EDITED BY THOMAS RITCHIE.

THOMAS RITCHIE & JOHN P. HEISS,
PROPRIETORS AND PUBLISHERS.

TERMS.

DAILY,	per year, for one copy		$10 00
"	" "	five copies	40 00
TRI-WEEKLY,	" "	one copy	5 00
" "	" "	five copies	20 00
" "	" "	ten copies	35 00
WEEKLY	" "	one copy	2 00
"	" "	five copies	8 00
"	" "	ten copies	15 00

The name of no person will be entered upon our books unless the payment of the subscription be made in advance.

Distant subscribers may forward us money by letter, the postage on which will be paid by us, and all risk assumed by ourselves in its safe transmission.

The country paper will be published tri-weekly during the sessions of Congress, and semi-weekly during the recess.

Subscribers will be notified some days in advance of the time when their subscriptions will expire.

Subscriptions for a period less than a year will be received on terms proportioned to the above annual rates.

A postmaster's certificate of remittances in payment for subscriptions or advertisements will be a sufficient receipt therefor. The notes of any specie-paying bank will be received.

PRICES FOR ADVERTISING.

Twelve lines, or less, three insertions	$1 00
Every additional insertion	25

Longer advertisements charged in proportion.

A liberal discount made to those who advertise by the year.

The Daily Union.

VOLUME II. "LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION." NUMBER 80.

WASHINGTON CITY, MONDAY NIGHT, AUGUST 3, 1846.

CONGRESSIONAL.

SPEECH OF MR. HARMANSON, OF LOUISIANA.

In the House of Representatives, Wednesday, June 24 1846—On the bill reported from the Committee of Ways and Means, amendatory of the tariff law of 1842.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. HARMANSON spoke as follows:

I enter into this discussion, Mr. Chairman, fully conscious of my incompetency to do it the justice demanded by its vast importance. But representing a constituency who are uncompromising in their opinions on this subject, I should be recreant to every principle of honor and duty did I fail to enter their protest against the perpetuation of a system which they honestly believe will bring ruin to the agricultural, commercial, and maritime interests of our country; a system which, if forced upon us, must end in the subversion of the liberties of the people, when the few will govern the many, and revel in wealth extorted from them by unjust legislation; a system which, if persisted in, ere half a century passes by will reduce the people to a state of degradation, immorality, and abject slavery.

It is to avert this, sir—it is to save my children from so sad an inheritance—that I enter my protest against your deceptive, fraudulent, miscalled protective system, that carries a hypocritical smile on its face, and a lie on its tongue, to allure, deceive, and rob its victim; wherein every argument that cunning, avarice, and ambition can conceive, is unscrupulously used to persuade a confiding people that they are benefited by oppression and robbery.

I shall enter this discussion with a full determination to oppose all legislation for special interest, whether that interest be located at home or abroad. I was not sent here, sir, as a political vulture, to prey upon the interest of any section of the Union, but to demand and accord evenhanded justice—a fair competition—to all, advantages to none.

But before I examine into the merits and demerits of this ruinous system, I would advise the committee, and particularly my opponents, that I do not wish to be understood as impugning their motives. Their motives and my motives must be left to the consciences of each, and to our God. But in exposing what I consider the errors and frauds of the system, I shall not curb my indignation, nor let a false courtesy smooth over its injustice. I shall strip it, as far as I am able, to its nakedness.

The ad valorem principle of this bill, or the principle of laying the duty according to the value of the article imported, is objected to by our opponents, for the reason, as they say, of its aiding the importer to defraud the revenue by false invoices. This objection I look upon as unreasonable and captious. The oath of the importer, the intimate knowledge our own appraisers have of the value of all imported articles, assisted by prices current, and the confiscation of the goods, if detected, are a full guarantee against that risk. I go for the tax according to the value, for the reason that it is honest on its very face; it is just and equal, bearing equally on all our fellow-citizens, rich and poor, as far as is practicable. By this system of taxation—what is still very important in a republican government—we shall all know what amount of taxes we pay.

As to the specific duty our opponents wish to place in its stead, I am utterly opposed to it, as unjust, unequal, and as throwing the whole weight of the government on the poor, instead of the rich—thus reversing every principle of justice. By way of illustration, let us take the article of flannels, which, by your tariff of 1842, is taxed 14 cents per yard, without any regard to its value. The fine article, at $1 per yard, which the wealthy buy, will be taxed 14 cents on every yard. The coarser article, which the poor, from their circumstances, are compelled to buy, if it cost 30 cents a yard, is taxed the same amount. All men must, it appears to me, see the injustice of this. Take, again, the article of silk: your tariff of 1842 taxes it $2 50 per pound. Of the fine gauze silks, it would take (say) twenty yards to make a pound, and should be worth $2 or $3 per yard, and yet it would be taxed but $2 50 for the twenty yards. Take the heavy, substantial article that the people in moderate circumstances wear, and suppose it would take ten yards to make a pound, and is sold at $1 per yard: the tax would be $2 50, the same as that on the twenty yards, which cost double as much. This is a palpably unjust, that I have no hesitation in saying that no man would countenance the principle for a moment, unless he was wholly blinded by party passion and party bias. These are the reasons why I unhesitatingly condemn all specific duties.

Let us now examine, Mr. Chairman, the true question at issue. If I understand it, it is simply this: Who is to furnish this country with manufactured goods?—the agriculturists—comprising three-fourths of the people of this Union, through their agents as it were, the merchants and sailors, by exchanging their flour, cotton, lard, tobacco, rice, bacon, beef, lumber, butter, cheese, mules, horses, and other productions of the farm and forest, for them, with other nations; not only to furnish the farmers, but the army, navy, merchant, mechanic, &c.—or will Congress prohibit this, and allow a few capitalists to do it? This is the true question. Both are contending to do the same thing. The tiller of the soil asks nothing but a fair competition—evenhanded justice; but these chartered capitalists, true to their instincts, have the insolence to come with their money bags to Congress, and demand as a right of the representatives of a free people, that the farmers, merchants, and sailors be prohibited from doing this, and demand a monopoly. It is yet to be seen whether the representatives of the people on this floor are prepared and willing to harness the tillers of the soil to the cars of these monetary Shylocks—whether the agriculturists are to be made, by law, the hewers of wood and drawers of water for these lords of the spinning-jenny.

To show the inevitable ruin of the agricultural, commercial, and maritime interests of our country, if the policy our opponents are pressing on us is carried out, I will place the government precisely in the condition they are striving to force it into. I think I can show to the most skeptical that it would be our country's ruin. Let us adopt their system, and manufacture everything at home, (for this is what every whig politician has persuaded the farmers would be best for their interests,) and I say it would be their certain destruction. Keep this constantly in mind, that all the goods imported into the United States are paid for with your flour, cotton, pork, lard, tobacco, beef, butter, cheese, lumber, horses, mules, corn, rice, and other agricultural productions, and you are furnishing yourselves just as certainly as if you were manufacturing them on your farms. You are indirectly the manufacturers, and this is the very bone of contention.

Now, admit that by our assistance these chartered companies, through the help of this glorious protective policy, supplied the United States, and that nothing was imported. We will take a view of the condition of the planters and farmers, did such a state of things exist. For illustration, I will take the article of cotton. I select this for the reason that the amount made and consumed in the United States is better ascertained than any other article of export. Flour, corn, pork, lard, tobacco, rice, horses, mules, lumber, beef, &c., would share the same fate. We imported into the United States last year ten millions of dollars worth of cotton goods. That would be equal (say) to two hundred thousand bales of cotton. We manufactured in the United States (say) four hundred thousand bales. That would make six hundred thousand bales, being the amount the American people consume or wear out annually. The crop of the United States is two millions and a half of bales. We would then have on hand, deducting the six hundred thousand bales we use, one million nine hundred thousand bales. I now ask our opponents to show us how we are to dispose of this cotton. They tell us that England and France are obliged to have it. That, Mr. Chairman, is a child's argument. *Obliged* to have it, indeed? They must show us that they are *able to buy it*. Now, I would ask these gentlemen, if they were destitute of shirts, and nobody would give them one, and they had nothing that the seller would take in exchange for one, if their saying they were *obliged* to have a shirt would get it for them? So it would be as to England and France being *obliged* to have our cotton. That they would suffer for the want of it, and that that want might possibly revolutionize their governments, I can plainly see; but that they can *pay* for it is another thing. Say that we load our ships with our cotton, pork, flour, &c., send it to England, and ask her if she wants it. She would tell you yes, they were suffering for it; their mills were stopped, and their laborers in a state of starvation and rebellion, and offered you their cotton manufactures, various manufactures of wool, iron in all its varieties, glassware, earthenware, and other manufactures that she has always exchanged for our cotton. You would tell them, No, we had enough at home! You go to France, and you get the same answer. She would offer you her silk, wine, brandy, lace, glass, and other productions she has always exchanged with you. Our answer would be the same, that we had enough at home! It is the duty of our opponents to show us how we are to dispose of this cotton. If they cannot do it in so clear and satisfactory a manner that every good common-sense mind can see that it is practicable—if it does not prove conclusively the utter absurdity and humbug of your policy, it at least must prove to every prudent mind that it would be too hazardous to adopt. It would, to say the least of it, be giving up a certainty for an uncertainty.

What shall we do with this cotton, flour, pork, &c., is the question. Possibly, as you are so hard pressed, you may venture to say, we will take gold and silver for it. I would have no objection, if it were practicable; but I know that to be impossible. I will, however, expose this fallacy. I hold it to be an established principle of commerce, that all trade between all nations is an exchange of productions. That gold and silver is, and can only be, used to pay small balances, unless by such nations as have mines of gold and silver, that they make annually, as we do our cotton and flour, and which is their annual crop, to exchange for what they desire, as we now exchange our crops for what we need. But this cannot be the case with England and France, for neither have mines of gold and silver. Their crop is their manufactures. They have just enough specie to facilitate the exchange of productions. Let us say she paid us in specie. England has about two hundred millions of gold and silver currency; France has somewhat more, having no small paper money. We sell to England (say) fifty millions of our cotton, pork, flour, &c., and we receive specie in payment. That would reduce her circulation to one hundred and fifty millions, or 25 per cent. We take them the next crop, and what price would we get for it? It is admitted on all hands that the amount of currency regulates the price. It would be fair to presume that we would lose 25 per cent. in the crop. But we will pass that by. Say we got another fifty millions: with the next two crops we should have all. From this time to eternity, I suppose our whig friends think we should not want a market! So much for the absurdity of taking specie in exchange. The most stupid minds must see its utter impracticability. I admit, as far as we trade with Mexico, we might take gold and silver. Say for two or three millions we could receive pay in specie, for that is the crop she makes annually, to exchange for what she desires. So with Russia, and some few South Americans, and for tea and coffee; but all would not amount even to the surplus flour we export. But to give this idea of receiving specie in payment: I have the best whig authority for saying that thirty millions is the entire amount of gold and silver annually made throughout the world—just one-third the amount of our exportation; and if we got all, could sell but one-third of our surplus. What shall we do with this cotton? You will admit the planters cannot give it away. Perhaps, in your desperation, as a dernier resort, you will tell us that we will manufacture it. That can be done easy enough; but it would only make the thing worse. Instead of our having one hundred millions surplus, it would increase to two or three hundred millions, and there would be the same difficulty. What are we to do with it? You cannot sell it; there is nothing you can take in exchange. Other nations would suffer for its want, but we are not able to buy it. And can any man be so senseless as to suppose that these chartered companies would buy a pound of our cotton unless they can sell the goods after they are manufactured? No; not one pound would be sold.

I contend that no nation can be at the same time a generally manufacturing, a generally agricultural, and a great commercial nation. It is impossible. The commerce of a nation depends on the absence of one or the other. A nation may manufacture a few leading articles, produce a few leading articles, and be a great commercial nation, by having a wide list of exchange; but that is impossible with us. We have a climate and soil that produces in the highest perfection almost every agricultural production that is made between the tropics and the frigid zone; and many articles the world desires and would take, to almost an incalculable amount, if we would take their manufactures in exchange. It appears to me to be clear, that the moment we succeed in forcing ourselves to manufacture everything at home, the Carolinas, Georgia, the uplands of Alabama, Mississippi, Texas, and Louisiana, Arkansas and Tennessee, will have to abandon the culture of cotton. The lowlands of Mississippi and Louisiana would produce a million bales of cotton, which would be as much as we could consume and dispose of, for our tea, coffee, and other articles we cannot make. Those States would, from necessity, raise flour, corn, pork, beef, lard, horses and mules, butter, cheese, &c.; the very articles they now purchase by millions from the eastern and western States. I would ask, in all seriousness, what would then be the condition of those States that now find a market at the South for those articles? They would find them competitors instead of consumers. Their ruin, it appears to me, would be inevitable.

We may be told, however, that we shall make no surplus, as labor will have been taken from agriculture to manufactures, and the operatives will have become consumers instead of producers. Let us examine this, and see whether it be true or not.

It will be acknowledged if we import and export nothing, that our fifteen thousand vessels will be destroyed. It will throw one hundred and eighty thousand sailors, all the timber-getters, shipbuilders, riggers, caulkers, joiners, sailmakers, ropemakers, tar-getters, hemp-growers, importers and exporters, and those connected with those interests, out of employment. Now, to settle this question, I would ask if those whose employment you have broken up would be a sufficient force to do the manufacturing? Yes, they would be more than enough. This I can prove beyond cavil or doubt, by the facts furnished by the protectionists themselves. I will read from this pamphlet, entitled "The Tariff: a Tract for the Times: by a Citizen of Virginia," prepared by the order of the Hon. Willis Green, chairman of the Executive Committee of whig members of Congress. This document was franked by the Hon. Alexander Barrow, now whig senator from Louisiana. I call the attention of the farmer to this, as his weal or wo depends on the settlement of this question. This is what this whig document states. It says:

"Great Britain with a population of twenty-four millions, employs in her manufactories five hundred thousand operatives, who, by the aid of machinery, exert the power and perform the work of one hundred million of men laboring with their own unaided efforts. This power is considered sufficient to supply manufactures for the whole world. But the condition of the operatives is that of the veriest slaves on the face of the earth; they labor sixteen hours a day, for eight or ten cents, and at night lie down on a straw bed or dirt floor."

Now I would ask our good whig friends, who cry out so loudly about their home market, and are so expert at figuring, particularly for the benefit of the honest whig farmer, who has been deceived into a belief that it really enlarged his market by manufacturing everything at home, if it takes five hundred thousand half-starved Englishmen to manufacture enough for the whole world, how many full-fed Americans will it take to manufacture for the United States? The result will settle the question about the home market. It is all a cheat, a humbug, a lie, got up by these capitalists and chartered companies, to deceive and dupe their fellow-citizens, that they may fleece them.

To expose this insidious policy, and the cunning of these men, let us take the article of salt. Say that the farmers of our country were exchanging ten millions worth of their flour, pork, lard, lumber, beef, butter, cheese, tobacco, cotton, rice, &c., with Turk's Island for ten millions worth of salt of the best and cheapest that can be made in the world; say that year after year the farmer's productions were exchanged for this salt, to furnish the United States, employing some five hundred vessels and thirty thousand sailors, and others connected with that interest. Let us say that a few capitalists should apply to Congress and require that it should prohibit the farmers, merchants, and sailors from doing it; but to protect American industry, let them do it. Do not, says the cunning capitalists, tell the farmers outright that they shall not do it, for they would then understand the game; but put on a high duty, calling it protection to home industry. Congress, in its wisdom, puts on a high tariff, and gradually the sharpers undermine the farmers, and finally furnish all the salt of an inferior quality, at a higher price. The farmer has lost his market for ten millions worth of his productions; he has a surplus, prices fall, he sees that he has been robbed, and his trade broken down, and all under the pretence of protecting home industry! He complains, and the capitalist tells him of his great home market, and that he has given the people labor. He has taken labor from agriculture to making salt, who are now consumers instead of producers!

Then come up the protection and free-trade policy. The free-traders contend that the farmers, while they furnished the salt by exchange of their flour, pork, lard, butter, cheese, lumber, horses, mules, corn, &c., were indirectly the manufacturers as much so as if they had manufactured it on their own farms; and that the government's inteference was unjust—it had ruined them to benefit the capitalist. He is answered that it has been an advantage to them—it has taken labor from agriculture—has lessened the quantity raised—and that they furnish them a home market; which is a vile fraud! They have only displaced labor, by destroying the five hundred vessels, and throwing out of employment the thirty thousand sailors, shipbuilders, lumber-getters, and hundreds of others connected with that business, who would be sufficient to make all the salt. I have taken the article of salt for the reason that it gave the protectionists the best possible case, as it required more human labor to make the salt. Those whose productions are made by machinery are in an infinitely worse condition; for when they take one man to manufacturing with machinery, they throw out of employment two from commercial and maritime pursuits.

The protectionist tells us, that the half of every bushel of salt is of agricultural production. They consumed the same amount while they were in the shipping interest. But, for the sake of argument, admit it to be a fact that half is agricultural: does not this prove conclusively the fraud and humbuggery of your home market? For the veriest simpleton can see, that while the farmer furnished it from Turk's Island by exchange, it was all agricultural. That is precisely the ground of our complaint—that when you make it, it is but half agricultural.

The chamber of commerce, of New Orleans, Mr. Chairman, has done me the honor to send me a pamphlet, which is an answer to a call from the Secretary of the Treasury, (and I take pleasure in now stating my belief that the Treasury Department has never been under the direction of an abler head,) eulogizing and endorsing an able article from the pen of E. J. Forstall, esq., a distinguished merchant and sugar-planter of Louisiana, on the sugar interest. I have examined it with much care, and have come to an opposite conclusion from those distinguished gentlemen. It has convinced me that the two and a half cents duty under the act of 1842 is a sham, a cheat; that the real duty has been less than half a cent per pound. It proves more: that even with half a cent duty it is the most flourishing agricultural business in the world. And still more: that no country is better adapted to the culture of sugar than Louisiana, and that it has met competition and overcome it, having had the last three years really less than 30 per cent. duty. I will read from this pamphlet, for the benefit of the committee, the facts and opinions of Mr. E. J. Forstall, endorsed by the chamber of commerce of New Orleans, which produced this conviction on my mind. Mr. Forstall says:

"It has often been asserted that the culture of the cane was not congenial to Louisiana. This is altogether an error. Our crops are fully as regular as in any part of the West Indies. If we have to contend against early winters, the droughts so common in those islands are equally fatal to the cane. On an average, the Cuba planter produces six hogsheads of sugar to each working hand. There is not a well-managed plantation in Louisiana that does not yield, on an average, an equal number of hogsheads to each hand. The great advantage of the Cuba over the Louisiana planter is not, as generally believed, in the climate, but in the difference of value of his hands, and of expenses to support them. In Louisiana a good field hand is worth one thousand dollars, and is provided with two meals of beef or pork per day throughout the year, besides corn, whiskey, tobacco, and two suits of clothes per annum, the cost of all of which is about seventy-five dollars on a well-regulated plantation. In Cuba, a good field hand only costs four hundred dollars, requires little or no clothing, and lives chiefly on roots and bananas, which are of a spontaneous growth. And this is the reason why sugar cannot be produced in Louisiana below five cents, whilst four cents is said to be about the cost of production in Cuba. Indeed, it cannot be denied that the reduction in the duty on foreign sugars has been a bounty to slave traders. Let the slave trade be effectually put down, and then Louisiana sugars will require little or no protection; but until then, it is needed; and, whether considered in a national point of view, or as a matter of sheer justice to Louisiana, it cannot be refused without gross injustice."

It is seen here that the only disadvantage the Louisiana planter labors under is the great cost of his hands, which no longer exists, as good hands can now be purchased at $1,000 to $1,200 per pair. The only advantage that the Cuba planter has, is one hundred dollars in the cost of hands, and the lighter expenses in clothing and feeding them; which, I think, is more than overbalanced by the Louisiana planter being in the market, and saving insurance and freight. Mr. Forstall states:

"The average yield of estates, working to their full power, may be assumed to be per slave five hogsheads of sugar and two hundred and fifty gallons of molasses, which would give the following result:

5,000 lbs sugar, at 4 cts.	$200 00
250 gallons molasses, at 15 cts.	37 50
	$237 50
Deduct expenses as before	75 00
Product per slave	$162 50

"Which shows that, on a well-conducted sugar estate, with means, on the part of its owner, to work it to advantage, four cents for sugar is as good a return per slave as ten cents for cotton."

It will be seen that Mr. Forstall, in estimating the value of labor per hand, has taken four cents as the cost, he says, of the production in Cuba, and makes the nett yield $162 50. I will now, by the way of comparison, estimate the value of labor per hand on a cotton plantation. I will take five bales as the average crop per hand. I know it will be thought by the gentlemen from the Carolinas, Alabama, Tennessee, and Georgia, that this is too high an average; but with this large average, it will be seen that it is the cotton planter that requires protection.

Say per hand five bales cotton, at 6¼ cents per pound	$125
Expenses per hand	30
Product per hand	95

So it is seen that the sugar planter makes $162 50 per hand, and the cotton planter $95. Which wants protection, I ask? If you wish to protect the sugar planter, put on a high tariff to prohibit the importation of sugar; and the very reverse, if you wish to protect the cotton planter: open new markets to sell his cotton. It is said that it is an advantage to the cotton planter, as it draws labor from cotton. It is true; and if sugar was the only thing protected, it would be some advantage. But whilst this benefits him one dollar, you are applying this principle to all manufactures, cutting off his exchanges, and injuring him ten dollars.

Now to the proof that the 2½ cents on the statute book is all a cheat, a lie, to dupe the sugar planter. The Chamber of Commerce of New Orleans says:

"Before quitting the subject of sugar, the committee would refer to the fact, how greatly the nominal protection afforded to it is neutralized, and the public revenue injured, by the provisions of the present tariff as connected with the article of molasses.

"The official returns show that 22,000,000 of gallons were imported into the United States in the year 1843-'44. Of this, about 17,000,000 of gallons were from Cuba, where the whole produce of real molasses, which consists of the drainings of moscovado sugar, of which comparatively a small quantity is made on the island, does not exceed 500,000 gallons, and the balance must have been the sirup arising from the operation of making their white and brown clayed sugar, composing the great bulk of their crop, which sirup is not known in Cuba by the name of molasses, but which is shipped as such in these immense quantities to the United States, and introduced under the molasses duty of 4½ cents per 100 pounds. This article, on its first boiling, will yield 50 per cent. of good sugar, and the residue molasses, from which more sugar can be obtained by a second process. Since the tariff of 1842, large establishments have been created at the north for the purpose of thus extracting sugar; and at an estimated yield of only 50 per cent., it will be seen that 125,000,000 of pounds, or 125,000 hogsheads of foreign sugars are thus annually introduced at a duty of less than one-half cent per pound, to the great injury of the sugar interest, and at a loss of nearly three millions of dollars to the revenue."

From this it is clear that the planters of Louisiana have been amused by their loving whig friends, with the idea of having the protection of 2½ cents per pound, while in reality they have less than that proposed by this bill. It has had the happy effect, however, to convince them that they do not require protection, but can compete with the world, and will now be ready to join the other great agricultural interests of the country, to carry out the great principles of free trade. But had it been otherwise, that the sugar planter could not have competed with other countries, I never could have agreed to the principle of taxing the balance of the Union for their special benefit; nor will I now agree to tax them for the benefit of any other section of this Union. I contend the government has no right, nor would it be expedient, to interfere in the conflicts of interest between its citizens. I am now planting seed cane, and expect in two or three years to make sugar. And should I do it, I hope never to be so much a slave to interest as to demand that the government tax my neighbors for my special benefit.

There is one great advantage the sugar interest of the United States possesses that is not fully appreciated; it is the suppression of the slave trade. Our fleet on the African coast will be of more advantage to the sugar interest than all the tariffs we have ever had. It will be permanent and real. It prevents the African slave labor from being applied to its culture, and it is impossible for free labor to compete with the well-organized labor of the Louisiana planter. I think the sugar lands and sugar interest in the United States have brighter prospects ahead than any other agricultural interest.

The agriculturists of our country receive about 2½ per cent. interest on the capital invested, whilst these chartered manufacturers declare dividends from 15 to 50 per cent. Their insatiable avarice still crying aloud for protection: ask them against whom, they will tell you the pauper labor of Europe. It is false, and they know it to be false. It is to be protected against the tillers of the soil. It is that he knows that they can furnish the market by exchange cheaper than they can; and they have the audacity to call on the government to prohibit them from doing it. They charge us with being opposed to the manufacturing interest. It is wholly untrue. I have no hostility to any legitimate interest of my country. I go in to protect American industry—not your protection of American industry, however, such as the wolf gave the lamb; but to protect the great agricultural, commercial, and maritime interests of my country from your mastery and robbery. Nothing will satisfy the avarice and ambition of these haughty capitalists but a public acknowledgment that we are their willing slaves. If we give a duty of 10 per cent., have they not 10 per cent. advantage over us in furnishing the market? —if 20 per cent., have they not 20? It is now proposed by this bill to give them from $25 to $30 on every hundred advantage over us. This even does not satisfy their cupidity. Let them learn wisdom ere it is too late. Let the fate of the protectionists of England warn them.

We are indebted, Mr. Chairman, to the honorable gentleman from New York, [Mr. COLLIN,] for an exposé of the condition of the iron interest. He here proves, beyond cavil or doubt—taking the census returns of the amount of capital invested, the number of tons of iron made, its value, the number of hands employed, allowing each $400, making a liberal deduction for other expenses—that the capitalist made 60 per cent. interest on his capital invested. He proved more than this: he took the price of iron in the English market, allowing five dollars per ton for freight, insurance, &c., and proved conclusively, that if the capitalist had sold his iron to his countrymen as low as the English iron could be brought here, adding five dollars per ton, he would then have made, after paying each hand $400, and full allowance for other expenses, 30 per cent. on the capital he had invested. Notwithstanding this, I regret to say we find gentleman from Pennsylvania, calling themselves friends of equal rights, abandoning their ancient friends who have stood shoulder to shoulder with them in many a glorious battle-field; and at this late hour, when victory is about perching again on the Republican banner, with deep mortification and regret do we behold them in the ranks of federalism, with their battle-cry of plunder. Let me entreat you to stay the fratricidal blow; ponder well before you take the irremediable leap. We are told that the interest of Pennsylvania demands it. Are the sacred principles of truth and justice to succumb to the fleeting monetary interests of the hour? Are truth, justice, and equal rights to be trampled under foot to satisfy the insatiable avarice of a few Shylocks? No, sir. Let our friends join us in wresting from these bold men the chartered privilege of pillaging their fellow-citizens; return to the old Keystone State, unfurl the banner of free trade, and show the tillers of the soil it was for their freedom and interest they fought. Go to the merchants and sailors, and offer them commercial emancipation; go to the manufacturers and tell them you have dared to tear from the statute-book their license to plunder. Tell the day-laborers to hie to the west, with wife and children, build their log-cabin, whose roof may shelter a freeman's head; and my life for it, old Pennsylvania will do, as she has always nobly done, her full duty. It is whispered that they may lose their seats on this floor. Even suppose they did, which I do not believe, I ask if they could die in a nobler cause? As to myself, I should prefer that doom a thousand times to a seat on this floor, with a consciousness that I was doing what I knew to be wrong.

Mr. Chairman, we are told by our opponents that our foreign commerce is as nothing compared to the internal commerce of the country, and they claim that the internal commerce is the legitimate fruit of their policy. This I deny, and think that I can prove to the most skeptical mind that their policy, if carried out, leads to its certain destruction. If their policy is right as to the United States, why not apply to the different States, to make everything at home? If applicable to the States, why not to each county? If to each county, why not carry it out, and make every man a jack-of-all-trades? Where, then would be the internal trade? It would be annihilated. Is it not clear, as you approach the principle of making everything at home, you diminish the internal commerce to the same extent?

Our internal commerce entirely depends on the foreign commerce of the country. They are inseparably connected; they live or die together. Strike off your foreign trade, and what would become of the producers of the fifteen millions of tobacco we now make more than the American people can consume? What will become of the wheat, pork, lard, beef, corn, butter, cheese, horses, mules, lumber producing States, that now make millions more than the whole people of the United States can consume, even with the great cotton States as consumers, and when your policy forces the cotton States to the abandonment of its culture, and necessity must force them to make the same productions that they now purchase from the west? I would ask, in all seriousness, where is your internal commerce; where are the thousand steamboats that now ply the mighty rivers of the west? Would they then be freighted, as they now are, with flour, corn, beef, bacon, horses, mules, &c., to furnish the south? No, sir; your protective policy—your making-everything-at-home policy—has forced them into opposition to nature, to be producers, instead of consumers of these articles. What becomes of the great canals and railroads of Pennsylvania and New York, that are now bearing the teeming productions of the west, to scatter them to the four quarters of the globe, to exchange for the very articles that these protectionists say we ought to make at home? That is, the government must not let farmers furnish the market by exchange, but prohibit it, and let a few chartered companies do it! I will tell those cunning men that it is now made at home just as certainly as if it was made on their farms; and I repeat again, the contest is, who is to furnish the market, the tillers of the soil by exchange, or a few chartered companies. We have the same right to demand that government prohibit the chartered companies from furnishing the market, for the reason that it conflicts with our interest, as they have to demand that Congress prohibit us, because it conflicts with their interest. But neither has the right to ask more than a fair competition. We now import into the United States four million dollars worth of sugar, and, I ask, who furnishes this sugar? It is the lumber of Maine and the Carolinas, the corn, flour, pork, lard, beef, mules, and horses from the farming States, and giving employment to thousands of ship-carpenters, sailors, and others, connected with that business; and why shall they be prohibited from doing it? I can see no reason, in common justice or sound policy. But on the contrary, it would be breaking down one set of our citizens for the benefit of another. Carry out your policy of destroying the foreign commerce of the country, and what becomes of New York, now the centre of our commercial system? What of Philadelphia? What of New Orleans—a mart that nature has pointed out, and will be, if the great natural interests of the country are unshackled, the mightiest city in the civilized world? But a half a century will not pass by, if your prohibitory system is persisted in, before their wharves will have rotted down, beggary will infest, and grass grow in their streets. Such will be the fate of all those cities.

In pointing to the list of free articles of the tariff of 1842, and demanding to know the reason why one set of articles have a duty, varying from 59 to 200 per cent., and another set free of duty, our opponents tell us that they made them free, because it would be unjust and oppressive to the poor, and detrimental to the general interests of the country to tax those articles. In the very next breath they tell us that their object in the high duties is to draw capital to those points, to enable us to make them at home; and so soon as accomplished, must, from necessity, throw the whole weight upon the government, on the articles they now make free, and which they acknowledge it would be so oppressive to the poor, and destructive to the general interests of the country to tax.

They also charge us with being in favor of direct taxation. They denounce the system as iniquitous, odious, and tending to revolution. They say that every whig is opposed to it. I am not one of those who believe it to be unjust, iniquitous, odious, or that it would destroy my country. But if I did believe it, as our opponents profess to believe, and should advocate a policy that I clearly saw would lead to so direful a result, my conscience would tell me that I was a traitor to my country, to humanity, and my God. And let me entreat our opponents to stay their course, for their policy will produce that result as certainly as that there is a God. Make everything at home, and you have done it; nay, make the articles you are protecting for the very purpose of enabling us to make them at home, and you have done it. What would be thought of a pilot who would warn the passengers that a mighty gulf was in the seas, that to enter it was certain destruction, and charged the pilot who was then navigating the ship with the intention of running into it? The pilot at the helm is interrogated by the affrighted passengers; he tells them that he does not believe in such a gulf; but if such a gulf did exist, the course he was steering would avoid it; the passengers were urged not to trust him; whilst they slept he would ingulf them; but to give him the helm and they would be safe. He was asked the direction he would steer if they gave him the helm; he pointed out the direction, and all saw if such a gulf existed, and he had the helm, their destruction was inevitable! Would they be wise to give it to him? No, sir; for he would have proved to them one of two things: that he was ignorant, or wished to destroy them: either would be sufficient to condemn him.

Yet these men boast loudly of their statesmanship. I readily accord them the highest order of intellect. But, Mr. Chairman, a man to be entitled to the proud name of statesman, in my opinion, must not only have intellect and intelligence enough to understand the effect and bearing of these great measures, but he must have honesty with it. He must point out to his fellow-citizens fairly and fearlessly the effect and intention of his measures, so as to enable his countrymen to cast an honest and intelligent vote; and he who suppresses the truth, or advances arguments he knows to be false, instead of deserving the proud name of statesman, should be stigmatized as a contemptible demagogue, who would deceive and dupe his fellow-citizens, that he might carry out his scheme of avarice and ambition. When I look at the condition that the American women must be placed in which a heartless policy would draw to these mills—thousands working by the day, with no other security from starvation and misery but the slender dependence on the interest of heartless speculators, who can and will starve them at any moment, if interest or ambition commands—I cannot contemplate it without the deepest solicitude. I look on it as counteracting the designs of our God. Your law of protection is a law of celibacy. It crushes the fairest hopes of youthful life, and deprives old age of its solace: they cannot marry. Its fruits, the highest blessings of matrimony, in their condition, would be a curse and dread, and must by shunned. Starvation or the poor-house would be the certain penalty of violating your law of celibacy. The young man cannot marry, for, instead of getting a helpmate, he would have an insupportable clog around his neck. And can it be supposed the women could trudge at those mills from morning till night, with their infants clinging to their breasts? Can it be thought that these chartered companies would stop their spindles until the mother could appease the hunger of her child? No, sir; the cries of a thousand infants could not stay for a moment their tireless machinery. Their fate indeed would be a gloomy one.

If happiness, virtue, and freedom are the true ends of government, can our opponents attain it by driving our people to manufacturing? I would ask if it is wise or humane to drive people to so uncertain employment, who, by the force of population, ere a half century passes by, will be reduced to unspeakable degradation and misery. I ask, whose children are they whom you would doom to this slavery? Are they the children of the proud owners of the mills? No, sir; they are the farmers' and mechanics' children you would invite to this servitude. It is a deep-laid scheme to enslave them, to carry out your purposes of avarice and ambition. You say you give them labor. It is true. But the complaint is, you give them too much labor, and too little for it. Heaven knows you give them labor enough! From the gray of the morn till twilight they are trudging at these mills, with but a short half-hour to gulp down their hasty meals.

Our policy is exactly the reverse. It is to draw them to the public lands—the happiest condition of life. Take one hundred couple, and place them to manufacturing by the day; take a hundred and send them to the public lands. Let twenty years pass by, and then visit the children you had placed under the kind guardianship of these manufacturers. Hunt them up in the garrets and cellers; go to the poor-house, you will find some there; go to the penitentiary, you will there find some of your once noble-hearted children driven to excesses by starvation. Search in the streets for your beggar grandchildren, who never had a home; go to the orphan asylum, and search out those who are too small to beg: see the haggardness and degradation of your once happy and free children! Turn and visit those who have been led by a more humane policy to the flowery prairies of the west. Go to their log-cabins, see the health and happiness around; sit down to their loaded board, the fruits of the sweat of a freeman's brow, and how freely given! Look at your grandchildren, reared to industry and educated to understand their country's honor and interest, who will ever be ready to protect them with a freeman's heart and firm arm, and who can say this is my mother and father's house—this is my home!

They tell us they furnish capital, and give the people labor. That is true. It is also true, that from the fruits of that labor they take the lion's share. So do we furnish capital in land, and they have the whole fruits of their labor. There is the difference.

Let us look at the condition of the agricultural interest, not yielding over 2½ per cent. on the capital; whilst the manufacturing is averaging 25 per cent. It is yet to be said for the first time in my presence, that the intention of your tariff of 1842 was to enable the capitalist to make a higher interest on his money; but, on the contrary, the pretence has always been, it was intended to raise the price of labor. Five per cent., all must acknowledge, would be a fair remuneration for the capital invested. But they have made, by the influence of this law, an average of 25 per cent. Is it not perfectly clear that one of two things is certain—that they have not paid their workmen enough, or they have charged the people too high for their goods? If they did not charge the people too much for their manufactures, it is perfectly clear that the laborers should have had the residue over a fair interest, else it is all humbug and deception that the tariff was intended to benefit labor. Its intention and effect has been to benefit capital at the expense of labor. And when this pillage is pointed out so clearly that he that runs may read, they charge you with demagoguism—of a desire to excite the poor against the rich. No doubt, sir, it would be much more grateful to the feelings of these men did we connive at this plundering, and hide it from the gaze of an injured people. I do denounce it, for the purpose of exciting them to repel and resent this injustice. I do denounce it, for the purpose of exciting every honest mind, both rich and poor, to stay this career of plunder; and if that is a crime, I glory in being a criminal.

You tell us you buy our cotton, flour, pork, butter, cheese, &c. That is true. Ask the little Prince of Wales why the starving people of England are taxed a million of dollars for his benefit. Will he not give the same answer? Would he not say to the farmer, Do I not buy your horses, and your corn to feed them with, your provisions to feed myself, servants, and dogs? Would he not say, Do I not hire your children to wait on me, wash my feet, curry my horses, and feed my hounds? This would all be true. But it is equally true that you buy both with the money you have filched from the pockets of the people by unjust legislation.

We have achieved our personal freedom, and we have religious freedom. We have but one more step to take to perfect our republican system: that is, to give us freedom of property. That is the contest now. Free trade is nothing more nor less than freedom of property. I make my cotton, flour, pork, corn, &c. And the simple question is this: Shall I use my cotton, flour, pork, beef, &c. as I think most conducive to the interest and welfare of my family? Your protective system says no, you shall not do it; if you do, these manufactures will be injured. Then I say, I am not master of the fruits of my own labor, but the manufacturer is, so far as to prevent my using it in any way that will be detrimental to his interest. This is the question to be settled. These arrogant vampires have the insulting impudence to tell the tillers of the soil of this free country that they shall not dispose of the fruits of their labor, if doing so conflicts with their interest. It does appear to me that these men think that the farmers and mechanics of this country are only fit to be their bondmen, and their wives breeders of slaves for their especial benefit.

It is full time that the producers of this republic should look to their freedom. It is full time that they rise to the true dignity of their calling, and teach these bloated lords of the spinning jenny that they know their rights and interests, and at all hazards, will maintain them.

To say other nations shall not sell their manufactures to us, is to say we shall not sell our flour, corn, cotton, beef, tobacco, lard, rice, horses, mules, and lumber, to them. To say that we shall not sell to them is tantamount to passing a positive law prohibiting our raising those articles; for every simpleton must know that we cannot raise them unless we can sell them. That is the question we are called on to decide. The capitalist says you shall not. It is left with the American people to say whether we are their willing slaves or freemen.

Thousands of good honest whigs, who are as true to their country, as true to the great principles of republicanism, as any man in the democratic ranks, have been led to the advocacy of this protective system from the highest feeling of patriotism, conscientiously believing that it would add to their country's glory, wealth, power, and independence. They are cheated, vilely cheated into this belief, by the most subtle sophistries, the most specious deceptions, the most daring frauds that the keenest intellects could forge, stimulated by insatiate avarice and ambition.

They tell you that they give you a home market. You see it is untrue; that it destroys your market. They tell you they give your children labor; you know it draws them to the most uncertain employment, where they may be starved at any moment, and in the end must be wretched. They tell you that, by giving them a monopoly, they will sell goods to you cheaper. You know this to be false; and, if true, that they have ruined you, and deprived you of the ability of buying. They tell you they have drawn capital from agriculture to manufactures, and benefited the farmer, which is wholly a mistake. It has prevented its going to the very points that would have been most in unison with the agricultural interest. If it had not been misdirected by legislation to manufacturing, it would have been used for building railroads and canals, to assist the farmers of the country to send their productions to the great marts of our country. They tell you it makes us independent and free, when it annihilates our shipping interest—our right arm of national defence—and makes bondmen of the tillers of the soil.

We cannot be a great manufacturing, agricultural, and commercial country. That is impossible. We cannot be all three. Commerce depends on the absence of one or the other. Hence it is that England is the greatest commercial nation in the world. She scatters her manufactures over the world, and brings back agricultural products. This has given her the control of the seas, and by its power has placed the fate of nations at her disposal. Suffering humanity can attest how hard that fate has been. We are the next great commercial nation of the earth. We scatter our agricultural productions to the four quarters of the globe, and bring back manufactures as cheap as they can be made. God has given us a climate congenial to the highest perfection of man, and a soil that no quarter of the habitable globe can equal; productions of the finest quality, and of a kind that the whole world desire, and who would take to an almost illimitable amount, if they had the ability. That ability entirely depends on whether we will take their productions in exchange. If we take them, we will give incalculable comforts to our fellow-man; and they will give us, in return, all the varied manufactures of the earth, of the best quality, and at as low a price as skill and competition can produce them. This is the question to be decided. Momentous results for the weal or wo of mankind depend on our decision. And can it be supposed, for a moment, at this advanced stage of civilization, that prejudice, avarice, and ambition, will be permitted to break down the great natural interests and power of our country, to stay its advancement to that wealth, power, and glory, the contemplation of which expands the heart of the American patriot? Never, sir. Never can America be so false to herself and her God. Carry out your hateful, blighting, miscalled American system, and what have you done? You have destroyed the agricultural and maritime interests of your country. We will have been false to ourselves and traitors to humanity. As to the political power we would have over the world, to guide the advancing civilization of the age, we will have sunk into nothingness—a disgrace to our lineage—and will be recollected by posterity only to be despised.

Such cannot be the miserable fate of the race that sprung from the loins of the fathers of the revolution. No, sir; we will be true to our sires. The rich legacy they have left us of personal freedom and religious liberty, we will hand down to our children unimpaired. We will do more: add to it the freedom of property. We will carry out the great principles of free trade; we will take that position among the nations of the earth that nature intended; we will freight our thousands of ships to every quarter of the habitable globe, carrying peace and comfort to every man's door; a Bible to teach him the true doctrines of Christianity; our declaration of rights, that he may know his own, and learn to respect those of others. And ere half a century passes by the stars and stripes will float in every part of the habitable world. No longer will it be sung that Britannia rules the waves. Her day will have passed; her power will have gone into other hands. It will be our proud boast that America rules the waves. The fate of nations will be in her hands. She will control the advancing civilization of the age—be the freeman's love and tyrant's dread. All those barriers that prejudice and despotism have built up to make man the enemy of man will be broken down. The principle of war, hate, and a thirst of power to oppress and rob our fellow-man, will have run its reckless and bloody career. The American principle—the American idea—will control the actions of mankind. Equal rights, personal freedom, religious liberty, freedom of property, peace and good will to all mankind will be the legitimate fruits of the policy we propose.

By Wm. Marshall, Auctioneer.

CARRIAGES and harness at auction.—On Thursday afternoon, 6th August, a 5½ o'clock, I shall sell, in front of my store, a very handsome lot of carriages, harness, &c.—viz:

Buggies with and without top.
Rockaways with standing and falling tops, for two and four persons.
Close square carriages, for four and six persons.
Close Rockaways, for six persons.
Clarence carriages.
Very light square carryall.
Also, several second-hand carriages.
Double and single harness, saddles, bridles, &c.

WM. MARSHALL,
August 1—dts Auctioneer.

By William Marshall, Auctioneer.

CLOSING out sale of carriages and harness.—On Tuesday afternoon, 11th August, at 5½ o'clock, I shall sell, in front of my store, a very large and handsome assortment of carriages, to close consignments, among which are,

Close rockaway and clarence carriages.
Square carriages, for six persons.
Rockaways, with standing and falling tops, for two and four persons.
Buggies, with and without tops.
Light square carryalls, with several second-hand carriages.
Single and double harness.

WM. WARSHALL,
August 1—dts Auctioneer.

BOARD IN THE COUNTRY may be had at a pleasant and healthy location on the Columbia turnpike, five miles from the Long Bridge. Horses and carriages can be furnished, if wanted.

July 30— LEWIS BAILEY.

HOBRON John's Tobacco.—McCLERY & CLEMENTS have been established agents for this unequalled tobacco, and have just received a large invoice of it, which they offer at wholesale or retail, on the most liberal terms of the manufacturer, at their drug and chemical store, on Pennsylvania avenue, opposite Fuller's Hotel, Washington.

August 1—2wif

From the New York Journal of Commerce.

THE NEW TARIFF.

We have already shown the oppressive bearing of the system of *minimums* and of *specific duties* upon articles not of uniform value, by compelling the poor, and men in moderate circumstances, to pay much higher duties in proportion to the value of the articles they consume than are paid by the rich. By the usual modes of taxation, all pay in proportion to their property; John Jacob Astor, say $150,000 per annum, and the poor man nothing, for he has no property. But because the poor man has a stomach as well as Mr. Astor, and like him must be clad, and like him must provide for his family; and because he is obliged to content himself with an inferior quality of goods, the minimums and specific duties tax him just as much on that inferior quality as they do Mr. Astor on the best. It is undoubtedly true, that many a man not worth $1,000 in the world, pays more for the support of the national government, than Mr. Astor with his $25,000,000. But this is not the worst of the case. If the poor man only paid taxes to the government, even though out of all proportion compared with the rich man, his patriotism might render it tolerable. But what if he were obliged to pay a large part of it to the rich?—to the manufacturers, who out of his hard earnings, and those of others like him, have made their fortunes in a year, and are living in splendid palaces while he pines in a hovel? What would human nature say to this? Yet it is exactly what is passing before our eyes every day and moment. By subjecting foreign articles to extravagant duties, they are either excluded entirely, or greatly enhanced in price. Both these things together constitute what is called "protection." By enhancing the price of the foreign article, the price of the domestic article with which it comes in competition is also enhanced; and thus, while consumers are paying one dollar to the government, they are paying another dollar, or it may be two, three, or five dollars, to the manufacturers or producers of the competing article. It is not pretended that the price of the domestic article is enhanced in precisely the amount of the duty on the foreign article, for such is not commonly the fact. Various collateral circumstances come in, to modify the result. It is sufficient for our present purpose to say that after an elaborate investigation, with all the helps which his official station gives him, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Walker—a clear-headed, intelligent, and candid man—states that on sixteen articles, which he specifies—viz: iron and the manufactures thereof; the manufactures of tobacco, cotton, wool, and leather; coal, salt, sugar, molasses, paper, cordage, cotton bagging, hats and caps, straw hats, bonnets and braid, and earthen-ware—the annual production of which in the United States is $331,198,859 in value—the enhanced price to consumers in consequence of the tariff of 1842, if equal to the duty on the foreign articles with which these compete, *would be* $119,770,598; and is in fact, according to the best light he can obtain, $75,784,405. This enormous sum, according to Secretary Walker's calculations, is paid to the manufacturers and producers of the said sixteen articles, by their fellow-citizens the consumers, in raising a nett revenue for the government (after deducting $1,304,163 expenses of collection) of only $17,032,289. The process by which the secretary arrives at these astounding results, and many of the details of that process, are contained in his recent report to the Senate, made in compliance with a resolution of that body, and the accompanying tables. The report itself we published on Monday last. One of the principal tables will be found on our first page. The actual addition to the price of the domestic articles, says Mr. Walker, "is based upon prices current and sales, and upon the actual difference in price of the foreign and domestic article in our own markets, arising from the tariff. This is founded upon actual sales at home and abroad, a comparison of the foreign and domestic prices current, including the charges and transportation of articles, together with numerous invoices based upon actual importations and sales, and furnished heretofore by merchants of the highest character. Whenever any difference was presented in comparing these data, the lowest sum has invariably been taken."

Admitting that the secretary's calculations are correct, or anything like correct, can anybody wonder at the prosperity of the manufacturers and ironmen, or at the comparative depression of other interests, especially that greatest of all interests, the agricultural? Taking human nature as it is, and not as it ought to be, can anybody wonder that the classes first mentioned should be reluctant to part with any portion of their $75,000,000 bounty per annum, (or $50,000,000 if this amount is preferred,) and cry ruin, ruin, fire, blood, and murder, if the "deed should be consummated?"

Now bear in mind that a large part of this $75,000,000, or $50,000,000, is paid by men in moderate circumstances, who are scarcely able to make the ends of the year meet, and paid to men (in numerous cases) of splendid fortunes, derived from this long-continued, but half-concealed oppression, and you have the case a little as it presents itself to our own minds.

Is not, then, a law which removes the grinding inequalities of the tariff of 1842, by abolishing minimums and specific duties, and which diminishes the excessive burdens borne by the masses for the benefit of a comparatively small portion of the people, a public blessing? And ought it not to be welcomed by every man, whether a manufacturer or not, who loves justice more than wealth drawn from the pockets of their fellow-citizens without an equivalent? Surely it ought, or our moral perceptions are strangely bewildered.

Complaint has been made that dye-stuffs are raw materials used in manufacturing are subjected to a duty under the new tariff. On examination, we find that almost the whole class of dye-stuffs, except indigo, are assessed at five per cent on their value, and no more. Indigo, the most important of all the dyes, pays ten per cent. duty, while under the tariff of 1842 in paid six cents a pound. Five per cent. duty is little more than nominal; yet we should be quite willing that it were wholly dispensed with in reference to dye-stuffs. It will not amount altogether to $25,000 a year; yet it enables the manufacturers to cry persecution, as if they were ever to pay anything, from their own business, towards the support of the government!

Then, again, it is said the manufacturers are oppressed by an increase of the duty on coarse wool. By the tariff of 1842, wool, costing not exceeding 7 cents a pound at the place whence imported, was charged with only 5 per cent. duty, while wool costing more than 7 cents a pound, was subject to a duty of three cents a pound and 30 per cent. ad valorem. Now the fact is, that under the 5 per cent. duty, immense quantities of wool were imported—about 13,000,000 lbs. in 1845—and it was found that a good deal of it was so fine, (owing to a change in the breed of the flocks,) as to come in competition with our own wool-growers. With this view, no doubt—wool being about the only agricultural article which it is possible to protect—the duty on all wool was fixed in the new tariff at 30 per cent. If the carpet-men are displeased at this, they must settle the question with the farmers. The former are few in number—the latter are hundreds of thousands.

The iron men are favored with a duty of 30 per cent. under the new bill, which, at the present price of iron in Europe, will give them an ample protection. Some decline from the extravagant prices of iron abroad is to be expected; but such is the increase of consumption, for railroads, ships, roofs, and a thousand other things, that the price is likely to continue high for a long time to come. Manufactures of wool not otherwise provided for, are subject to 30 per cent. duty—manufactures of cotton 25 per cent. All this is well.

We hope now that by a separate bill Congress will at once proceed to lay a duty of 20 per cent. upon tea and coffee. We dare say the money will be wanted. There will almost of course be a check upon many articles of import until the 1st of December, in order to enter them at the reduced rate of duty. On the other hand, the duty on some articles, but not the most important ones, is increased. These will be imported more freely before the 1st of December than afterwards.

CHEAP GOODS.—The subscribers will sell any part of their stock of goods at less than cost prices until the 20th August, to reduce their stock.

July 31 D. CLAGETT & CO.

WANTED, by a lady, a situation as a governess in a gentleman's family. She is competent to teach English, French, music, and drawing, needlework, writing, &c. The applicant has had several years' experience in the training up of youth, and can give most satisfactory testimonials as to her abilities, &c. For further particulars please apply to H. R., south side Pennsylvania avenue, near 7th street—at Mrs. Thorp's.

Aug. 1—3t*

NEW BOOKS.—The American Law of Real Property: By Francis Hilliard, 2 vols.
McKenney's Memoirs and Travels, and the Wrongs and Rights of the Indians, 2 vols. in one.
A new supply of—
Simondi's Literature of Europe, 2 vols.
Life of Leo the Tenth: By Roscoe, 2 vols.
Memoirs of Count Grammont, and Charles the 2d.
Robt. Hall's Miscellaneous Works
Life of Lorenzo De Medici: By Roscoe
Schlegel's Philosophy of History—all of Bohn's Standard Library of London books.
Received, and for sale by
July 21 GEO. TEMPLEMAN.