thus open a new market to agriculture. It is true the manufacturer may consume as much when he works on the soil as when he labours in the workshop; but when he is in the latter department of industry, he is fabricating articles to meet the extraneous necessities of the farmer, and the farmer is toiling to raise commodities which he can exchange for those articles, instead of borrowing money and contracting debts with banks and sharpers, to purchase them from abroad. Instead of growing wheat to perish in his granaries, the farmer will find a market for wool, flax, hemp, and provisions of various descriptions; and new divisions of agricultural labor will be embraced. It seems incomprehensible, how a policy grounded on such a basis as this, should be denounced and opposed by any class of citizens who take a liberal and comprehensive view of our national welfare.

But we are told, that if the tariff is raised, the high price of labour, and the extent of soil, in the United States, will long prevent us from successfully embarking in manufactures—even for our own consumption. While the avails of our agriculture fed a great portion of Europe, agricultural as well as all other labor was high because it was productive; but it would be a strange perversion of facts to say that labor is now high in this country, when it is well known that thousands and hundreds of thousands have no steady employment; that thousands would be glad to work for their food; and when the cultivation of the soil opens no road to wealth for want of markets. The United States at this moment has a capacity for as much effective labor as Great Britain, speaking distinctly from the application of labor-saving machinery. When we reflect on the cheapness with which we can furnish the raw material, and the abundance and low rate of subsistence; the superior skill, assiduity and enterprise that mark every industrious pursuit; our coal mines, and more particularly, our water privileges for mechanism; we cannot rationally doubt our ability to compete with foreign manufactures, under the parental protection of the government. The cry for bread will never generate insurrections, while the tendency of free laws, and the operation of our social system, will enable one American citizen to accomplish more than five English paupers. Another fact is to be here recollected. Most of our own manufactures possess a superiority, in their substantial qualities over those vended to us from abroad;—and so visible is the difference, that during the last session, American cottons have been consumed in the Canadas to no inconsiderable extent, although the nominal price of British cottons has been much below them, and they are subject to a duty of ten per cent. In some articles we have already driven foreign manufactures from us:—for instance, those of hats and leather: and we need nothing but protection, until manufactures requiring extensive capital and machinery are in full operation, and our markets are placed under our own command, to extend the same success to the manufacture of cotton, woollen, iron, glass flax, hemp, and other branches of industry. But it is very singular, that among other things, the high rate of agricultural labor has never been glanced at by the opposers of the tariff. If labor is so much cheaper in Europe than it is in the United States, and that is a sufficient reason for obtaining goods from them, why is it not better also to import our food? According to the doctrine of our opponents, it would be, and we might bring wheat salted provisons, bread-stuffs, and every thing of the kind, into the United States to great advantage: but in what shall we pay? is the question: and it certainly applies with great force, but not with more, in this case, than it does to the purchase and consumption of foreign fabrics, that we can make at home.

The assertion that wages are too high to permit us to manufacture the necessaries of life, assumes a new aspect, as we extend its application. Let us suppose that the crop of cotton in 1819, in the United States, was 360,000 bags. This quantity, if sold abroad, at 16 cents per pound, and allowing 2 cents per lb. for freight would have produced about 19,000,000 dollars to the country. Let it be admitted, that this crop was manufactured in England, and exported from thence to the United States in its manufactured state; at a fair wholesale price in our markets, it would be worth more than 100,000,000 dollars. Here the value of the raw material would be enhanced 81,000,000 dollars. This value, of course, includes the high price of American labor in raising the cotton. But in what is this 100,000,000 dollars worth of manufactured goods to be paid? The opposers of the tariff say, in the agricultural products of the country, and, of course, in American labor. What is the deduction? Why, that one year's product in cotton, when exported to Great Britain and converted into commodities by British labor, cheap as it is, and delivered in the United States, ready for consumption, will cost more than five years' labor of the same people who produced the original crop, extravagant as the standard of American wages may be. Now suppose, that, instead of sending this 360,000 bags of cotton to England to be manufactured, it had been sent to the middle and eastern states, and there converted to useful commodities? Would not more than 80,000,000 dollars have been saved to the country? It is, indeed, most extraordinary that the profits of manufacturing industry are so erroneously estimated on this side of the Atlantic. Mr. Calquhoun, in his work on the Wealth, Power, and Resources of the British Empire, estimates the annual profits of that country, in the manufacture of cotton, wool, linen, and leather alone, to be 270,000,000 dollars; and the aggregate annual profits of all their manufactures, in which three millions of people only are employed, at 507,688,888 dollars.*—One solution of our mistake is, that we forget the almost incalculable productiveness of labor-saving machinery, which can be applied but to a small extent in agriculture, but to an astonishing latitude in manufactures. A war is waged against the only branch of industry in which this great discovery can be extensively and successfully applied. According to the calculation of Mr. Ewen, the superintendant of an extensive manufacturing establishment in Scotland, the manual labor of Great Britain, in 1817, was equal to that of 6,000,000 of men, while her manual labor and labour-saving machinery united were equal to 217,250,000—or, in other words, 6,000,000 labourers can, with machinery, do the work of 217,250,000, without machinery. Labour saving machinery can be applied with as much ease in the United States as in England, and even with less expense, and the phantom of high wages may thus be driven from our affrighted economists.

But let us admit that wages are high in the United States. If we should pay 50,000,000 dollars annually to the manufacturers of cotton, wool, glass, iron, paper, hemp, flax, and other articles, in our own country, and other employments were lucrative, who would be the gainer? The American nation. If paid to France Spain, England, or Russia, those nations would be the gainers. If manufacturing labor is high in the United States, agricultural labor is also high, and they will balance each other. Internal exchanges will correct themselves, and wherever the profit falls, it ultimately falls to the increase of national wealth. The great object is, to husband and command our own resources and not waste them, to hire foreign artificers to feed, clothe, or defend us. This an effectual tariff will accomplish.

Far be it from the friends of national industry to wish to plunge the government into financial embarrassments. The prejudicial tendency of the proposed tariff, as respects the revenue, could easily be obviated. Our importations of cotton, woolen, iron, glass, and other protected manufactures, would, of course, be diminished, and the revenue affected. This decrease, would, in some degree, be supplied by the augmentation of duties on these very commodities. Thus, if we imported less of iron, glass, and cotton goods, yet, as the duty would be advanced, the loss would be much less than might be imagined. But we would go further. It is universally granted, by sound political economists, that the most wholesome tax is that imposed on the luxuries of a people. This principle could now be applied in this country. The duty on wines, brandies, gin, malt liquors, spices, European silks. China silks, worsted goods, linen fabrics, crockery and china-ware, hard ware, and plated ware, could be increased to an extent more than sufficient to meet the deficit produced by restraining the importation of cottons, woolens, iron, glass, paper, lead, hemp, flax, and other manufactures, for which we have an abundance of the raw material, and yet the consumption of the former articles be not materially lessened: for it is a truth perfectly evident, that by augmenting our general ability to consume, the present demand for them could not only be sustained, but even extended. The expedient is fair, plain—and would be effectual, and surely ought not to be rejected when the lasting prosperity of the nation is at stake.

From the tariff we pass to the second consideration, the cash payments.

On this subject, it is natural that much prejudice and much contrariety of opinion should exist. When a portion of any community have their habits moulded to a particular manner of collecting revenue, and neither its advantages nor disadvantages come before the eyes of the great mass of the nation, changes, however rational and necessary, will excite some apprehension. This is the precise case before us.

The system of custom-house credits, as it now operates in the United States, extends a bounty to foreign capitalists, who monopolize the sale of foreign goods in the American market. A British merchant may export one hundred thousand dollars, in British manufactures to this country: on arriving here, they are entered at the custom-house, bonds given for the payment of the duties with a long term of credit. By means of our sales at auction, these goods, however defective in point of quality, are forced upon the people and sold off for cash. The avails of the cargo can be sent out to England, and a second, third, and fourth cargo, sent out to this country, before the whole amount contained in the custom-house bonds, for the first cargo, is paid. The current expenses of the shipping manufacturer, or foreign merchant, who thus exports cargoes to the United States, are nothing to be campared with those of the American importer. The former pays a commission on the goods sold by the auctioneers, and that, with other incidental charges, may amount to five or six per cent; while the importer of this country must keep up a regular mercantile establishment, pay his store rent, his clerk-hire, taxes, sustain the expenditures of his family, perform civil and military duties, and defray other heavy disbursements. The foreign importer and the foreign agent, perfectly understand the means of controlling the markets of this country, and have had this knowledge for many years. The fluctuations of demand are always known, and shipments are made accordingly.

The disadvantages resulting to the United States from the toleration of this state of things are numerous and striking. The employment and circulation of American capital are prevented, and our wealth is drawn away. The home market is destroyed, and the foreign market, for our products, in no degree benefitted. For, while money and stock can be received in return for British goods, reciprocity of commercial exchange will be discarded, and necessity alone govern the consumption of American produce. While vast quantities of foreign fabrics thus fill the country from foreign workshops, and their introduction and sale are thus directly protected, facilitated and encouraged by the government, a fair competition can never be enjoyed by the American manufacturer or merchant. He has no chance; neither capital or enterprise will avail him.

By abolishing the present system of custom-house credits, and resorting to cash payments the foregoing evils will meet a remedy. Over-trading and wild and disastrous speculation will be greatly corrected, and a healthy and regular state of things ensue. American capital, skill, and enterprise, will be placed on a basis that is fair and equal. Suits on custom-house bonds, which now include an amount of between three and four millions, will be obviated, and the government be enabled to know the extent and have the immediate use, of its pecuniary resources, free from loss and disappointment.

The most plausible objection brought against the adoption of cash payments, is the assertion that they would have a tendency to destroy small, and benefit large capitalists. This objection is more specious than valid. What is now the course pursued by the slender capitalist? If he makes importations of foreign goods, he must give bonds, at the custom-house, for the payment of the duties. Sound and responsible sureties are required. The object in giving bonds, is the enjoyment of credit. Why then will not good sureties at the custom-house be good endorsers at the banks? Notwithstanding the manner in which the interests of the government are guarded when it assumes the capacity and relations of a creditor, the extended credit at the custom-house, and the liability of failure in the concerns of small capitalists, render the character of a surety highly responsible in this case, and probably more so, than endorsements at bank. In the present state of this country, no difficulty occurs in obtaining liberal discounts at the banks, and they can always be had by importers, when they are deserved. There is more money in the nation than can find employment. The advantages which must result to the community from bringing a large banking capital into circulation, are of no inconsiderable import. The effect of the credits at the custom-house in causing extended and ruinous credits, in all the minor transactions of business, is worthy of attentive consideration. Not only merchants, but the farmers and the consumers of goods generally, have suffered much from the credit system.

We now come to our last clause, the proposed duties on Sales at Auction.

The present auction system is the counterpart of custom-house credits; but its friends are far less numerous. Among all the violent opposers of a new tariff and a resort to cash payments, none have stood forth to vindicate the monopoly of the auctioneers. On the contrary they are compelled to allow, that it prostrates American industry, and carries ruin equally to the doors of the regular merchant, the trader, the manufacturer, and the consumer. We shall here glance at some of its manifold evils.

It has been estimated, and we believe the calculations within bounds, that foreign manufactures, to the amount of 50,000,000 dollars, have been annually sold in the United States, at auction. It has also been estimated, the sales in the city of New-York being the data, that three-fourths of this immense aggregate belong to foreigners. If we suppose that the foreign goods consumed annually, in the United States, have amounted to 60,000,000 dollars, we can easily calculate the extent of the auction monopoly, and the degree in which foreigners displace the employment of American capital, and control the supplying of our markets. Four fifths of the primary sales, in some of our principal commercial cities, are now effected by the auctioneers.—Goods of inferior quality, manufactured abroad, for the auction markets of this country, and the remnants of large stocks, are sent here, sometimes, merely for the sake of drawbacks and bounties on exportation, and sold for cash. Every thing is reduced to system, and the practice of bidding-up the articles on sales, is well understood by the owners and venders. So long have the people been accustomed to resort to auctions—such an allurement do they hold out to gambling and speculating propensities—such a stable command of the markets have they obtained—that, with all their pernicious effects, they will still flourish amid the general ruin which they create. It is apparent, that they cause continual fluctuations in trade, baffle the calculations of the most discreet and discerning, prevent any settled value to property, encourage fraudulent contracts, operate frequently to the great detriment of honest creditors, when debtors choose to rid themselves of their effects, and realise the avails in the most rapid way. The loss to purchasers at auction is oftentimes immense. Goods are vended at different prices, varying from 10 to 50 or 60 per cent. and again sold by regular traders. Those who buy low, can afford to sell low, while the purchaser who obtains his merchandise at an extravagant rate must see himself undersold, and his commodities remaining upon his hands.

While these things exist, and the manufacturers and shippers of foreign nations can thus send $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 of their merchandise, annually, to the United States, and have a long credit at the custom house on the duties; while, without paying rent, taxes, or clerk hire, they can place this merchandise in the hands of the auctioneers, and carry away every thing like convertible capital; while their advantages are worth from 10 to 15 per cent. over those of the American citizen—can we expect to flourish? Do we wonder that domestic manufactures are prostrated and nearly excluded from our markets? Can we wonder that national industry is unproductive, and its prospects so gloomy and cheerless?

But what is the remedy? Let such a tax on sales at auction be imposed, as will place American industry, capital, and enterprise on fair and equal terms with the industry, capital and enterprise of foreigners frequenting our markets. This seems to be the only practicable method of doing away monopoly, and relieving the country from the gross evils which are now suffered from this source. We have said, that by means of the auction system, the advantages enjoyed by foreigners over ourselves are equal to from 10 to 15 per cent. and they are often more. A duty, then graduated by these advantages, would but open a theatre of fair competition, & the vital interests of the American community require it.

The friends of national industry, in closing this examination of the three foregoing measures, which they ardently hope may engage the favourable attention of the general government, will here advert to another result which will flow from the adoption of their views—the promotion of INLAND TRADE.

No country on the face of the globe is so well calculated to sustain an extensive and profitable inland trade as the United States; and yet it has been left to struggle with the obstacles of nature as well as those of an adverse policy. When the navigation of our great rivers is improved to the extent which they will easily admit; when canals are opened, roads, constructed, and domestic manufactures duly encouraged, this country will present a new and unparalleled spectacle of national prosperity. Different climates, different habits, different soils, different agricultural and manufacturing pursuits, directly conspire to favour internal commerce. Whatever may be thought of the doctrines of Adam Smith when applied *in extenso* to the policy of nations, they may at least be considered binding on those who continually urge them, to dissuade the American government from protecting the industry of the community. We will here quote the words of this celebrated writer, upon the subject of home or inland trade. "The capital," he observes, "employed in purchasing foreign goods for home consumption, when this purchase is made with the produce of domestic industry, replaces too, by every such operation, two distinct capitals; but one of them only is employed in supporting domestic industry. The capital which sends British goods to Portugal, and brings back Portuguese goods to Great Britain, replaces by every such operation only one British capital.—The other is a Portuguese one. Though the returns, therefore, of the foreign trade of consumption should be as quick as those of the home trade, the capital employed in it will give but one half of the encouragement to the industry or *productive labour* of the country.

"But the returns of the foreign trade of consumption are very seldom so quick as those of the home trade. The returns of the home trade generally come in before the end of the year, and sometimes THREE or FOUR times in the year. The returns of the foreign trade of consumption seldom come in before the end of three years. A capital, therefore, employed in the HOME TRADE will sometimes make twelve operations, or be sent out and returned twelve times before a capital employed in the foreign trade of consumption has made one. *If the capitals are equal, therefore, one will give four and twenty times more encouragement and support to the industry of the country than the other.*"

How far a nation adopts these principles of policy when she suffers foreign nations to crush her productive industry, by flooding her with foreign manufactures to the amount of 30, 40, 50, and sometimes $100,000,000 annually, without extending a market to her raw produce, is left for rational calculators to say. The products of agriculture and domestic manufactures must constitute the grand support of internal trade and exchange; and inland trade will flourish in proportion as these products are multiplied and channels for their distribution opened.

The present deplorable state of our fiscal concerns, is too important to be forgotten in this place. The late report of the secretary of the treasury has exploded all the fine-wrought theories of speculative economists, concerning the dependence upon revenue derived from commerce. We have been told that since the institution of the government, *commerce* has paid $350,000,000 into the treasury of the nation while the fact, that not commerce, but the *consumers of foreign products and manufactures*, from the Atlantic to the Mississippi, have paid this sum, has been studiously kept out of sight, and no notice taken of what those consumers, the labourers, the farmers of the country, have paid in war debts, appropriations for foreign missions, for building and supporting a navy, and other heavy disbursements to protect commerce. We have again been informed, that unless we encourage importations of foreign merchandise, to the discouragement of our own industry, that our revenue will fail, and the government be driven to seek for new sources of pecuniary supply; and we have been told this too with as much solemnity as though our coffers were now full and overflowing. But do these politicians who thus oppose the highest interests of the country, pretend still to make us believe that commerce sustains the government in its annual expenditures? Do they vainly imagine that the people of the country are blind & ignorant? What does Mr. Crawford, the secretary of the treasury inform us? He informs us that the net revenue of the present year will fall short of the estimates about $4,500,000, the loans authorised not being included: and, without those loans, short of the expenditures about $10,000,000. He recommends a further loan; but is it not time for the nation to protect its industry, and lay a foundation for a regular and permanent revenue, instead of annually sustaining the public expenses by an increase of public debt?

We conclude this appeal to the American people by noticing the leading objections which have been urged against the protection of the labour of the country.

We shall first advert to the allegation that it is unconstitutional for Congress to legislate for the protection of American against foreign industry. We are told, that the legislature of the nation have no right materially to control the pursuits and occupations of individuals, and to say that this avocation shall be followed, and that another shall not. Now the friends of a system of protection have never contended that Congress has a right to declare, by statute, that no more farms shall be cultivated, that no more ships shall be built, nor any more cloth manufactured:—these are points foreign to the question at issue. The Constitution tells us, that Congress has the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and provide for the general welfare of the Union; and it is surely inconsistent to say, that when the importation of foreign manufactures destroys the prosperity and paralyzes the enterprise and industry of the nation, Congress have no right to adopt a remedy. In such a case, we are not controlling our own, but preventing the interference of foreign industry with the interests of the country. Let us take a case that would be no miracle in this fertile age of wonders. Suppose the allied powers of Europe should convene at Vienna, and agree to wage a settled warfare against American manufactures, and thus retard our advancement to national wealth and power: and also agree to exclude our agricultural produce from every market in Europe. Let us suppose that a system of bounties, premiums, and extravagant privileges, is adopted, and in one year, two hundred millions of foreign fabrics are sent to the United States, sold off by means of the auctions, at a reduced price, and our manufactures crushed thereby in one heap of ruins—how long would it be the duty of the American Congress to cherish constitutional scruples and coolly behold the desolating operation of such a policy? Where then would be the welfare of the Union? Would not Congress have a right to say to the allied powers of Europe, we will not permit one article of your manufactures to enter the United States? Would they not have the power, in such a case, to protect three hundred millions of capital that might be invested in manufacturing establishments in this country? And does not the greater power include the lesser? We do not call upon Congress to regulate and restrain the pursuits of individuals—we ask them to correct the evils flowing from foreign interference. It is somewhat singular, that Congress, for many years past, have granted bounties to promote particular branches of industry, if they have no power to defend the salutary tendency of such bounties, against foreign rivalship and hostility. And it is equally so that neither John Jay, James Madison, nor Alexander Hamilton, whose comments on the Constitution of the United States will control public opinion for ages, never dreamt of the doubts and apprehensions now under consideration. We refer particularly to Gen. Hamilton. He was one of the greatest constitutional lawyers that ever adorned the American forum; and yet, when he drew his celebrated report in favor of protecting domestic manufactures in the manner now demanded, he saw nothing in the Constitution to debar Congress from pursuing the policy which he laid down and vindicated. If there be any in the ranks of our opposers superior to this illustrious statesman, let him come forth.

We are also informed, that every branch of national industry should be left to regulate itself—and that protection and restraints are impolitic and ruinous. If there was but one nation in the world, this doctrine might be sound; but while there are different nations, possessing the same capacities, there will be seperate and conflicting interests, and each nation will watch over its own welfare. Look to England, to France, to Russia, the German states, and to every nation in Europe—open the history of modern policy, and it will be seen that every wise government protects her own industry. Russia, as young as she is in the list of civilized nations, has a tariff that prohibits more than two hundred articles of foreign manufactures to protect her own industry. England prohibits almost every article of agriculture and manufacture. France, although England aided her in putting Louis XVIII on his throne, will not suffer an English commodity of any description to prejudice the prosperity of her own labourers. All Europe presents but one vast system of regulations—restraints—and prohibitions for the protection of domestic industry; and yet when we talk of taking care of our own interests like other nations—*leave things to themselves* is the cry. If the nations of the eastern continent would abolish their tariffs and commercial regulations, this country would follow the example; but prudence, nay, self-preservation forbids, that we should take the lead in so preposterous a course. This doctrine of leaving things to themselves is a new doctrine in this country. We heard nothing of it under the administration of Washington, Adams, and Jefferson. Why have we laid heavy duties on the tonnage of foreign vessels, but to protect American tonnage? Why have we excluded foreign bottoms from our coasting trade? Why, for twenty years, have we protected our fisheries, by bounties? Let Mr. Jefferson's report of 1791 answer the question. He will tell you, that this policy of giving bounties originated in a resolution to protect our fisheries against foreign competition. Upon this principle, why has not commerce been left to herself? Why has more than $8,000,000 been paid into the Mediterranean fund by the consumers of foreign manufactures, but to protect commerce beyond the straits of Gibraltar? Why was war declared, and more than $78,000,000 expended, but to secure future protection to this branch of industry? Let the American people reflect on these facts.

We also hear it daily asserted, that the protection of industry will diminish foreign commerce, and thus destroy our nursery of seamen. When England began to open canals, and encourage inland trade, the same apprehension was expressed. The greatest nursery of American seamen has always been found in the fisheries. It was so in the revolution. Mr. Seybert, in his able work on the statistics of the U. States, has made the following judicious remarks: "Our fisheries constitute the best nursery for that hardy race of citizen seamen, who feel the love of country, and are, therefore, willing and able to maintain its rights; and they are also the sources to which commerce must look for its defenders." (p. 340.) In addition to the fisheries, we must recollect the bold, hardy, and expert seamen which are bread up in the coasting trade. When we look at the extent of the sea coast, from New Orleans to Eastport, and consider the immense trade which will be carried on between these two extremities of the maritime frontier, our apprehensions subside on this subject. Our fisheries, our coasting trade, and the extensive commerce which we shall always have with distant quarters of the globe, will enable us to call forth defenders of the American flag, even if the industry of the nation is duly protected and encouraged.

Another fruitful source of objection to the encouragement of national industry is, the alleged immoral tendency of manufacturing establishments. Whenever this topic is introduced, the condition of England is brought forward. Nothing is said of Holland, Austria, or France. Great Britain is placed before our eyes as the sink of abominations. Yet the example of England has but little bearing on the question in application to this country. She possesses a small territory, crowded population, and, for generations, has been the great workshop of Europe. Her manufacturing establishments unparalleled in extent. Her labouring manufacturers are, to a great extent, destitute of early education, and of moral instruction, and have grown up in the neglect of moral habits. During the fluctuations of the commercial world, for a few years past, this immense population has been driven to many desperate acts, by the pressure of public burdens, the loss of employment, and the sufferings of hunger. But what is proposed in the United States? Not that large manufacturing towns shall spring up on every side, to be filled with starving and degraded thousands, whose perpetual apprehension will be the want of bread;—not that our agricultural population shall be transferred from the soil to cities, that we may furnish surplus manufactures to a great portion of the world; but that we may cherish such establishments, at convenient places, where there are great natural advantages, as will be necessary to supply our own wants, and render our aggregate labour more productive. But why is it necesary that manufacturing establishments should be the abodes of vice and profligacy? Is there any thing in the pursuits of an artificer intrinsically vicious? Surely there is not. If early education is attended to: if early moral habits are inculcated and enforced; if strict and wholesome internal regulations are adopted—the excesses of English manufacturing towns may be avoided. There are now many extensive manufactories in the United States; and we look into them in vain for instances of moral debasement, or for atrocious crimes. Nor do we see, why this fact should not remain the same. The mild and wholesome tendency of our civil institutions—the school establishments of the country—the great abundance of the necessaries of life—the numerous incitements to industry and enterprise—induce us to believe that it would.

It has been again and again asserted, that domestic manufactures are now rapidly increasing in the United States, by means of family industry, and require no further protection. We are, indeed, happy to see thousands of families supplying themselves with articles of necessity by means of their own labour. But they cannot be expected to be successfully engaged in manufactures requiring extensive capital and the application of labour-saving machinery. Will they supply the nation with manufactures of iron, glass, paper, woollen, cotton, and lead? No one can pretend it; and yet these articles are vitally essential to the happiness of the nation, and we are paying tens of millions, annually, to foreign nations, for furnishing us with them. Let the distinction here drawn, be well considered.

By affording further protection to the manufactures of this country, it is thought by many, that smuggling, to an enormous extent, will take place. It is very singular, that this alarming abuse has not been deprecated at an earlier period. On many articles, liable to be smuggled into our ports and harbours, such as teas, spices, wines, and silks, the duties are already sufficiently high to form the inducement; and for the bare protection of domestic manufactures of iron, glass, lead, woolen and cotton, it is not required that they should be higher than an average of the former articles. The temptation is now stronger to smuggle spices, teas, and many other light and expensive commodities, than it would be to smuggle iron, glass, woollen, cotton, and other manufactures, if adequately protected. On this point a false alarm has been sounded, and that, too, by the very persons who vindicate the auction system, which is even more productive of moral turpitude than any smuggling that can be carried on. We are inclined to adopt the opinion, that when the manufactures of iron, glass, lead, paper, cotton and woollen, are prosecuted under the protecting auspices of the general government, with that success which must pertain to our exertions, that these articles will be afforded to the consumer with a cheapness and of a quality that will operate to prevent their illegal introduction into the country from abroad. They will be manufactured in various parts of the country, exchanged for agricultural products, and command the avenues to consumption.

Is there any danger that the merchant of character and respectability, in the United States, will do what is done in Europe by those alone who are destitute of both. The relative situation of the United States, and the states of Europe, are so dissimilar, that what the revenue officers, with their hosts of attendants, could not prevent there, might be effected here with ease, and without a dollar additional expense. In the first place, vessels used for conveying goods from Europe and Asia into the United States, are of the first class; of course they are valuable. In the second place, most of them have goods for from ten to one hundred individuals, and, with the exception of those from India, the owners have, comparatively, but a small interest in the cargo. Is there a shadow of probability, therefore, that the owner of the vessel, and the several owners of the goods, would agree to have her, after crossing the Atlantic, lie off the coast for the purpose of clandestinely introducing her cargo; hazarding their property and jeopardizing their character? In the third place, those embarked in the India trade, we hope, have too high an estimate of character and moral principle, to descend so low; if they have not, the value of property that must necessarily be risked, is a sufficient guarantee on their part. In the fourth place, if there is an apprehension that goods will be smuggled from the vessel, after she has arrived in port, it must be indulged by those only who are unacquinted with our present revenue laws. With vigilant appraisers and other officers, the thing would be impracticable.

In England and France the case is far otherwise. The proximity of their coasts is such, that from three to six hours sail will carry them from one to the other. Consequently, small craft, of little value, and men who have no reputation to lose, embark in it. They may make their returns daily, and as their risk of loss is always small at any one time, people of that character are always to be found engaged in it.

Of the alleged loss of revenue, by adopting a new tariff, we have spoken, and also of the error as to high wages in this country. As to the objection, formerly drawn from the extent of vacant lands in the United States, it wears but a repulsive aspect—when it is recollected, that we have neither foreign nor domestic markets for our surplus produce, and the inducements to cultivate the soil are diminished instead of increased.

In regard to the assertion made by the opposers of the proposed tariff, that its advocates meditated the abolition of the drawback system, we need only say, that nothing of the kind has been, or is, contemplated; nor can the imputation be accounted for upon any principles of fairness or honor. A new tariff can, in no way, injuriously affect the exportation of goods entitled to debenture.

With these views, we appeal to the sound and sober sense of the people. They are called upon to exercise their candor and reflection. They are earnestly solicited to survey the present condition of the country—to examine the causes which have produced it—the ruinous consequences which must inevitably result from pursuing our present policy—and

---

* People employed in agricultural pursuits in England 5,500,000, annual product, £216,217,620

In Manufactures, 3,000,000, annual profits, after deducting the raw materials, £184,230,000

Or $507,688,888 88

Colquhoun's Resources.

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc3923_scm2842-0246.jpg