

EASTERN-SHORE WHIG AND PEOPLE'S ADVOCATE.

VOL. V.—NO. 32.

EASTON, MD.—SATURDAY MORNING, FEBRUARY 9, 1833.

WHOLE NO. 240.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY TUESDAY & SATURDAY MORNING, (during the Session of Congress) and every TUESDAY MORNING, the residue of the year—BY EDWARD MULLIKEN, PUBLISHER OF THE LAWS OF THE UNION.

THE TERMS Are THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, payable half yearly in advance. No subscription discontinued until all arrearages are settled, without the approbation of the publisher. ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding a square, inserted THREE TIMES FOR ONE DOLLAR, and twenty five cents for each subsequent insertion—larger advertisements in proportion.



BY AUTHORITY. LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES PASSED AT THE 2ND. SESSION 21ST. CONGRESS.

[Public No 4] Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all a part of the Territory of Michigan, which is comprehended within the following boundaries, shall, from and after the passage of this act, constitute one land district for the sale and entry of the public lands viz: lying between the third and fourth ranges of townships south of the base line, and east of the principal meridian, except so much thereof as lies north of the river Huron of Lake Erie; and also, the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth ranges of Townships south of said base line, and west of said principal meridian. And there is hereby established a land office within the same, to be located at such place as the President in his discretion shall think proper to designate. Sec. 2. And he is further enacted, That there shall be appointed by the President, and with the advice and consent of the Senate, under the existing laws, a Register and Receiver in and for said district, whose compensation shall be the same as provided for other Registers and Receivers.

A. STEVENSON, Speaker of the House of Representatives. THOMAS L. W. HITE, President of the Senate pro tempore. Approved, January 30, 1833. ANDREW JACKSON.

[FOR THE WHIG] At a very large and interesting meeting of the citizens of Denton and its vicinity, convened at the Methodist Episcopal Church, on Monday evening the 28th inst. pursuant to previous arrangement, for the purpose of considering the propriety of forming a Temperance Society. James Sangston, Esq. was called to the chair and William T. Furnell, appointed secretary. The object of the meeting being announced by the chairman, the Rev. William D. Burnham, Rev. John L. Leachman and Dr. William T. Furnell, respectively addressed the meeting in a very eloquent and appropriate manner with regard to the multitude of evils attending the habitual use of ardent spirits and strenuously advocated the formation of a Temperance Society, upon the plan of entire abstinence. On motion of the Rev. John L. Leachman it was resolved unanimously, that a Temperance Society be organized.

Whereupon the following constitution was submitted for the consideration of the meeting, which being read was unanimously adopted. Article 1st. This society shall be called the Denton Temperance Society. Art. 2nd. Any person subscribing this constitution shall be a member of this society. Art. 3d. We the members of this society do pledge ourselves not to make, sell, give away nor drink alcoholic liquors of any kind, except in case of sickness, and furthermore we do pledge ourselves to discountenance the use of it in our families and wherever we may have influence.

Resolved, That the proceedings of the meeting be signed by the Chairman and attested by the Secretary, and published in the Eastern Gazette and Eastern Shore Whig. JAMES SANGSTON, Chairman. WILLIAM T. FURNELL, Secy. Denton, 29th Jan 1833.

BEWARE! We earnestly beseech our fellow citizens of the North, not to delude themselves. It is true, that the South is generally opposed to Nullification. We are sure that Virginia, North Carolina and Georgia are dissatisfied not only with this mode, but with the precipitation of South Carolina in rushing at once to such extremities. But we charge our Northern brethren not to believe for one moment that the South will acquiesce in the present Tariff system, that the public sentiment among us will much longer remain subdued and tranquil. We do not wish to play the braggadocho—but we warn them to beware. They know how deeply we are attached to this Union—and how anxiously we are opposed to the policy of nullification. But it is impossible not to see the dangers which surround us. The South feel the oppression to which she

is subjected by the monopolists of the North. We have strong interests, and some strong feelings too, in common with the citizens of South Carolina. Suppose blood was to flow in this quarrel, (we can conceive of many ways in which it may be brought about either by accident or by design)—and who can say how long it will be before the flame would spread through the whole South? Suppose also, that we perceive the intention of fastening this as a permanent system upon us—that this session passes off without giving us relief—that in the meantime money is drawn from our pockets to overflow the treasury, and to give rise to wild and mischievous and unaccountable expenditures, does the North think that we can quietly submit to this state of things? that there is no danger of the discontents of our countrymen increasing, and of the popular excitement of the South spreading until no wise man will be able to calculate its extent?

We beg the citizens of the North to think of these things, and to act upon them. Why should any of the soldiers of the North be thoughtless enough to offer publicly as volunteers at this moment? Why have the appearances concerning South Carolina? Why does the U. S. Gazette of Philadelphia, name South Carolina with threatening and blustering? Why is the Legislature of Massachusetts mad enough to bring in resolutions to instruct her Senators against reducing the Tariff? This Union was made in the spirit of confusion—and by the same liberal spirit must it be maintained. We speak without passion and without affectation. We utter only what we believe to be a true word in good season. May we not experience the fate of Cassandras? "Is madness to rule the present hour?" All parties have duties to discharge—but will they discharge them? Will all avoid the errors which beset them? Will the North do us the justice? Will South Carolina avoid the use of force? And will the United States? Or will each madly press upon the other—until blood may be drawn, and the blessed Union be put in jeopardy? The Union may be saved by conciliating South Carolina. Self interest and violence may destroy it. At this crisis, Virginia may now or never, may be the time for her to act.—Richmond, Eng.

SCENES IN CONGRESS. A correspondent of the Baltimore Patriot thus describes Mr. Calhoun, when he delivered the speech which appeared in our last. "In the Senate, Mr. Calhoun spoke under a degree of excitement I have never before witnessed in a parliamentary body. His whole frame was agitated. His gestures and countenance expressed things unutterable, while, as you will observe, his language is quite guarded, and his speech quite specious. For two years past, Mr. Calhoun has made nullification almost the sole topic of his conversation, and has thus been accumulating energies, to which, yesterday, he for the first time had an opportunity to give birth in public. The very warmest oratory you ever witnessed in Baltimore, will give you but a faint idea of the manner in which you will witness, that no part whatever in this debate. He regretted that it was now necessary for him to say a single word. When he had heard the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Vinton) he could not repress the involuntary exclamation he had made. Its strictness it was perhaps disorderly—though such had been permitted in other similar assemblies. As it was deemed not to be in order, he owed an apology to the House for his involuntary expression."

THE TARIFF. SPEECH OF MR. HOWARD, OF MARYLAND, On Mr. HUNTINGTON'S motion to strike out the 36th and 37th sections of the bill to reduce and otherwise alter the duties on imports, Jan. 28th, 1833.

I have hitherto been, Mr. Chairman, a patient auditor of this debate, and would have been content to remain so, if it had been confined to what I conceive to be the fair and legitimate question before the House. But the excursions which gentlemen have made into the almost interminable field of the Tariff, have been so extensive, and the light which they have shed, diffused over such a wide space, in their successive illustrations of the obscure parts of the subject, that the point which we are called upon to decide, has received but little illumination from their efforts, however brilliant. I know that under the rules of the House, a motion to amend any part of the bill, opens the consideration of the whole subject in the form of a discussion of the general principles of the bill; and I am not disposed to complain either of the existence or application of the rule. It is highly proper that a general debate upon the leading features of any bill, involving important general principles, should precede a particular examination of its clauses; in order that the House, having settled the main point, may be better able to adjust the details. If the debate, to which we have listened for so long a time, had conformed to the spirit of this rule, I should not have troubled the committee with the few remarks that I propose to submit. But it has not only this deviation explains the singular and one-sided condition of the debate, presenting to the view of the nation a series of attacks upon this bill from every quarter, assailing it wherever a breach was thought to be practicable, while the garrison within preserved a sullen and ominous silence. That the bill may have suffered in the estimation of the people, and even of the members of this committee, by the fact of its friends, (with the exception of the committee who reported it) refraining from stepping forward in its defence, is not improbable; but if the debate had been confined to what is properly the general principle of the bill, it would not have been difficult to muster a force sufficient to establish that general principle triumphantly. It purports to be a bill to reduce the revenue to the wants of the Government.—This is its main object.—A secondary one

is to "otherwise alter the duties upon imports," so as to make our Tariff more conformable to the present condition of things. But this last object can only be attained into by adjusting an immense mass of details, and it is in this confused heap of yards and pounds, and per centages, that gentlemen have been searching for some general principle, whose no such thing can be found, as the subject is now placed before the House. If the question were "Shall this bill pass?" and the committee had previously determined that all these details stand, then indeed it would be easy to extract the essential spirit of the bill, and examine it by any alembic that might be thought applicable. But the committee have yet to pass through the investigation of all these minutiae. If a child were learning A, it would be thought strange to thrust upon him the acquisition of all the other letters of the alphabet at once. Whilst the investigation of the details of the bill is, as yet, nothing more than a distant prospect ahead, we find our attention constantly drawn to every part of it in succession, at the imminent hazard of its accumulation being all forgotten, when the time shall arrive, at which it might be useful. During our last session, we passed a bill to reduce the revenue; but found, after we ceased to work at it, that it was insufficient to answer our purpose, because its effect would be to create more revenue than sound policy would justify in collecting. It became manifest, that owing to the amendments engrafed upon the original bill as it passed through the Committee of the Whole and which were added to give further protection to this of that species of manufacture, the amount of money that would flow into the Treasury would not fall short of 18 millions of dollars from imports alone, and the general principle of this bill is, "shall the revenue be reduced to a sum proportioned to the expenses of the Government?" the affirmative of which proposition would deny. A few years ago, a treaty was partially broached, that the Federal Government should intentionally raise more money than its ordinary expenditures require, that it might have a fund upon which to draw for donations for various purposes. But the opinion of the people was soon found to be unfavorable to this doctrine; and now no party maintains it. From the moment, therefore, of passing the act of 1832 it became apparent that it must be reviewed; and the precise point of time when this review should take place, could be a matter of small moment, except that the permanent adjustment of the Tariff is so desirable, that every consideration of justice and policy concurs in recommending its speedy accomplishment. The proper question now before us, is merely—"Shall we now undertake this review?" after deciding in the affirmative, every section, line and letter of the bill be brought under our view, and will of course be open to amendment. If these amendments are rejected when offered, or are not satisfactory when adopted, then will arise the proper question, whether the bill is upon the whole a proper bill and ought to pass. But the only enquiry is now, whether we will look into the subject at all.

I have been surprised that the most strenuous opposition to reviewing the Tariff is made by those members of the House whose votes are recorded against the act of the last session. One would have thought that a law which was so objectionable as to receive the hearty condemnation of these gentlemen both by voice and vote, would have been repealed by them at the earliest opportunity, and yet, when a proposition is made to reconsider and review it, they instantly take shelter under its protection, and insist upon its remaining the permanent law of the land. Have they changed their opinions with regard to it? Or if not, how can they reconcile what appears to me an irreconcilable inconsistency of desiring a bad law to remain upon the Statute book? No interests have been built up, no capital invested, no durable arrangement of labor taken place as yet under the act of 1832, and it may, therefore, be reviewed without meeting with those serious difficulties that oppose us when about to change a law which has been in force for years. But it is said, that it would be better to suffer this bad law to remain than to incur the hazard of having a worse one. Are we not, sir, the same members identically, who exacted the other law? and what reason can be given for the apprehension that a worse law will be the result of our deliberations, any more than the existence of a hope that we shall pass a better one? The members of this Congress studied the subject of the tariff for nearly six months last winter, and have renewed their attention now. How unreasonable is it to expect that a body of men will ever assemble here, who have devoted more time to the investigation of this complicated subject. One of the gentlemen from Mass. [Mr. Choate] assumed the position that an equitable tariff might possibly be made, which would satisfy the reasonable men of all parties, and contended that this result could only be the work of patient research, laborious investigation and cool judgment; and yet protest against this Congress undertaking it, who have bestowed more time and attention upon the subject than any future Congress can be expected to give. I dissent from the opinion expressed by that gentleman, that a single Tariff could be produced by a single effort, however much preparatory labor had been expended upon it. I think

that it can only be the result of repeated efforts; and therefore, it is, that I am willing to try again. Gentlemen object to this bill, but do they forget the course of the bill of the last session? We set out with one, intended to raise a revenue of twelve millions, and ended with one, producing eighteen millions. I voted against many of the amendments as they were successively engrafed upon it in its passage through the committee of the whole, but was in a minority. But I cannot see how those who were the most zealous supporters of those amendments, and who carried a majority of the House with them, should now be afraid to trust that majority. There is, indeed, one consideration which was rather hinted at than argued, by the gentleman from Connecticut, who opened this debate, [Mr. Huntington], who said that "he was not insensible of the weight of the Executive recommendations in this House." If he means to say that the President is exercising the influence of his station to excite the jarring and sectional divisions that now unhappily prevail, and that have made discord where there formerly was harmony, I agree with him in the fact, and will further express my belief that the people of this country will sustain him in this effort. This Congress may or may not respond to his sentiments; but the irresistible power which shapes and directs the course of this government in all its concerns, I mean the calm & disinterested voice of public opinion, will array itself upon the side of "moderate and healing counsels," and compel its decision to be respected. But in the meantime, differences of opinion are passing into acrimony and strife; the breach between the two grand divisions of the country is becoming wider and wider, and the difficulty of a final adjustment of this fiercely contested question is enhanced as each Congress leaves it as a legacy to its successor. I am disposed to review our legislation. Those who think that the act of 1832 is the last effort that ought to be made on the part of the Federal Government, who are content to see a surplus revenue of six millions of dollars flow into the Treasury forever, or who anticipate more knowledge, better feeling, and greater tranquility in legislation, on the part of the succeeding Congress with less acerbity in the public mind to be encountered, do well to postpone the present consideration of the subject. What aspect this bill will wear when it issues from the Committee of the Whole, whether it will experience the fate of its predecessor of last year, and be so altered, that like Anson's ship, after her voyage original timber remained in consequence of its repeated patchings; or whether it will wear the appearance that the Committee of Ways and Means have given it, no one can foresee. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. Young) who has just taken his seat has expatiated upon the destruction it would bring upon the woolen and cotton factories, and has argued arithmetically upon the condition of those establishments. I think there is a vicious principle in the whole of our legislation upon the subject of woolsens; I say vicious because it does not accomplish the end in view. In the discussion of the last Tariff, we first fixed upon a duty to be put upon raw wool; and then proceeded to assess the duty upon the manufactured article by the argument and calculation of the gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Davis,) insisting it so as to correspond exactly with the duty upon wool; for, said he "the manufacturer will have to pay an enhanced price on his raw material, and must therefore have additional protection." So that, after having protected the wool grower, we next proceeded to render the manufacturer entirely independent of him, by putting it in his power to import his wool; and regulated the duty for the express purpose of enabling him to import it. We place the grower of wool entirely at the mercy of the manufacturer (an antagonist interest) and then tell him that he is well protected. Sirs, there are some philosophy in this legislation! In practice it works exactly as might be supposed. The manufacturer, having the grower of the raw material entirely at his command, can beat him down to whatever price he chooses to give. Hence it is, that upon recurring to the statistical tables upon our desks, during the last year of which we have any returns, nearly seven millions of pounds of raw wool were imported, paying a duty of upwards of two hundred and seventy thousand dollars. I should like to show this to one of our farmers and ask him how he relishes such protection. But it may be said that the price of wool is enhanced by it, because if the domestic seller will consent to take a little less than the cost of importation, he will be sure of a market. The argument is specious and deserves a moment's consideration. When the proprietor of any article is so anxious to sell that the purchaser is to buy, depreciation is the necessary consequence. The farmers are detached from each other and have little opportunity of judging how much it costs to purchase wool abroad and pay its freight home. He is offered a price, and he has no means of comparison between this price and the cost of the foreign article. All that he knows is, that the foreign article can be imported to advantage under our laws; and that if he does not sell it at less than this cost, whatever it may be, he will lose the sale altogether. The purchaser can turn his back upon him

and look abroad for a supply, and our laws puts it in his power to do so. But a convincing proof that our present system of legislation is of no service to the wool grower is found in the fact, that (except in the year 1831, in which a speculation took place in wool, temporarily raising its price,) the price has not increased since the act of 1832. Its average value has remained the same, as it was prior to that law. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Appleton] declared in his speech that he had always felt himself authorized to say, on behalf of the manufacturers of woolsens, that a clear duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem would be a sufficient protection, provided wool was made free. For one, I would at once close with his suggestion and adopt it; and I would myself make the proposition, if there was any chance of carrying it. But I fear there is none. I thought in 1828 and I think still, that the substantial interests of the wool growers would be promoted by the adoption of a policy which would build up the manufacturing establishments in the first instance and when they had struck the roots of their prosperity deep into the soil, to look forward either to the competition amongst them or to subsequent encouragement for the producers of the raw material. But the effort to build up two rivals, and in some respects hostile, interests simultaneously, involves too much contradiction to be successful. If either one of them had been strong, you might have burdened it for the advancement of the weaker; but where both are weak, it is almost impossible to foster both at once.

It may be thought that these views upon the propriety of introducing the raw material from a foreign country, free of duty, are inconsistent with opinions expressed a few days since, adverse to the importation of fossil salt from Liverpool. But the difference is clear between the two cases. I stated then that the grievance of the complaint was, the encouragement of British shipping owing to their enjoyment of a trade in which our vessels are not allowed to participate. Coming to Nova Scotia for timber, they can bring their article at a low freight, as otherwise they would come in ballast. If the American shipping could enter upon the competition upon equal terms, it might perhaps be conformable to my doctrine about wool, that the manufacturers of this salt should be scattered over the Atlantic coast and the raw material admitted free. But waiting for the present all other considerations, it is sufficient to rest the point shipping and the consequent injury of our own. Our vessels from the middle States go to the Southward for a cargo of cotton which they take to Europe and bring back in exchange for foreign manufactures; but as the return cargo is not so bulky as the outward, and the surplus space cannot now as heretofore be filled up with salt, they must either lose a portion of freight or charge more upon the transportation of the outward cargo, neither of which is desirable. In passing over this subject, I will refer to a statement which I have obtained from the records of the Treasury, upon which the gentleman from Maine may ruminate until we arrive at the Salt part of the bill. It appears that, during the year ending on the 30th Sept., 1832, the importation of salt into the District of Passamaquoddy, which includes all that part of Maine into which this fossil salt is brought, amounted to 9,781 3-4 tons, valued at \$1,078 11, and that the item of tonnage stands thus:

American, Entered, 3,553 Tons. Departed, 4,322 Foreign, Entered, 63,356 Departed, 63,374

The very recital of this disproportion is enough to create astonishment. A gentleman near me says, "the West India Trade." Not so, Sir, I have examined the original returns made by the Collector, of all the articles imported into the District, and will show to the House, when the proper time arrives, from the nature of the importations that this redundancy of British shipping is not owing to the West India trade. On the contrary, the arrangement of that trade, as settled by this administration, has been held unjustly responsible for the sin of the fossil salt duty.

The gentleman from Connecticut who has just addressed the Committee, [Mr. Young] deplored also the consequences that would fall upon the Cotton spinners, by the smallness of the duty proposed to be levied upon Cotton yarn or Cotton twist. Upon this point, I hope that his complaints are premature, and that the Committee will arrange this duty differently when we come to that part of the bill. I am inclined to think that it can be changed for the better.

There is now lying before me the latest Liverpool price current, by which it appears that the price of cotton is as follows:

Sea Island,	11 10	20 10
Stained,	6 10	10
Bowed Georgia,	6 3-4	7 1/2
Mobile,	6 3-8	7 1/2
Alabama,	6 1/2	7 1/2
Surat,	6 1/2	7 1/2
Bengal,	5 1/2	6 1/2

The price of the East India cotton is generally in proportion to the above rates. I confess I cannot see why the Committee of Ways and Means should have made a distinction between the duty upon cotton yarn and cotton goods, making the former less than the latter; nor can I acquiesce in its necessity. The