

# RALEIGH REGISTER,

## AND NORTH-CAROLINA STATE GAZETTE.

Vol. 1.

Friday, April 9, 1824.

No. 42.

**THE REGISTER**  
Published every TUESDAY and FRIDAY, by  
**JOSEPH GALES & SON,**  
At Five Dollars per annum—half in advance.

**ADVERTISEMENTS**  
Not exceeding 16 lines, neatly inserted three  
times for a Dollar, and 25 cents for every suc-  
ceeding publication; those of greater length  
in the same proportion. COMMUNICATIONS  
Frankly received. LETTERS to the Editors  
must be post-paid.

**CONGRESS.**  
**REMARKS OF MR. TOD, OF PENN.**  
On opening the discussion of the Bill for a revision  
of the Tariff.  
WEDNESDAY, FEB. 11.

Mr. Tod said, that the subject of protect-  
ing domestic manufactures, by duties on im-  
ports, had been so often discussed, that a par-  
ticular explanation, on the part of the Com-  
mittee, would not probably be wanted. That  
he should state the details and objects of the  
bill, and some of the reasons in their favor as  
briefly as possible. That there was nothing  
here proposed that was new in principle—  
nothing but to extend and equalize a system  
which experience had shown to be most bene-  
ficial, and to give to other departments of do-  
mestic industry, and other oppressed por-  
tions of the community, something of that  
protection which our laws had so liberally and  
wisely given to the cultivators of cotton, of  
sugar, and to all the interests of navigation.

One object of the bill, said Mr. T. is, that  
as to some certain manufactured articles, the  
raw material of which exists in abundance at  
home, we should, by legislative provision,  
give to our own workmen, not the exclusive  
supply and command of even our own market,  
but barely give them a part of the business of  
furnishing our own people with the plain,  
rough necessities of life. That another ob-  
ject of equal importance was, that, instead of  
continuing to support the agriculturists of  
Europe, in almost every thing, we may be  
compelled, by using more home manufac-  
tured articles, to give to the farmers of our  
country some market for their products. And  
another object not inferior in magnitude to  
either of the former two, was, to give to the  
country that strength and power which arise  
from possessing, within itself, the means of  
defence, and to rescue it from the danger and  
disgrace of habitual reliance upon foreign na-  
tions for the common daily necessities of life.

That the duties proposed were upon two  
distinct classes of articles. One class is that  
upon silks, linens, cutlery, spices, and some  
other things of less importance; most of which  
are not necessary by any means, and which  
with few exceptions, do not much interfere  
with any home production, or with any man-  
ufacture which the country is now prepared  
for. That most of these articles were char-  
ged, in the bill, with the identical increase re-  
commended by the Secretary of the Treasury  
—this for the purpose of revenue chiefly, and  
to make up to the government the deficiencies  
which may probably be occasioned by  
checking the excessive importation of other  
articles. But, that the important duties pro-  
posed in the bill were for the purposes of pro-  
tection, and were upon iron, hemp, lead, glass,  
wool, and woollen goods.

We say that they also caused the country to  
flourish, by giving employment to the indus-  
trious, a market to the farmer, value to prop-  
erty, life to every sort of valuable business.

Peace came, and shortly after, the new tar-  
riff. It may, said Mr. T. be deemed absurd  
to argue now against a law which passed eight  
years ago, and the mischief of which, whatever  
it is, may now be supposed to be done and ir-  
retrievable. But the mischief of it is not yet  
finished. The tariff of 1816, is what is here  
proposed to be repealed in part, and it is nec-  
essary now to protest against the impolicy of  
the measure. What at that time was the situ-  
ation of the country, every one knows. The  
most important of our manufacturing estab-  
lishments were just beginning. They were  
yet to gain skill in management, system, habit,  
all the indispensable requisites which experi-  
ence only can give. Probably nine tenths,  
at least, of the owners were in debt, and only  
getting slowly out of it by the weekly profits  
of their business. In a word, according to the  
emphatic name long ago given by universal  
popular consent, they were, in every respect,  
*infant manufactures.* To expect that, under  
such circumstances, our countrymen should be  
able to rival in cheapness, the old, estab-  
lished foreign manufactures, was to expect  
what never yet happened in any country.  
So that, what in 1816 was called a moderate  
protecting duty, would scarcely have been  
adequate protection against a fair and liberal  
European competition, but was absolutely  
nothing against the little tricks of oppression  
by which wealthy foreign manufacturers can  
afford to throw away cargoes of their goods,  
at reduced prices, or at no prices, in order to  
break down a growing rival, and indemnify  
themselves by fleecing the whole country af-  
terwards.

It was not continued Mr. T. said nor be-  
lieved, that there was any design by the  
tariff of 1816, to put down our rising man-  
ufactures. But the mistake was most pernicious.

It was the fashion of the day to consider the  
question of protection to domestic industry,  
not as a question between our own country  
and foreign nations, but as a question merely  
between our own manufacturers on the one  
side, and all the remaining classes of our own  
people on the other; and that whatever  
could be withheld from the mechanic was not  
to be lost to the nation, not at all, but only  
divided among the farmers, the planters, the  
merchants. Then there was the cry—  
about taxing the many for the benefit of the  
few; and monopoly. But what had chief ef-  
fect in destroying our manufactures, and al-  
most bringing us back again into colonial  
bondage, was that theory of foreign specu-  
lative writers called political economists. A  
doctrine which is now mentioned because it  
is yet adhered to, and if not proposed, is now  
as conclusive against this bill as it was in  
1816 against any efficient protection of do-  
mestic industry. This doctrine teaches that  
all interference like the present, by legisla-  
tion, has merely the effect to force capital  
from one employment into another. That  
this forcing can only be from an employment  
more productive into an employment less  
productive, to the certain injury of the com-  
munity. The argument prevailed. We have  
seen the effects.

Under this tariff, said Mr. T. first went all  
the newly erected manufactures of earthen  
ware. They and their workmen are now no  
more talked of than if they never had existed.  
In the same way went the most of our  
glass factories, our manufactures of white and  
red lead, our woollens, our hemp. Domest-  
ic iron has lingered a while longer, and  
still holds a feeble existence, dwindling every  
year, and gradually sinking under foreign  
importations. All the devastations and losses  
of the war were nothing compared with  
the devastations and losses of manufacturing  
capital under the tariff of 1816.

But, said Mr. T. the sum total of destruc-  
tion of domestic industry will never be cred-  
ited, unless we refer to the public records for  
the amount of manufactures brought from  
abroad, by which our own have been oppres-  
sed, excluded and supplied. In the first year  
of peace, we imported, or there was imported  
for us, of lead and shot, thirteen millions  
of pounds; of white and red lead, seven mil-  
lions; perhaps more than enough for two  
years consumption of the country, even if we  
had none of our own. The average of the  
imports of both, since the peace, amounts,  
for each year, to 7,749,368 lbs. and the av-  
erage cost to near half a million of dollars a  
year.

Cost of it, in 1821, \$510,489  
1822, 576,687  
1823, 632,591

This is altogether independent of the manu-  
factures of Hemp, for which, for the last 3  
years, we have paid, on an average, \$849,603  
a year.

Earthen Ware, being altogether an ad val-  
orem article, the amount imported cannot  
conveniently be ascertained, except for some  
few late years.  
In 1822, we paid for it, \$1,061,263  
1823, 1,047,708

And varied from that but inconsiderably, until  
1822, when it amounted to 31,107 tons. In  
1823 it amounted to 33,787 tons; and in the  
same year, the consumption of imported Sheet  
Iron, rods and hoops was 7401 tons. Even  
Pig Iron has gradually increased from 104 tons  
in 1818, to an importation of 3,111 tons in  
1823. Add, that all the steel we use is im-  
ported. But of this there is no complaint. Per-  
haps it cannot be fabricated at home as good  
as the imported. Steel is not charged with any  
additional duty by this bill. Add, also, the  
manufactures of Iron and Steel, which are  
imported to the amount of two millions of  
dollars a year. But there is no complaint of  
this. Perhaps our workmen are not so skill-  
ful in the fine manufactures as the European.  
There is nothing so intolerable as the depend-  
ence on foreigners for what we may have as  
good or better at home, which is the case of  
iron.

It was, said Mr. T. estimated by our statisti-  
cal writers in 1815, that the quantity of bar  
iron necessary for a yearly consumption of the  
United States, was from forty-eight to fifty  
thousand tons. Since that time, from the  
decay in agriculture, in manufactures, in  
building, in every species of improvement  
and of useful business, and from the frugality  
which belongs to poverty, it is probable that  
the yearly consumption of bar iron has been  
lessened to eight or ten thousand tons. But,  
however improbable, let it be supposed to  
continue the same, and to amount to 48,000  
tons a year. Then we import 33,000 tons  
from Europe, and make for ourselves 15,000.  
If any gentleman is prepared to say this is as  
it should be he must contend, that we should  
be in the high road of national wealth, if our  
farmers were to get from abroad two-thirds  
of the grain and provisions for their families.  
It is notorious, that these 33,000 tons of iron  
may be made at home, that the workmen,  
while not employed in that business, cannot  
be employed in any other profitable business.  
That the food by which they could be sustai-  
ned is now without a market, and useless. If  
so, whatever is paid to Europe for iron, is  
paid for what may be had, in substance, for  
nothing, at home. That is, it will cost the na-  
tion nothing, nor cost the consumer any more  
than what he pays, except that small addi-  
tion which arises from a higher rate of wages  
of labor, a cost, which must inevitably be  
more than made up to him, the consumer, in  
a hundred different ways.

Thus, Sir, said Mr. T. for these plain com-  
mon necessities, which our own country is so  
competent to produce, lead, hemp, earthen  
wares, woollen goods and unmanufactured  
iron, we go on paying a tribute to foreigners  
of more than thirteen millions of dollars a year;  
and after a visionary fear of forcing capital  
to an unproductive channel, by protecting do-  
mestic industry, we have ended, by forcing  
our own manufacturing capital into non-exis-  
tence and our workmen into beggary. What  
advantage has accrued to any portion of the  
community to compensate for this loss? Who  
is benefited? Not the farmer. His share of  
the gains from the suppression of manufact-  
ures is only to have the production of his  
farm left perishing on his hands for want of a  
market. As little has the government gained,  
which, twice in time of peace, has been  
compelled to resort to loans to defray its year-  
ly expenses.

It is supposed, said Mr. Tod, that during  
the war, our manufacturer took advantage of  
the situation of our country, and extorted high  
prices, and that now, he may be enabled to  
lay his neighbor under contribution, and ex-  
tort prices exactly in proportion to the increase  
of the duties. It is probable enough, that  
during the late war, and at all other times,  
our manufacturers have taken the highest  
market price for their goods. Buy where  
you can buy the cheapest is the maxim of the  
political economist, without inquiring wheth-  
er you buy from a friend or an enemy.—

Whether this maxim is right or not, one thing  
is certain, that sell where you can sell the  
highest has been the general practice of every  
seller since the world began, and to expect  
otherwise, is to expect an impracticable re-  
finement in the morality of trade, and useless,  
even if it were practicable.

But, said Mr. Tod, the objection seems  
founded on a total mistake in another respec-  
t. High duties on the rival imports are not for  
the purpose of enabling the manufacturer to  
sell his wares high, and never can have that  
effect, but precisely the opposite effect. Mr.  
Tod spoke only of those articles which can  
be made at home to any necessary extent, and  
the raw material of which abounds at home.  
It is protection only which enables the man-  
ufacturer to sell them cheaply. And protec-  
tion will be found invariably to have that ef-  
fect in England, in France, in this country, in  
every country, that we know of. The reason  
why protection from foreign rivals should be  
so absolutely necessary, to the cheapness  
of any manufacture, need not be accurately  
inquired into, when we know the invariable  
fact. Perhaps it is, that cheapness depends  
essentially upon the assurance of a market;  
a steady demand. The great market, the  
home market creates this demand. The pro-  
fits of business to be very small, must be very  
certain. This certainly can never be had  
without an exclusion of accidental supplies.  
Probably an auction of cargoes of cotton  
goods, every month, in the neighborhood of  
the best established cotton manufactory in  
England would, in two years time, be suffi-  
cient to break it down. Such exclusion is pec-  
uliarly necessary to manufacturing establish-  
ments when beginning. No industry, no skill,  
no economy can hold them up if abandoned  
by their government. So familiar is this to  
the two greatest manufacturing nations in the  
world, England and France, that when they  
mean peculiarly to cherish any manufacture,  
(which they invariably do every manufacture,  
which their people are or can be made com-  
petent to) they do not content themselves  
with a duty of 25 or 30 per cent. on the for-  
eign rival commodity, but they impose a du-  
bly equal to, and sometimes above the va-  
lue of the article, or they prohibit it altogeth-  
er.

As to details of the bill, Mr. T. observed,

that, on cotton goods, the bill left the duties  
as it found them, with one exception. The  
minimum valuation of imported cloths is rais-  
ed from 25 cents the square yard, to 35 cents.  
The intent is to give protection to fabrics su-  
perior in fineness, by two or three grades, to  
those which are now protected. As to the  
second and third grades from the lowest, the  
addition here proposed to the duty is merely  
nominal. Those goods will never be impor-  
ted. The duty, as to them, is already effect-  
ual. It is clear, that immense benefits have  
accrued to the country, from that prohibition.  
The valuation of 35 cents, prohibits no cot-  
ton goods which may not be fabricated bet-  
ter at home than any imported, and cheaper,  
too, most certainly, as soon as foreign com-  
petition is excluded, and never before.

A specific duty is proposed, of 6 cents per  
square yard, on cotton bagging. It is under-  
stood that the war, which excluded importa-  
tions, gave to Kentucky and other Western  
States the opportunity to supply the cotton  
growers with bagging. A trade not hurtful  
to either side, but which is now prostrated.  
The duty of 6 cents is intended to be pro-  
tective and prohibitory, and to give to those  
States which manufacture the bagging, and  
which consume vast quantities of cotton, an  
advantage corresponding, in a very small de-  
gree, with the protecting duty enjoyed by  
the cotton grower, of three cents a pound.

As to the specific duties on sundry articles  
of hardware, Mr. T. said those were taken  
chiefly from a list furnished by the Secretary  
of the Treasury, some years ago, in answer  
to a call from the House. This was from a  
desire to substitute specific duties, where-  
ever practicable. Complaints are made, that,  
in some items, the change proposed will be  
inconvenient. If the committee think so,  
these will be struck out.

If, continued Mr. T. the prevalence of  
smuggling is apprehended from this increase  
of the duties, a reflection will perhaps shew  
the alarm to be unfounded. The duties here  
proposed are not extravagantly high, not  
amounting to one half of the usual protecting  
duties in other countries. There seems no  
just reason to apprehend, that the practice  
ever can be carried on in this country so as  
materially to affect any provision of the law,  
either for revenue or for the protection of  
domestic manufactures. No ship owner, or  
captain, incurs the risk of forfeiting ship  
and cargo for the sake of evading the duties  
on such articles as can be clandestinely land-  
ed. This dread of smuggling is perhaps im-  
ported from Great-Britain, and received here,  
like many other impressions, without much  
inquiry whether it is applicable to our situa-  
tion. The British coast is, perhaps, as ex-  
tensive as our own. France lies within sight.  
A boat may sail from one country to the other,  
probably in less than one night. The English  
duty on French silks, is said to be between  
eight and nine dollars per pound. So on  
brandies, their duties are very high. So on  
laces. The English smuggler, if successful,  
gains enormous profit—whereas here, there  
are not only all the difficulties arising from  
distance, but there is no such temptation of  
profit. Take the article said to be charged  
with the highest duty in our tariff for the  
purpose of protection, that of coarse cottons,  
which are said to pay a duty of 100 per cent.  
Suppose they could be landed without de-  
duction—would they be smuggled? No.  
Because smuggling can only be of those ar-  
ticles which can be bought very cheap and  
sold very dear. So, take any article charged  
the highest in this bill for the purpose of pro-  
tection. Take those woollen cloths, subject  
to the minimum calculation of 40 cents, or  
those subject to that of 80 cents; so far from  
any just ground to apprehend smuggling,  
reason and fact will shew that a reduction of  
their price below the lowest that can be  
imported, will inevitably follow their protec-  
tion.

As to the question, what effect this bill, if  
passed, will have upon the revenue? It may  
be answered, Mr. T. thought satisfactorily  
to every friend of the measure. The impor-  
tation of some things may be stopped; but  
if those items the most important to the re-  
venue, the reduction of the amount of im-  
ports by the substitution of domestic goods  
must be more than made up by the augmen-  
tation of the duty. Besides, the Secretary  
of the Treasury has clearly shown, in his com-  
munication to Congress at the last Session,  
that the most of what can be lost to the re-  
venue by the prevalence of home manufac-  
tures may be restored in the augmented du-  
ties upon articles which will still be im-  
ported. For three years, or perhaps longer,  
it may be reasonably expected that the re-  
venue will be increased by the change here  
proposed. But, if the contrary were appreh-  
ended, that would be no reason against in-  
creasing the real wealth of the country by  
protecting domestic industry.

I have, said Mr. T. but one thing more to  
mention. On this important question, sup-  
posing the matter to be in itself doubtful,  
have we nothing by which to direct the  
judgment to a safe conclusion? We have.—  
We have the opinions of our own experi-  
enced statesmen. We have the examples of other  
nations. We have actual fact and experi-  
ment at home. Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Jef-  
ferson have shewn that our only source of  
national prosperity was in the protection of  
domestic manufactures, the latter publicly  
retracting an opinion to the contrary in his  
notes on Virginia. Every President of the  
Union, whenever he has mentioned the sub-  
ject, which has been very frequently, has  
given the same opinion. So every Secre-  
tary of the Treasury. It is not known that  
one public man, since the formation of the  
government, except members of Congress  
representing districts, has given a different  
opinion. It is notorious that the chief na-  
tions of Europe are wealthy and powerful al-  
most exactly in proportion to the vigilance  
with which they exclude the products of for-  
eign industry and cherish their own; and  
others weak and miserable exactly in pro-  
portion to their dependence on the industry  
of their neighbors. But we want no example

of foreign nations. We have an experiment  
of our own conclusive. I mean, said Mr. T.  
the prohibitory duty imposed in the year  
1816 on cotton cloths, the only prohibitory  
duty we ever had in this country for the pro-  
tection of domestic industry. Like the prin-  
cipal articles in this bill: there the prohibi-  
tory duty was on an article; the raw material  
of which abounds at home. Now, it ought  
to be ever remembered that, when that pro-  
hibitory duty on the coarser cotton cloths, by  
minimum valuation, was proposed by Mr.  
Dallas, then Secretary of the Treasury, (for  
the immortal honor of the measure belongs  
to him) no effort was left untried by the op-  
ponents of protection to crush the measure.  
And, even after it became a law, the mer-  
chants of Salem, by a memorial to this House,  
shewed how detestable the measure was con-  
sidered to be by them, and assailed it by  
predictions of every ruinous consequence.

That, then, were those arguments against  
the prohibitory duty on coarse cottons, and  
the pernicious consequences which, accord-  
ing to the fears of the merchants, and the  
books of the economists, were most surely  
to happen? First, that imported coarse cot-  
tons were used in immense quantities, chiefly  
by the poor; that nothing could be more in-  
iquitous and oppressive, than to wring from  
the poor double prices for the necessaries of  
life, in order to divide the proceeds among a  
set of rapacious manufacturers, who, so far  
from being able to enter into competition  
with the workmen of India or England, could  
never live by their trade, unless they had a  
charter for extortion, and were quartered,  
by force of law, upon the hard working agri-  
culturalist. Then, there was a cry of monopoly  
—monopoly; & taxing the many for the ben-  
efit of the few. Was this all? Not half.—  
The people would have India muslins, in  
spite of the law; smuggling would come in  
fashion, and morals be spoiled. Commerce  
and ship building would sink, together with  
the public revenue. Now, said Mr. T. if, in  
stating the consequences which really have  
followed the prohibition of foreign coarse  
cottons, I state any thing which any gentle-  
man does not know to be the fact, let him  
consider the whole experiment as thrown  
away. Instead of the oppression of the poor,  
and a tax on the community to support the  
manufacturer, that article protected by the  
prohibitory duty is now afforded to the con-  
sumer at a less price per yard, than those  
fimsy India muslins used to be sold for; and  
if you take durability and other qualities into  
view, it is now sold for one half, perhaps for  
one-third, its former price. Instead of our  
workmen being found unequal to the India  
or British manufacturer, they have been able  
to contend with the British themselves, on  
equal ground, in every market, successfully,  
as proved by the notorious practice of the  
British workmen, of placing their coarse  
cotton goods upon their customers, under  
the name and disguise of American. Instead  
of smuggling, it is clear that those India  
muslins could not now be sold in this coun-  
try, if the duty was taken off, and a bounty  
allowed for their importation. Instead of  
supporting the agriculture of India, by wear-  
ing their cottons, we create an immense mar-  
ket for the raw material raised in our own  
country; and another market to our own  
farmers, for the immense quantities of pro-  
visions consumed by the workmen. Instead  
of destroying commerce, it is a fact, that, in  
the town of Providence, where the prohibi-  
tory duty had an operation as strong as in any  
place, the coasting trade is more than dou-  
bled. All these benefits have followed pro-  
tection, in one instance, of an article fabrica-  
ted from our own raw material. Similar ben-  
efits, in a greater or less degree, may rea-  
sonably be expected, from a similar protec-  
tion of woollen manufactures, and of hemp,  
lead, glass, and iron.

**Sheriff's Sale.**  
ON Monday the 14th day of June next,  
will be sold at Nash Courthouse, in the  
town of Nashville, the following Tracts of  
Land or so much thereof as will be sufficient  
to pay the tax due thereon for the year 1822  
and cost of advertising, to wit:  
William Bateman 66 acres, valued at \$ 66  
Winne Joiner 66 do do 66  
Cele Joiner 92 do do 92  
John Rollins heirs 300 do do 300  
Wm. Arrington 705 do do 705  
Abel Barge 120 do do 120  
Hardy Griswell 240 do do 240  
Sim'n Carpenter 278 do do 278  
Wm. Harrison 504 do do 706  
Daniel Taylor 100 do do 62  
Willis Williams 466 do do 466  
Benj. Atkinson 70 do do 70  
Jeremiah Biggs 150 do do 225  
Jeremiah Nichols for Whitley Land 100 acres,  
valued at \$100.  
James Ferrell for William Hammons 340 do  
valued at \$340.  
Bryant Lewis for Burwell Kent's orphans 291  
acres, valued at \$150.  
Bryant Barnes 1183 acres, valued at \$218 50.  
SAMUEL N. N. VICK, Sheriff of  
Nash county,  
March 8. pr. adv. \$

**STATE OF NORTH-CAROLINA.**  
**Mecklenburg County.**  
Thomas Boyd, Adm'r. of the real estate of Isaac Beatty, dec'd. v. Isaac Beatty, dec'd.  
Petition for the sale of the real estate of Isaac Beatty, dec'd.  
The heirs at law of Isaac Beatty, dec'd.  
It appearing to the satisfaction of the Court, that Joseph Haynes in right of his wife Viny, Elijah D. via in right of his wife Ruth, Albert Alexander and Thomas Beay are inhabitants of another state, it is therefore ordered, that publication be made for six weeks successively in the Raleigh Register, that the heirs at law above named, appear at the next Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions to be held at the Courthouse in Charlotte, on the 4th Monday in May next, and plead, answer or demur to the said petition otherwise the same will be taken pro confesso and heard ex parte against them.  
ISAAC ALEXANDER, C. M. C.