with the fabric at four cents the running yard. The absurdity is apparent. Take a fabric, valued at 9 cents the square yard; the duties
and charges would be about the same I have before stated. According to the rule, this fabric could be afforded to the consumer for nothing. Take nails; the duty is 5 cents. The average price may be 7 cents in market. The consumer, by the rule laid down, should have them for 2 cents per pound. I will mention but one article more—one very valuable, and recently—however, that is not very important—I mean cheese. The duty is 9 cents per pound. The average value in market not over 7 cents. If duties in the foreign article are a tax on the consumer, he is in equity and good conscience entitled to 2 cents for every pound he eats.

I shall now proceed to examine some of the principal details of the bill.

**Bar Iron.** —I cheerfully concurred with the Committee in giving further protection to this important article. It is one of first necessity, in peace and war. No country can be independent without a domestic supply, and more than a country can be independent which does not produce its own bread stuffs and clothing. The value imported appears from a statement in my possession. For the last six years, it amounts to about $1,600,000 on an average. In 1826, rolled or English bar iron amounted to 88,741 cwt.; in 1227, to 163,000. Hammered, principally Swedian and Russian, in 1826, to 467,500 cwt.; and in 1827, to 438,000. The price, it is true, has advanced within a few years; but this I consider is no reason why further protection should be refused. My object is to give to the manufacturer the home market. I am confident that a full supply will be soon produced. The capacity of the country is abundant. By the evidence taken before the Committee on Manufactures, it appears that Pennsylvania now produces 21,000 tons, which is nearly two-thirds as much as we import—New Jersey is rich in mines, and adds much to the domestic supply. The valley of Lake Champlain yields about 3000 tons per annum. Many other sections of the United States furnish all that is required for immediate neighborhood consumption.

But on Pennsylvania, more than any other portion of the Union, will the American market depend for this great and valuable material. The internal communications now in progress, and which are rapidly progressing, will enable that State, alone, to furnish the whole American market with iron, should the foreign article be excluded.

The present duty on hammered bar iron is $18 per ton, and $30 on rolled. From several invoices in my possession, it appears that the average cost on shipboard, in Sweden and Russia, has been, the year past, about $57 per ton. Considering freight, exchange, and duty, alone, the efficient protection is equal to 60 per cent. English or rolled iron cost in Bristol, the year past, about $38 60 per ton. Duty, exchange, and freight, will amount to nearly $40, or above 100 per cent. The proposed duty, in addition, is $4 44 on hammered, and $7 on rolled. The protections afforded to the American manufacturer against the, will be, in practical effect, equal to about 67 per cent.; and against the
latter 121, should the bill become a law. This, it would seem, must answer the purpose. The duty is specific. No evasions can take place. No inducement exists to misrepresent its value.

On Pig Iron, the Committee propose to advance the present duty 25 per cent. In this they were almost unanimous. The vast quantities now produced—the unlimited capacity of the country to supply what is now required from abroad, induced the Committee to advance the duty. The value imported is small, it is true. It averages, for the last three years, not much above $50,000. So effectual has been the operations of the existing and former tariffs. The proposed advance of duty will readily produce a domestic supply, as the foreign may be diminished.

_Steel._—The present duty is $1 per hundred weight—the proposed duty $1 50, an advance of 50 per cent. The Committee on Manufactures derived but little aid from the witnesses examined on this point. It was, however, considered that sound policy required more decided protection. That it can be produced in the United States to the greatest amount required for domestic use, the Committee did not doubt.

I shall not occupy the time of the Committee with any remarks on the proposed advance of duty on the smaller manufactures of iron and steel.

Next in order of the bill, is the subject of wool and woollens. These are the great interest which most occupy attention. Upon them it has been my misfortune to differ most essentially from the Committee on Manufactures. I shall endeavor to present the reasons by which I am led to the conclusions which follow.

I shall not take up the time of the Committee with extensive remarks on the deep interest which the farmer and manufacturer have in the question about to be decided. It is a subject that has been fully examined by the people themselves, and they fully understand its importance. A reference only will be made. Statements made on a former occasion have been often examined, and found sufficiently accurate for argument as well as legislation. The number of sheep may be set down at $16,000,000. The value dependent on manufacturing establishments is not less than $20,000,000. The land required $20,000,000 more. This great interest now stands suspended. Its fate depends on our decision. Its salvation or ruin depends on the determination of Congress.

Now, Sir, let us consider what the farming interest demands. The answer is at hand: a market, a market for what he produces, Who gives it? England? No. France? No. Germany? No, I have already stated the experiments of sending wool to England. It produced 23 2–3 cents per pound, whilst the American manufacturer gave 50 cents for the same quality. By the evidence taken before the committee, it appears that the foreign manufacture obtains the raw material for a far less price than
the American has given. In Europe the price is daily diminishing. I have evidence in my possession, upon which the most perfect reliance may be placed, of the recent purchase and sales of German wool. The purchased was made at Liepsic and and sold in the United States.

What cost 51 1–2 cents sold for $1 1

Do, do. $39 1–2 do. do. 81 1–4

Do, do. 27 1–4 66

Do, do. 21 1–4 57

Suppose you impose a duty of ten dollars a pound, or prohibit wool at once, what then? Will our farmers send it to England and Germany. I confess, Mr. Chairman I am minute. I mean to be; such exertions have been made out of doors to enlist the prejudices of the farmer against the manufacturer, that a full explanation shall be given. Who then can give the American farmer a market. It is the domestic manufacturer, if there is any market at all. Under what circumstances do you expect he will buy? If he is reduced to bankruptcy and ruin, will you compel him to purchase? It would seem, that if you only exclude foreign wool, the manufacturer is in duty bound, even compelled, to buy of the farmer, at all events. If such is his condition, it is truly distressing. I am sure no farmer, who is entitled to the name, can be the dope of such fallacy.

Next the manufacturers are to be considered. I am fully aware of the treatment they have received from abroad. I do not, however, refer to the views of a portion of the country, which has been steady and consistent in a divided opposition to the policy of protecting domestic manufacturers. We have often heard them charged with becoming rich at the expense of the hard labor of the labouring classes of the community; that twenty or twenty-five millions of dollars are drawn from the consumers under the operations of the existing tariff and put in the pockets of 100,000 persons engaged in manufacturers. It is said we annually produce in the United States, $72,000,000 of woollen fabrics. The duties alone, merchants profits not included, amount to 23,000,000 of dollars, and this amount is enjoyed by 100,000 employed in the manufacturing business. It is not true; but suppose this sum is the bounty, who enjoys it? Household fabrics exceed $40,000,000, as a portion of the estimate of consumption. Is the farmer conscious—Is it true, that he is thus rewarded for the productions of his industry by his fire side? He does receive it in proportions as much as the manufacturer who conducts an extensive establishment. Does not the wool grower participate when he receives double the amount for his wool that is received by the farmer of England, Spain or Germany? And yet the 100,000 manufacturers are accused of enjoying the annual income of twenty
or five and twenty millions. This enormous perversion of truth is spread through the country, and many receive it as conclusive evidence of the grasping avarice of manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, I consider the manufacturers as a class entitled to as much respect as the same number of any other—to no more. To their interests I would extend the paternal arm of Government when required, as much as to same amount belonging to any other class, and no more. But on this great question, they are not to be considered as individuals independent of the rest of the community. I consider them as then agents and factors of the agricultural interest. Hence is derived my strongest argument for sustaining them. Their capital and industry are employed to give life and animation to millions around them. Their interest, and those of the farmer are identified. They must exist, or perish together.

I shall now, sir, ask your attention to the woollen manufacturer. It seemed to me that on this point we could have been satisfied, without resort to the examination of examinees. That examination has put the question to rest, as to their embarrassed condition, could any doubt have existed. I shall refer to the evidence in mass. I believe that every one who will examine it must inevitably come to the conclusion that the condition is even worse than public representation ever made it. If I recollect, it was said the other day, by an honorable gentleman from New York, (Mr. Cambreleng,) that he was acquainted with woollen establishments which had divided, during the past year, from ten to twenty-five per cent. on the capital.

[Mr. Cambreleng, in explanation, said the reporters had made him say something of that kind. What he did say was, that on balancing the books for the six months ending April 1, 1825, and for the next six months, ending October 1, there was found to be in the latter a difference of 10 per cent. in favor of the establishment. It was proper to say that the concern to which he had referred turns out to be such an ode as no man should, and no honorable man would, have an interest in.]

Sir, I had hoped, if such evidence existed, we should have had the benefit of it before the Committee—I am confident we should. But the honorable gentleman was mistaken. I think I am not a stranger to the source of his information. As I understand it, the company to which he refers, in making up their accounts, found they had, in their operations, lost only fifteen per cent. when they supposed they had lost twenty five. So far, they may be said to have gained ten per cent. Even this was a gain that but few could boast of. Let gentlemen examine as many witnesses as they please, pry into the concerns of the manufacturers as deep as they please, they will find nothing but an empty, unprofitable, ruinous business. But one alone, for the last year, unless by aid of a government contract, has said that he made a farthing of profit. Mr. Marland, engaged in the flannel business, thought he might have made a saving. But he explains the cause. As an experiment, in 1826, he with his friend, suddenly put into the New York market about 400 bales of flannels, sold them in a day, at
auction. The effect of the immense sale was to check importations. In 1827 the domestic market was better, and he had a temporary advantage. He tells us also that he shall diminish his operations for the coming year. He dare not hazard the foreign competition under existing circumstances.

Now, sir, I will briefly state some of the causes of the fatal embarrassments which surround the woollen manufacturer. One is the law price of wool in Europe. This is probably the most important. Should the American farmer supply the raw material as cheap as the Spaniard and German, far less protection would be required for the fabric. Sales at auction is another; credit for duties is another. This gives to the foreigner the use of an amount of revenue for eight, ten and twelve months, equal to the duties charged on his merchandise. It becomes a capital, without interest, and gives him continual aid in all his operations. Our revenue system is detective also, in the mode of imposing duties on woollens. It is evaded. It invites evasion, by the facility with which it can be done. No better evidence is wanted than that which has been given by the appraisers in the city of New York. In a report made last session by the Secretary of the Treasury, we have the rule by which they are governed in fixing the value on which duties are paid. They say “that impositions to a limited extent, not sufficiently gross to be met by the provisions of penalties of the law, may be occasionally practised on this and another custom-houses in the United States, &c. But that any considerable amount of importations has passed this custom house before possible prices, the examinations under our superintendence, authorize us confidently and unequivocally to deny” Possible prices — possible prices! This proves the character of the law, that now it is pretended gives protection to the manufactures of the country. Possible prices!

What is the possible price of a piece of broad cloth? This expression itself proves that there is no standard of valuation. The foreign manufacturer can put his own price to his fabrics, and will do so to avoid the payment of duties. His interest requires it. He is justified by the expounders of the laws themselves. They may be right. The original fault is in the system. It requires correction. Another great cause of the depression of the domestic manufacturers, is the irregularity of the market. The effects have been fully explained by the witnesses. They prove it to be one of the great causes of their past and present embarrassments.

Is this important branch of national industry worth the aid of government? Shall it be abandoned, shall it be left to perish? I trust not. What is the remedy? What is required to rescue it from impending destruction? Protection, sir; protection—real, efficient protection. Adopt a measure that will at once give confidence. At the termination of the late war, thousands were ruined. The tariff of 1816 revived hopes, but only for disappointment. The tariff of 1824 was delusive. Under its influence the manufacturer has struggled on in the expectation that he would be eventually sustained. He had better yield at once, than place reliance on a doubtful measure. While the manufacturer hesitates,
the farmer is left in suspense: He knows not whether he should give up his flocks to the butcher, or meet the expense of sustaining them. By adopting a decided course, every spindle is put in motion. The raw material will instantly find a market. The supply of the fabric will be, in a short time, adequate to any demand.

I shall now examine the proposed duty on wool. The bill provides for a duty of 7 cents per pound on all kinds of wool and, in addition, an ad valorem duty increasing from forty to fifty per cent. On this subject, I could not concur with a majority of the Committee. It seemed to me clearly that the proposed measure was not adapted to the existing state of things.

I am opposed, at present, to an additional duty on wool costing over eight cents per pound. My reasons are, that such wool is not produced in this country. The manufacture of it is established. The fabric which we formerly imported from abroad is now produced among ourselves. The advantages resulting from the manufacture we now enjoy. The raw material we do not produce. The evidence before the Committee clearly proves that the lowest priced wool of native growth is worth from 20 to 25 cents per pound. I know that the farmer is appealed to. He is asked to believe that he will enjoy a great benefit from his apparent protection. Now, sir, I venture to say that the State to which I belong is as deeply interested in the policy now under consideration as any portion of the Union. But I do not believe the farmers of my State would be much flattered with a recommendation to grow wool worth ten or twelve cents, when they can as well produce that which may be worth forty or fifty. Neither would they drive a manufacture out of the country because they did not produce the raw material. Protection should, in my opinion, be extended to such interests as do exist or may be promoted.

A majority of the Committee considered that the door would be open to frauds; that such wool as is imported into the United States would take the place of the wool of this country. To me this seems impossible. Wool costing abroad eight cents, and under, would be worth in our market about twelve or thirteen cents at most. The price of the poorest American, as we have seen, is from twenty to twenty-five, in the market. If it is a little lower in the interior, the cause which depresses the price there would also increase the price of the foreign article when transported into the interior. The space therefore is so wide between the price of foreign wool costing 8 cents and under, and the price of our own, worth 20 and 25, that it will perfectly secure our farmers from any danger. But it is said that foreign coarse wool comes to our market unwashed, and loses one half or two thirds in preparing for use. The duty then operates certainly, with greater effect. Again: the trade in wool is confined to the American merchant or importer. The foreign manufacturer is not engaged. The cost abroad is known. Responsibility to our own laws is felt.
From this material the coarsest fabrics are produced. Negro cloths, inferior baizes and flannels. They are used by the poorer classes of society. The poor—the poor—sir, have been subjects of great commiseration of late—much sympathy has been felt for them. I hope I am not destitute of humanity also. I am fully confident, should we impose the proposed duty, we should drive the manufacturer out of the country. The consequence will be an unnecessary burthen on those whose sufferings all seem desirous to alleviate.

Again, sir, relying on the provisions of the tariff of 1824, manufacturing establishments have been created for the express purpose of using this kind of raw material. An immense value of fabric is now produced. The foreigner is almost entirely excluded. Shall the American manufacturer be sacrificed, as he must be should the proposed duty be imposed? But this is intended for the American wool grower. Let us see the effect. The duty is to take effect instantly. Exclusion is inevitable. The manufacturer of coarse wool is compelled to stop at once. The farmer requires time to produce the raw material. What is the consequence? By the time the farmer grows wool worth 10 or 12 cents per pound, when is the manufacturer to use it? He will have been long in the shades. I will examine this subject further, because I know, abroad, it has been used to create hostility between the farmer and manufacturer. Let us see the operation of the tariff of 1824 on wool costing above ten cents per pound.

In 1825 it amounted to $515,000

1826 343,000

1827 234,000

Not to exceed in 1827 600,000 pounds; and less than is produced in the County of Dutchess, in the State of New York alone.

The coarse wool under ten cents per pound imported in

1825 cost $53,000

1826 106,000

1827 174,000

The quantity for 1827 must have been above two millions of pounds of this latter quality. The fabric produced from it must have been imported, had the raw material been excluded.
Again, sir. There is no doubt that the present capacity of the manufacturer is greater to produce the fabric that the former to produce the raw material. I have taken much pains to ascertain the quantity of wool that the imported cloths, cassimere, blankets, baizes, flannels and carpets would require. It cannot be less than 10,000,000 lbs. To this add 15 per cent, for increasing consumption in the country, together with the wool imported, and the quantity will not be much, if any less than 14,000,000 lbs. To produce this would require 5,000,000 of sheep in addition to the present number. The coarsest wools now produced would for years be required for cloths of a better grade than is made from the Smyrna, Adrianople and Buenos Avrean wool. The native wool in the United States is fitted for blankets, flannels, and other fabrics far superior in value to such as is made of the other. To exclude the coarse wool would, therefore, ruin the manufacturer and would, of course, not benefit the farmer a farthing.

To place this in fuller point of view, the following estimate is submitted of the quantity of wool, that would be required, if the foreign fabric should be excluded.

We import cloths and cassimers worth $5,000,000, requires wool 6,500,000 lbs. Flannels & Baizes, 500,000 do. do. 1,000,000 do. Carpeting, 600,000 do. do. 1000,000 do. Blankets, 600,000 do. do. 1,500,000 do. Add fine and coarse wool now imported, 2,450,000 do. Add 15 per ct for increasing consumption, 1,400,000 do. 13,850,000 lbs.

If there is any error the estimate is too low. But it is sufficiently accurate for the illustration I wish to make. The wool grower will be occupied for years in producing a supply of a superior quality, and the importation of the coarsest will not prove injurious. It will be recollected, that my proposition is to reduce the cost abroad from ten cents to eight, which will produce a considerable effect. On wool costing over 8 cents, I prefer a specific duty. Eighteen or twenty cents would be sufficient. Nine-tenths of the wool produced in the United States has a market value between twenty and forty cents per pound. The sum I have named would be abundant protection. The bill proposes 7 cts specific duty, and an increasing duty to 50 per ct. ad val'm. in addition. This is for the purpose of taxing the finest wool imported, as well as the coarsest which has been explained. The quantity of the finest wool grown in the United States is yet small. The manufacture requires great skill and experience. The wool grower must look to the manufacturer for a market. It is for the interest of the latter, that the former should be prosperous. It would be a folly to produce wool, while nobody could use it. To the twenty cents an annual addition of two or three cents, would augment the protection as the supply increased. The manufacture can go on. The farmer has a certain of a purchaser. The grower of the common and better quality of wool cannot complain. He will be fully protected at all events. The plans I propose has met the approbation of the owners of the best and choicest docks in the United States; who have expended an immense amount of money to obtain them, and who are equally desirous to make them profitable And, sir, it is worthy of remark, that those who have taken
the most pains to improve their flocks, and who have expended the most money to introduce them into this country, are the most decidedly in favor of an ample protection to the manufacturer, the least anxious for a heavy prohibitory duty on the raw material which they produce. They are sensible, in the present state of things, an exorbitant duty on the finest wool would drive the manufacturer out of the country, and prove a sacrifice of their own best interests.

Now, Sir, I will proceed to examine some of the provisions of the bill, which are intended for the protection of the manufacturer. On these it is again my misfortune to differ, widely, from a majority of the committee. With one exception, however, all considered that some legislation was necessary. That exception, was the Hon. member from South Carolina, (Mr. Martin). Although steadily opposed in principle and practice to the system of protection, to no one is the committee more indebted for efficient and liberal aid, during the whole of their laborious investigations, than to that gentleman.

The first point to which I call your attention is the proposed minimum of fifty cents. The bill provides that all woollen goods, the actual cost of which at the place whence imported shall not exceed fifty cents the square yard, and be charged with a duty of sixteen cents. It is my intention to show what will be the practical effect. I am, however sensible that the subject can be much better examined in the closet, than in a public assembly. But I cannot avoid the examination. I invite the most rigid scrutiny. If I am in error the sooner it is discovered the better. I wish to know it. No doubt now exists in my mind, that this provision of the bill is decidedly more injurious to the manufacturer than the tariff of 1824. By that act the duty in 33% per cent. ad valorum. By other acts 10 per cent. on cost and charges, is except insurance is taken into account. The duty on 50 cents would be nearly equal to 19 cents. The bill proposes 16 cents. If there was no further duty imposed on the raw material, this amount might operate as a protection on some of the most inferior fabrics. To see its practical operation, we must consider also the intended duty on wool. I have full confidence in the accuracy of the statements I offer. should they prove erroneous I shall cheerfully make an acknowledgment.

1 Yard ¾ wide, invoiced at 37# cents, is equal to 50 cents the square yard. This now pays a duty of 13¾ cents. By the proposed Bill the duty will be 12—loss, 1¼. Requires 1½ lb. wool, at 10 cents per lb. proposed duty 7 cents. 10# 50 per cost ad val. (loss 15 per cent. present duty.) 5¼ 15¾ Against the manufacturer, 17½ Duty by the tariff of 1824, 13¾ Wanted on the running yard, to make the protection as good as by the tariff of 1824, 31¼

This is at the rate of 40 cents square yard. Take a cloth costing 32 cents square yard, or 24 cents running yard.

Wanted 1½ lbs. wool, 12 cents.

Specific duty proposed, 10½
50 per cent (less 15,) 4¼

Loses in duty on wool, 14¾—gains by duty 12

12

Worse than if cloth and wool were duty free, 2¾

Carpets—a yard wide.

Carpets now pay duty, 25 cents,

By bill, 16, loss by duty 9

2½ lbs. 17½

50 per cent (less 15,) 8¾

26¼ loss by duty on wool, 26¾

Loss by duty on wool, and by bill at 16 cents square yard, 35¼

Duty by tariff, 1824. 25

Loss by proposed duty on wool, 26¼

51¼

This amount is required to make the protection equal to what it is now.

The effect is too apparent for any further illustration The manufacturer of the coarse fabric is ruined at a blow. The farmer who chooses to grow wool worth 8 or 12 cents, instead of that quality that should command 35, or 50, might as soon send it to Smyrna or Buenos Ayre, as to New York or Boston. I think, however, I am authorized to say that a reduction of the duty on carpets was not intended by the committee on manufactures That article escaped observation when the bill was framed. To this I understand the honorable gentleman from New York, (Mr. Wright) assents. Should any alteration be made in respect to carpets, a small part only of my objections will be removed. In referring to them, an illustration of the effects to be produced on the other fabrics was equally clear and strong. The manufacturer will be ruined:—what next? The foreigner will take the same
wool we prohibit, and furnish the same fabric which the American must abandon. This for the benefit of the farmers. If this is a correct policy, it is a mystery which I am unable to comprehend. It has been considered a maxim, that domestic competition would reduce any fabric when we were prepared to manufacture to the lowest price. It is proved to be true, entirely true, if that now under consideration. Never were the coarser fabrics so cheap—never were the poor—the poor, so economically supplied as now. Just as we are about to realize what the friends of the American policy have foretold, that American skill, industry, and enterprise, could accomplish to make them subservient to some fancied benefit, we offer them up as a sacrifice to our enemies.

Again, sir, by throwing the manufacture out of the country, the effects of domestic competition is lost. The duty imposed is, in reality, a tax on the consumer. The price must of necessity advance. What then becomes of the poor—the poor—who have recently become the objects of sympathetic regard? All this for the benefit of the farmer—the farmer—who loses the advantage of furnishing the manufacturer with the ordinary supplies for subsistence, and the anticipated market for what—, he does not produce—the raw material for a fabric that will be created by foreign labor. In truth, this is beyond my comprehension.

The next provision of the bill to which I wish to call the attention of the committee is the one dollar minimum. It is provided that clothes, whose cost shall exceed fifty cents and shall not exceed one dollar the square yard. This in my mind is the most objectionable feature in the whole measure.

We must here consider the duty proposed on the raw material. We must bear in mind that the foreign manufacturer obtains what he uses, free from such charge. The calculations I offer will best explain themselves.

A yard 6-4, invoice at 6s. 9d, equal to $1.50 a $1, square yard. This cloth sells for and is equal to domestic at, $2 25 and 2 50.

1 Yard 6-4 pays a duty of 55 cents,

Proposed duty, 6-4 60 gain to manufacturer 5

This kind of clothe requires wool in the United States worth 50 cents per lb. sorted, in England 30.

2 ¼ lbs. for a yard, 50 cents in U. States, 112 ¼ ' ' 30 England, 67½ In favor of England, 45

Present duty on 2 ¼ lbs. cost 30 cents abroad 23 cents
Proposed duty on 2 ¼ lbs. at mine cost of 30 cents abroad, calculating 7 cents specific and 50 per cent. ad valorem, 5

Loss on wool by duty proposed, 28

Gain by proposed duty on cloth, 5

Loss to America manufacturer on running yard, 23 cents 1 Yard cloth. 73 cents square yard, 5s. 0¾d, sterling, running yard—equal to American at $1 75 6–4

Additional duty on wool used in the manufacture, 24 lbs. at 20 cents 15. in Europe, at 7 cents specific, 15 ½ cents.

50 per cent, advalorem (less 30 present duty,) 10

26 ¾

Square yd. duty proposed by bill, 60 cents,

Duty by tariff of 1824, 41, difference 19

Worse than tariff of 1824, 6 ¾, per yard.

What consequences must inevitably follow? The quality of wool used in cloths, worth, in our market, $2 00, $2 25, and $2 50, is such as is now produced in this country, nearly sufficient to supply the demand. The price given by the manufacturer, has been, for a year of two past, from 35 to 40 cents in the fleece. This is abundantly proved by the witnesses examined before the Committee on Manufacturers. This quality also comprises the great proportion which the American wool growers sends to market. It is the production of his flocks, which, for years, he has sustained and improved. It is that which the manufacturer is prepared to use the fullest extent. We now propose to aid the farmer 28 cents—the manufacturer is allowed five. It must operate as a delusion to one, and a sacrifice of the other. Five cents on a fabric worth from two dollars to two and one half! Even on a cloth worth only 75 cents abroad, the proposed duty is less real protection than the fatal tariff of 1824. I know it is said that near the minimum of fifty cents, the duty will be effectual protection. Let us see its real practical operation. The foreign manufacturer will not be deceived. He will adapt his fabrics to the minimum points. The difference between 50 cents and one dollar, is of itself small, almost imperceptible, in the great operations of trade. But again, the foreign manufacturer will fill the market at those points, and the effect is felt each way. Vast quantities of cloths entered at the
customhouse will affect the value of such as are above and below. Cloths imported at 50 cents the square yard, and goods at one dollar, would effectually meet.

The great objection, therefore, is, that the minimum points are so near each other—only fifty cents between: The proposed duty, at one point, is less than is given by the tariff of 1824, and, at the other, only five cents in addition. This, with a disproportionate charge on wool must inevitably seal the fate of the domestic manufacturer, and with him the wool grower.

But, we are told that the duty is specific. This is considered a great improvement. It is not so. It is no better than ad valorum. The duty is imposed on the same basis, the pretended valuation abroad. There is no more security in applying sixteen or forty cents, on any assumed amount, than in the computation of thirty or fifty per cent.

The third minimum,—Manufactures of wool, the value of which shall exceed one dollar, and not exceed two dollars and fifty cents, the square yard, shall be considered as having cost two dollars and fifty cents, and charged with a duty of one dollar. The present duty is about ninety-five cents; the advance of duty on the minimum price five cents. The protection may be beneficial on fabrics valued at $1.25, or $1.30, on one side, and $2 on the other. As I before explained, the market will be filled by the foreigner, at the minimum points, and the effect will be felt in each direction. But, the amount of the fabric, thus protected, is small, compared with that which the American manufacturer now produces from American wool. The fabric requires a raw material, worth, in our market, from 60 to 80 cents per pound, as assorted for use, and the supply is yet deficient. The duty on the foreign will be from thirty to forty cents per pound, and this will diminish the apparent benefits which the domestic manufacturer might seem to drive.

The other minimums, contained in the bill, are of secondary importance. I shall not occupy time in the discussion of them.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that the best and sures way to accomplish the desired object, is a measure framed on the plan which I recently gave notice I should at a proper time, move as an amendment. I am satisfied that the first minimum should be at least fifty cents, as proposed in the bill. But the duty proposed clearly too low. We should begin at forty per cent, for the year to come. An addition of five per cent, per annum, until the duty reaches fifty per cent; would give a full and efficient protection for all the coarser fabrics. A progressive duty prefer. There will be no sudden shock to trade. The manufacturer looks forward and prepares to furnish a supply. The farmer uses exertions to furnish the raw material; which requires time to produce. There is then no sudden change in the employments of he people.
The second minimum I would carry as high as $2 50. The space between that and fifty cents admit is wide, but it need not excite alarm. At the minimum points, I have before stated, the foreign manufacturer would have access to our markets. The effect would be sensible above and below each. A large immediate space would be secured to the American manufacturer. It is a space he is amply competent to fill with his own fabric. The American wool grower is now prepared to furnish the raw material in abundance. The kind of cloths that would be furnished are precisely such as are made of the wool this country now produces. Should my plan be adopted, and take effect on the first of June, a vast amount from abroad would reach our market. It is expected. The effect would be to keep prices diminished. While the stock was exhausting, the American manufactures would be engaged. Hence, a security against any exorbitant increase of value; any oppression of the consumer.

I know, sir, that theoretically, to call a fabric worth $2 50, which cost only 61 cents, and to charge a duty upon it as having cost $2 50, appears at first unreasonable. But when the condition of the country for producing the raw material—the capacity of the manufacturer to furnish the fabric the necessity for taking a decided stand to sustain all the great interests concerned, no alarm need be felt. I admit that the nominal amount of duty is great as we descend from the minimum of $2 50; I will not pretend to disguise it. But when the practical operations are seen, we need no longer be alarmed.

An honorable member from New York, (Mr. Cambreleng,) soon after I gave notice of my intended motion for amendment, presented a formidable statement of calculations as to the effect. It seems that it never occurred to him, that it was necessary to give us calculations about the bill reported by the Committee. [Mr. Cambreleng said he should like to explain the reasons why he had not.] Sir, the honorable gentleman will soon have time to do so. As he is generally on the alert when a tariff is concerned, I was a little surprised that the bill seemed to have escaped his calculations. As soon as my proposition was made, we were soon advised that it had attracted his attention. This afforded me much satisfaction, I assure you, sir. It was evidence to my mind that it possessed some real, substantial merit; that it would fully answer the object I had in view; that it would be protection to the great interest to which it related. I could not have had better evidence. I think more favorable of it than ever. Such a plan a I have suggested, has the sanction of a numerous delegation from the farmers and manufactures from extensive sections of the country. It is sustained by thousands from different States, whose memorials are on our table. It has been examined for months, and is sustained by public opinion.

The next provision in the bill, to which I will call the attention of the Committee, is for the protection of the manufacture of Blankers. This receive the approbation of a decided majority of the Committee.
on Manufactures. It appeared evident from the testimony of Mr. Marland, that he can afford to manufacture wool into blankets, for six cents per pound. The common native wool of this country is precisely the quality required. By introducing the manufacture of this article, a market would be afforded for all the surplus common wool in the country. I should be even willing to give a progressive duty beyond that which has been proposed by the Committee. I am confident it would be good policy, and promote the farming interest. During the last war we had no supply; we suffered the humiliation to obtain from our enemy this necessary article for the comfort of our soldiers, and to fulfill our obligations to the Indians.

As to the smaller articles of hosiery, &c. the Committee recommend an advance duty. I shall not consume time by any remarks as to them.

The Committee recommend an additional duty on hemp. Ten dollars to take effect on the passage of the act, and five dollars per annum, until the whole, including present duty, shall amount to sixty dollars. It was considered by the Committee sound national policy to introduce the culture of an article so essential to the civil and military marine of the country, as well as to the agricultural interests. The average value imported for the last seven years, is about $600,000. The capacity of the country to produce it is undoubted. The quality is inferior to none in the world. Water rotting, instead of dew rotting, is necessary to make it suitable for the most important purposes. When the grower will adopt the former mode of preparing it, the country will have within itself an abundant supply. It seems from the testimony, that Russia water rotted hemp is usually worth about $225 per ton; the Kentucky, or American dew rotted, is worth about $117; making a difference of $108. At present Russia hemp is worth $270—American $125; a difference of $145. This certainly presents a great inducement to change in this country, the mode of preparation. At present, it appears from the evidence, but little of the first quality is produced, and the additional duty was believed, by the Committee, to be required. I should have preferred a smaller advance than the Committee recommend. Fifty dollars instead of sixty would have answered as well, and been less burthensome on the great interests of navigation and commerce. All that is wanted, is to turn the attention of the agriculturist to the best preparation of this important article.

Additional duties are also recommended on flax and sail duck. It is to be feared that these are not properly adjusted. The duty on flax will materially injure the manufacture, not only of canvass, but of smaller articles, which are at present entirely dependent on the foreign material. This country at present produces little or none prepared in a suitable manner for the uses required. When we reach this part of the bill, a proper adjustment can be made. I feel confident that the manufacture should have a decisive protection, and all necessary inducements afforded to the farming interest to furnish a supply of the raw material.
A majority of the Committee were in favor of an additional duty of five cents per gallon on molasses. The quantity imported in 1827 was 13,370,000 gallons, which is a near average for several years past. The value for the same year was $2,819,000. The principal, perhaps the only reason of the Committee, for imposing this duty, was that a considerable portion is distilled, and the spirits came into competition with such as are produced from the grain of this country; that, by imposing the duty, molasses, used for distillation would be excluded, and a wider market would be opened to the farming interest for its own productions. To any further charge on this article I am decidedly opposed. I cannot reconcile it to any tariff principles I possess; and all must admit that they are liberal. It is an article of general use, of the first necessity for the comfort and convenience of every class of people, especially of those in poor or moderate circumstances. This country does not, and cannot, produce a supply. It is stated by the Committee, that the trade is principally confined to one section of the country. This marks the objection to the duty still more palpable. If the trade was confined to the whole sea board, the burden would be more equally divided. The trade is most extensively carried on in the East by the State of Maine. It employs 100,000 tons of navigation, and a vast number of sailors. The chief articles of exchange are the products of the forest and fisheries. The great market for these is in the West Indies. One of the most valuable articles received in payment, is molasses. Cut up this trade, you cripple the operations of all concerned, and drive a multitude from their accustomed employments by sea and land. For what? To make the people drink whiskey. Soppose you destroy the trade, stop the distillation of rum, you cannot extent the market for whiskey in proportion. Those who are now able to purchase the one, would be unable to purchase the other.

Again: The advantages imagined to flow from this provision, to the grain growing States, will not be perceived, while the most disastrous consequences are sure to be felt by others. Why sacrifice a portion—a great and important portion of the industry of the nation, to confer a doubtful benefit on the other? This is not my doctrine.

By the testimony of Mr. Johnson—by authenic information, besides, in my possession, the duty and incidental charges are from two to three or four hundred per cent. on the cost of the article in the West India market. One would suppose that this should satisfy taxation.

Our annual exports to the West Indies, amount to sixteen or eighteen millions of dollars. The trade, I consider, is the only fair and reciprocal trade, of great importance, we have with the world, In the West Indies we sell. There we find a great market for the agricultural staples of the United States, which European nations refuse. We sell—we can buy. The great agricultural interests—the grain growing States, are also deeply concerned in the preservation of one of its most important branches.
The duty will have a double operation. By excluding the poorer qualities, (fit only for distillation,) you will advance the price in the West India market for the better. Lots, as they are called, are generally composed of different qualities. They are sold together. The purchaser would be compelled to give an advance of price on the best alone, so that the seller might, in some degree, be indemnified for a loss of the poorest. The consumer of molasses would be certainly required to pay six or eight cents more per gallons while the farmer could not, possibly, have a correspondent, advance on his grain. Considering the value of the West India market, for the grain growing States—the value of the trade to our shipping interests—the unnecessary tax on the consumer—the doubtful benefits that will be enjoyed by any, induce me to oppose the proposed duty. I shall make no further remarks. The subject is in better hands

I shall vote for the proposed duty on foreign spirits. They are not necessaries of life. A substitute can be furnished in the United States. If the price is increased, and the quantity consumed diminished, I have no doubt the benefits of the country will surpass any injury that will follow. It seems to me, however, that a better mode might be adopted. The proposed duty is ten cents per gallon; it operates alike on the lowest and highest proof. The existing law makes a necessary discrimination. To have the intended effect, the same principle, should now be observed. I think that an addition of twenty-five per cent. on the present duties, would operate more equally, and beneficially. The present duty is from 38 cents to 75 cents per gallon on the different kinds of spirits, according to the proof they bear.

By existing law, a drawback of four cents per gallon is allowed on the exportation of spirits distilled from molasses. This is the return of the greater portion of duty paid on the importation. The Committee propose to abolish it. The design of the Committee on Manufactures was to promote the distillation of spirits from domestic materials, and introduce them into the foreign market, in the place of the former. It really appears to me that a majority of the Committee have mistaken its operation. If the distillation of spirits from molasses is annihilated, the provision is sugatory. If the distillation continues, the more we send out of the country the better. In 1826 we exported to a value exceeding $70,000; in 1827, above $90,000. It is clear, that if this had remained in the country, it would have displaced nearly an equal quantity of domestic spirits, and produced also a depression of price. What is exported becomes an important article of trade, and is sent to various parts of the world. But it seems to be supposed, that because we can induce the people of the United States to drink whiskey, we can make every body else. On this, I have some doubts. One thing is certain; if we do not allow the drawback, spirits from molasses will remain at home. Whether the people of other countries will fall in love with our whiskey, is a matter not so clear. I would not exchange the certain market for a doubtful one. To my mind, the clause in question will operate decidedly unfavorable to the farmer and merchan. The only rule in political economy that seems to have been universally

adopted by the most enlightened nations abroad, is to sell all they can—and buy as little as possible. This is the sum and substance of all political economy, out of the United states.

There is one more topic to which I feel bound to allude Whenever any measure is proposed for the protection of manufactures, abroad, an alarm is sounded that it is a sectional measure—a Boston, a New England measure. It would seem to be the belief of some, that no part of the Union except the North and the East are, or ever would be, engaged in manufactures. It is true that the North and East have a deep interest in the question before us. Other sections of the country have also In the North and East capital was early acquired. Population had become dense. Whatever encouragement had been given by Government there took effect. But to suppose that there manufactures will be confined, is a serious error. One great cause, that operates in some other countries, is a dependence on steam power. Establishments must be placed in the vicinity of the fuel they require. Hence they may be confined to narrow sections. In this country water power is abundant, almost every where. It is the best and most economical, except in some places, like Pittsburg, where other great natural advantages exist. I do not recollect that the witnesses examined knew of a single cotton or woollen mill East of the Alleghanies, which was moved by steam. There is scarcely a portion of the Middle and Western and Southern States which have not equal or superior advantages to the North and East. Manufacturing institutions would have the raw material and subsistence at their doors. The expense incident to the transportation of supplies, would not be felt. A market for their various productions would also be at hand. That manufacturers will flourish in the North, if they flourish any where, there can be no doubt. A policy that should be fatal there, would spread ruin every where else. Then, sir, instead of manufactures contracting into narrow limits, such as are well established in the country are extending and spreading every day. They will some find their way into every corner of the Union, unless repelled by prejudice or a want of industry.

But, suppose that New England should be the seat of American manufactures; have other parts of the Union no interests in sustaining them? If we cannot sell, we cannot buy. The value of the market has been often conclusively shown. New England takes your floor; Europe does not New England consumes vast quantities of iron, the staple of Pennsylvania; Russia and Sweden do not. New England is now opening a vast market for coal; you cannot send it to New Castle. New England can buy, because her people can sell. Her prosperity is identified with the prosperity of the nation.

Sir, I now ask your attention to the general features of the bill. They are not in that proportion which justice demands. The committee gave to the manufacturer of iron all he asked—even more. To the manufacturer of glass what one of the most intelligent witnesses examined before the committee declared was not required. On the manufacture of iron, a generous increase of protection has been cheerfully awarded. On steel, an article of general use, an addition of fifty per cent. in addition
to the present duty. On foreign spirits, already charged with nearly prohibitory duties, we have imposed still heavier burdens. On molasses, an article so interesting to the trade and navigation of the country, so valuable for the comfort and convenience of millions of people of the United States, 100 per cent on existing duty is added, without reluctance or hesitation. We have almost urged on a flourishing branch of industry, the cotton trade, a favor to which it but faintly consents.

When, sir, we come to consider that great and general interest, the manufacture of woolens, which has long and ardently implored the aid of Government, all is doubt and difficulty. Why so? What is the cause? Why, sir, some think we shall tax the poor; some, that we shall favor the rich; and finally nothing is done which justice and sound policy demand.

Sir, the bill was not matured with all that care and deliberation which the committee would have desired. All recollect that it was announced that a bill would be presented in January. The reports of the committee is the evidence to which I refer to sustain any remark. the committee say, in relation to the taking of testimony, as required by the House, that “this additional labor was in no other way exceptionable to the committee, than as it rendered somewhat doubtful their ability to give their report to the House within the time within which they had signified that it would be received.” The committee also state in their report, that “the examinations of witnesses by the committee were not closed until Saturday night last, and Monday of the present week was entirely occupied in correcting and arranging the testimony taken, and had not been corrected, thus leaving but two days to them to digest their bill and prepare this hasty report. Under these circumstances, it cannot be expected that a minute examination of the various subjects included in the bill prepared by the committee, will be gone into much less that a discussion of the great question involved in the system of extending protection to the languishing interests of the country, by an increase of duties on imports, will be attempted. The former would be a task requiring time and care, combined with extensive research; and the latter, even if time were allowed to the committee, is a subject better suited to a discussion in this House, than in a report of one of its committees.” It seemed to me that the committee candidly and frankly admitted that the bill was not digested with all the care and attention which, under other circumstances, they would have bestowed. It was this that rendered the decisions of the committee less objectionable to the mind. Every question is left fairly open. Time has been given to research, and all can act with intelligence and discretion. For myself, I am not tenacious of form. Let us have the substance. The country demands some decided and effectual measure. If nothing can be done, let the great interests involved at once know their fate. Any longer suspense is as unjust as it is cruel. I cannot yet surrender the hope, that we shall finally adopt a measure which will give repose and prosperity to the nation.

Mr. M. then offered the amendment on wool and woollens of which he had previously given notice.
PROPOSALS

WILL be received at the Post Office Department until the 1st of April next, for carrying the Mail from Coweta, Ga. by the County Seats of Troup, Merriwether, Harris, Talbot, Marion and Muscogee, to Fort Mitchell, once in two weeks. Also, from Fort Mitchell to the County Seat of Lee, once in two weeks. The Mail to travel at the rate of 45 miles each day. The contract to begin on the 10th day of April next, and continue until the 31st December, 1830.

Jan 4—wil Ap

Navy Commissioners' Office, 11 th February, 1828

THE Commissioners of the Navy will receive sealed proposals until the first day of March next, for the following timber; viz:

feet. inches. 5000 cub. ft. ash timber, 12 to 20 long, 20 to 36 diameter 2000 do. white hickory, 12 to 24 do., 12 to 18 do. 1500 do. yellow poplar, 12 to 30 do., 15 to 30 do. 1000 do. black walnut, 12 to 30 do., 15 to 30 do. 1000 do. wild cherry, 6 to 12 do., 12 to 20 do.

All of which timber shall be of the best quality. It shall be delivered at the Navy Yard at Washington, on or before the 1st day of May next, and shall undergo the inspection and measurement agreeably to the established rules in practice at the several Navy Yards.

To be published twice a week in the National Intelligencer, Baltimore Patriot, Easton Star, Phœnix Gazette, and Rhichmond Enquirer. Feb 13—

DRAWING PAPER, &c.

BARTOW & BRANNAN, Psensylvania Avenue, near 10th street, have on sale, English Drawing Paper of the first quality.

Foolscap size, 6¼ cents per sheet, Royal size, 12¾ cents per sheet.

Demy do 8, Imperial do 18¾.

Medium do 10, Antiquatian 1 25.

Amies' Folio Post, Foolscap and Letter Paper, hot and cold pressed.

Bissell & Pense, Owen & Hulburt's, and Hudson's Letter Paper.
Hudson's Blue Laid Foolscap, Mesteer's hot pressed Letter Paper.

Imperial, Royal and Medium Printing Paper. Note Paper.

Foolscap, Letter Paper and Folio Post, feint lined.

Pocket Ledgers and Memorandum Books, with pockets.

Copying Paper, Bank Post, Tracing Paper.


Foolscap Books, half bound, broad and long folio and Quarto.

Johnson's Printing Ink, Ball Skins, Binder's Boards, &c.

A Card, containing the dimensions of the Capitol of the United States, and its grounds, price 6¼ cents.

[???] CASH paid for RAGS.

March 8—co3t

PRINTING

Of every description executed at this Office.