[wo]llen, cotton, metal and earthen manufactures. It appears impossible that we could be supplied from the continent of Europe with these articles, when we could sell our own products at better prices, and obtain these goods on better terms, by exchanging the one for the other in the same market. The truth is that we get none of them. And why? Not because we have not money on the continent to purchase with, but because they are not to be had there.

I offer this as a general argument to meet the assertions of those gentlemen who say that we can be supplied elsewhere than from Britain.

It has more than once been alledged that we can get from Germany all the coarse woollen cloths that we require, and *Saxony* in particular has been mentioned as being capable of furnishing a large supply. I hold in my hand a newspaper containing an extract from a German periodical work. This extract has been published for the purpose of shewing that some statements heretofore made by me relative to the German manufactures were imperfect. I do not know that it is quite prudent to notice in the House, attacks made upon us in the newspapers, but as there is nothing personal in this, and it is said to contain historical facts, published at this moment for information, I will venture to examine it. What I shall read will be the extracts from the German work. It states that the "electorate of Saxony has about two millions of inhabitants. It contains 89 large and small towns, the inhabitants of which principally subsist by the manufacture of *wool*. The number of persons employed in the woollen manufactories are calculated at 85,000."

As Saxony has been selected, the presumption is that it is one of the most considerable manufacturing states in Germany, and as a fact of very great importance it is stated that 85,000 of its inhabitants are employed in manufacturing wool. Supposing the same proportion to exist throughout all Germany, between the whole population and that part of it engaged in the manufacture of wool it follows that less than one twentieth part are concerned in this branch. How then can the woollen manufactures in Germany bear a comparison with those of England? The counties in England in which the manufacture of wool is most *extensively* carried on, are Lancaster, York, Wilts, Gloucester, Somerset, Essex, & Devonshire, and I learn from a work of very high authority, Postlethwayt's Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce, that in the Parish of Halifax only, in Yorkshire, there are upwards of one hundred thousand persons employed in the manufacture of kerseys alone. If then in a single parish this great number of persons are engaged in manufacturing one species only of coarse cloths, what number may we imagine are employed in the woollen manufacture throughout England?—I find from the same authority that not less than *one million* are engaged in the manufacture of *fine cloths* only, and as those of a coarser kind are more extensively used, I think it fair to calculate that *two millions* at least, of the people of England are employed in the manufacture of woollen cloths. This is equal to one fourth of their whole population. What then is the consequence? It is this—that in England where one fourth of the people carry on the manufacture of wool, they can, not only supply their population of eight millions, but also have large quantities for exportation—while in Germany, where it is carried on by a twentieth part only, it is scarcely possible that they can export any, after supplying their own population of about twenty-six millions. I do not believe, however, that they do even supply their own population, and I think this is proved by an extract from the same German work, that I have just read from. "The British manufacturers (says this German author) "consider the Saxons as dangerous rivals. British agents by making large "purchases in shearing, raised the "price of fine wool in Saxony, in 1804, "19 per cent, and of the *coarser* kinds "between 60 and 70 per cent. They "endeavored to ruin the Saxon manufacturers, & almost succeeded. When "the coarsest wool costs from four to "five rix dollars, a piece of coarse "cloth was sold at 13 to 14 rix dollars. "Now the same wool costs by reason "of *British purchases* chiefly, 8 to 9 "dollars, the price of cloth ought, therefore, to be 30 rix dollars, but *importations from England*, keep it at 16 "to 18 rix dollars." What then are the facts disclosed in this extract? They are these, (and I consider them as deciding the question, as to the supply of cloths to be drawn from Germany); that the British manufacturers can go into Saxony, purchase up the Saxon wool, carry it to England, manufacture it into cloth, return with it again to Saxony, pay the duties with double insurance and double freight, and after all, can *undersell the Saxon manufacturer in his own market*. Again, sir, Postlethwayt, in his valuable work, says, that in Leipsic, one of the principal cities of Saxony, and certainly among the most commercial in Germany, at their fairs which are held twice or three times a year, an immense trade is carried on in *English cloths*. In addition to this, I will state farther, that a most respectable German House to whom I applied by letter, say in their answer, "from the best information, we can collect, we learn that the coarse cloths which are made in Germany, are generally of an indifferent quality, and not faithfully manufactured." Can it then be said, after a knowledge of these fact, that we can be supplied from Germany with those coarse cloths which we now get from England? The finer ones I believe may be had from France and Holland, but not those of a coarser kind.

Gentlemen speak of this resolution as going merely to a prohibition of luxuries; these I shall be willing to surrender as soon as any man. But, sir, the luxury of a substantial cloth coat in a cold winter's day, or a warm woollen blanket, in a cold winter's night, I do not wish to see denied to the people of this country. As to woollen blanckets, they manufacture none in Germany, except those which are called horse blankets. Those for household use, are all made of cotton, and how readily our habits can be accommodated to these, I am not prepared to say.

I have thus endeavored to shew, with what success, the committee must determine, that by adopting this resolution, we hazard a war; that the course of commerce, will be materially, suddenly, and, therefore, injuriously changed; that inasmuch as we canot procure from other countries many important articles with which Britain supplies us, the revenue will be much diminished; and that the value of our own products will be lessened to an incalculable amount. Having been a considerable time on the floor, I feel extremely exhausted, and will, therefore, close my remarks, although it was my wish to have said much more on this subject; particularly to point out the different effects to be produced by the adoption of the measure now under discussion, and that which was submitted by myself. To my own proposition, however, I am not exclusively attached. I have thought and do still think it the best which has been proposed. This I trust will be the opinion of the House. Believing the conduct of G. Britain towards this country, not to be justified, I am willing to unite in such measures, as may induce her to do us justice. But I will not go to the extent proposed in this resolution, because I am persuaded it will operate much more injuriously upon ourselves, than upon those whom we intend to affect by it.

(Debate to be continued)

WASHINGTON CITY.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16.

The Senate have consented to and advised the ratification of the TRIPOLITAN TREATY—The votes were—Yeas 21—Nays 8.

The Senate yesterday passed the bill, from the House of Representatives, prohibiting the importation of certain [British] goods, wares, and merchandise, without amendment—Yeas 19—Nays 9.

This bill only requires the signature of the President to become a law.

At an election for Governor of Massachusetts held on the 7th of April, the following votes were given:

	Strong.	*Sullivan.*
Boston	2503	1605

At the last election Boston gave 2587 votes for Strong, and 1258 for Sullivan—from which it appears that the change in that town in favor of republican principles has been considerable.

It likewise appears that in 66 towns, including Boston,

Mr. Strong has received	11,390
Mr. Sullivan	9,935
Majority	1,455
The same towns gave last year a majority to Mr. Strong of	1,695
Difference in favor of Sullivan—	240

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, APRIL 14.

Mr. J. Randolph said he was about to call the attention of the House to a subject, which he should not have probably have brought into view, but for the change wrought in the state of the revenue, in consequence of the peace concluded with Tripoli. Among the different articles from which monies were drawn, there was none so heavily burthened as salt; and it would be recollected that it was one of the necessaries of life, and an article the free use and consumption of which was of material importance to the agriculture of the country. Two acts had been passed laying a duty on this article. It was no new thing to wish—it was indeed extremely desirable—to diminish, if not to take off this duty;—and for that purpose he submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the committee of Ways and Means be instructed to enquire into the expediency of repealing so much of any act as lays a duty on salt, and to report such provision, as may in their opinion, be calculated to meet the deficiency occasioned by that repeal.

Mr. Thomas said, the committee of Ways and Means, of which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. J. Randolph) who has made the motion, was and still is chairman, were instructed, by this House, in the early part of last session, on a motion which he had the honor then to submit, to enquire into the expediency of reducing the duty on salt; and if he recollected right they were directed to report by bill or otherwise, but, from some cause or other, to him unknown, that committee had never yet made any report on that subject—courtesy might induce him to impute this neglect to the multiplicity of business put into the hands of the members of that committee.

He, Mr. T. always considered the duty on this article too high, and falling particularly heavy on the agricultural part of the community. It was now and always has been his wish to reduce it as soon as our revenue would permit, if consistent with the provisions made for paying off our national debt, and meeting the other exigencies of government—for his part he was at a loss, however, to discover that the present situation of our revenue, and the calls on government for expenditure, together with the present aspect of our foreign relations, warranted this measure more now than last year. It was true that the war with the Barbary powers up the Mediterranean had ceased, but it was also true, that the two and an half per cent additional duty on goods paying ad valorem duties, has likewise ceased with the peace concluded with Tripoli—This duty was laid for the support of, and was more then adequate to the expence of that war.

He repeated, that he was in favor of reducing the duty on salt, whenever we could part with so much of our revenue. He regretted, however, that the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Randolph) had not brought this subject up at an earlier period of the session when it might have been in our power to have examined into it, and if found practicable to have reduced the duty; but as the gentleman is himself chairman of the committee, and has it in his power to act on it immediately if he pleases, he hoped he, (Mr Randolph,) would obey the instructions of the House when predicated on his own motion, although he did not when instructed by a resolution submitted by him, Mr. T. and, therefore, he would vote for the resolution with an expectation that we shall, now at least, have a report on the subject.

Mr. J. Randolph, said he had but two or three words to offer on the subject of the motion said to have been offered during the last year on this point. He had a distinct recollection of such a motion having been offered; and he also recollected that he had told the mover of it, that it was not then possible to take off the duty upon salt, inasmuch as they had only the session preceding been compelled to raise additional revenue for the purpose of carrying on the Tripolitan war. He did not recollect whether the resolution had been agreed to by the House. But it would be recollected that during the latter part of the session the most active members of the committee of Ways and Means were almost exclusively engaged in conducting an impeachment depending before the other branch of the legislature. If the committee of Ways and Means had failed in their duty to make a report, the House would perceive that it was on one of those trivial motions, which had been made under circumstances that did not entitle it to respect. For when it was considered that they had recently been obliged to resort to new taxes for carrying on an existing war, it could not have been expected that they were in a situation to dispense with old ones. The reason why this resolution had not been brought forward at an earlier period of the session, Mr. R. said, was most obvious. He had not heard of the conclusion of peace with Tripoli till Saturday, and this was, therefore, the earliest occasion that offered for making it.

Mr. Chandler said he hoped the motion would prevail. He had himself contemplated making a similar motion.

Mr. Smilie likewise supported the motion.

Mr. Alston said he heartily concurred in the propriety of taking off the duty on salt; but he thought the House ought previously to know what equivalent could be brought forward. This subject had been thought of before this proposition had been submitted, and the continuation of the duty of two and a half per cent. had been considered an advisable substitute. He had no doubt that the duty on salt might be dispensed with, and that that he had referred to would answer as a substitute. But he had doubts of the propriety of the direction proposed to be given to this business. He thought this resolution, together with that offered by a gentleman from Massachusetts, should go hand in hand with each other—whether they went to the committee of the whole House, or to the committee of Ways and Means, was immaterial to him—that if one of these sources of revenue were given up, the other should be at the same time substituted in room of it. He said he did not know in what situation the resolution offered by the gentlemen from Massachusetts was, which he would wish to know before he voted on this resolution.

A member observed that the House had never agreed to consider it.

Mr. Thomas said, as the gentleman from Virginia appeared to have forgot that the committee of which he was chairman, were instructed to enquire into the expediency of reducing the duty on salt, in the early part of the last session, he wished the clerk to read that part of the journal. The resolution he said passed about the first of December.

Mr. J. Randolph said he certainly did not deny the existence of such a resolution. He had only observed that he did not recollect having received it from the Clerk.

The Clerk read the resolution offered last session by Mr. Thomas on the 7th of December, 1804, which was such as he had stated, and which appeared to have received the sanction of the House.

Mr. Alston then moved that the resolution should be referred to a committee of the whole, which, after a few words in opposition to such a mode of reference by Mr. Leib, was disagreed to—Ayes 22.

When the original motion obtained without a division.

The bill for the safeguard of merchant vessels in the vicinity of the United States, was read a third time.

Mr. Dana observed that the Yeas and Nays had been called on several occasions to shew the difference that subsisted in the House. He hoped they would be taken on this occasion to manifest their concurrence in opinion.

The Yeas and Nays were accordingly taken, and were—Yeas 87—Nays 5.

The bill for carrying into effect certain Indian treaties, was read a third time and passed.

Mr. J. C. Smith, from the committee of claims, made a report on the petition of Daniel Cotton, recommending its indefinite postponement, in which the House concurred.

The bill making appropriations for carrying into effect the treaty between the United States and the Chickasaw tribe of Indians, was read a third time.

Mr. Lyon declared himself against this bill, on account of the provisions contained in the third section, and moved a recommitment of the bill to a committee of the whole House, which was disagreed to—Ayes 28.

The question recurring on the passage of the bill,

Mr. Quincy objected to the provisions of the third section; which are as follows:

Sec. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That if any person shall make, or attempt to make, a settlement on any of the lands thus ceded by the Cherokees and Chickasaws, and lying within the Mississippi territory, or shall, unless authorised so to do by the surveyor of the public lands south of Tennessee, survey or attempt to survey such lands, or designate boundaries by marking trees or otherwise, such offender shall, on conviction thereof in any court of record of the United States, or of any of the territories of the same, forfeit a sum not less than dollars, nor exceeding dollars, and suffer imprisonment for a term not less than months, nor exceeding years: and it shall moreover be lawful for the President of the United States, and he is hereby required to employ such military force as he may judge necessary, to remove from the said lands any person who shall make, or attempt to make any settlement as aforesaid: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained, shall affect persons making settlements on lands purchased from the United States in conformity with the preceding section of this act.

Whereupon a short debate ensued, in which Messrs. Quincy and Lyon opposed, and Messrs. J. Randolph, J. Clay and Gregg supported the passage of the bill.

The former gentlemen opposed it on account of the preceding provisions, which they considered as calculated, by authorising the use of military force, to prevent the *legal* adjustment by judicial decision of claims under individuals pretending to have good title to a part of the country.

The latter gentlemen contended that the power gave to the President was not only just in itself, but absolutely necessary to prevent an intrusion on the lands of the United States by a particular description of the Yazoo claimants, who were represented as having formed the purpose of establishing an extensive settlement on them, and thus creating a force which would keep posession of the country in defiance of the laws of the United States.

The question was then taken by yeas and nays on the passage of the bill—Yeas 68—Nays 33.

A bill respecting claims to land in the Indiana territory and state of Ohio, was read a third time, and passed without a division.

A message was received from the Senate, stating that they had agreed to the resolution authorising the adjournment of the two Houses, with an amendment, fixing Monday next as the time of adjournment.

The House immediately took up this amendment.

Mr. J. Randolph moved to postpone its consideration till Saturday.

Mr. Conrad opposed this motion, which was disagreed to—Ayes 29.

When the amendment of the Senate obtained—Ayes 73.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole—Mr. GREGG in the chair—on the bill "supplementary to the act, intituled, "An act making provision for the redemption of the whole public debt of the United States."

Mr. Varnum considered the objects contemplated by this bill too important and the subject too abstruse, to be likely at so late a period of the session to command that attention they merited; and therefore moved that the committee should rise, with a view to postponing the farther consideration of the bill to the next session.

Messrs. Tallmadge and Quincy supported, and Messrs. J. Clay and J. Randolph opposed this motion, which was disagreed to—Ayes 32—Noes 42.

When the bill was considered by sections, and some progress made in it, when the committee rose, and obtained leave to sit again.

The following message was received from the President of the U. S.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the U. States.

During the blockade of Tripoli by the squadron of the U. S. a small cruizer, under the flag of Tunis, with two prizes, (all of trifling value) attempted to enter Tripoli, was turned back, warned, and attempting again to enter, was taken, and detained, as prize by the squadron. Her restitution was claimed by the Bey of Tunis, with a threat of war in terms so serious, that on withdrawing from the blockade of Tripoli, the commanding officer of the squadron thought it his duty to repair to Tunis with his squadron, and to require a categorical declaration whether peace or war was intended. The Bey preferred explaining himself by an ambassador to the U. S. who on his arrival, renewed the request that the vessel and her prizes should be restored. It was deemed proper to give this proof of friendship to the Bey, and the ambassador was informed the vessels would be restored. Afterwards he made a requisition of naval stores to be sent to the Bey in order to secure a peace for the term of three years, with a threat of war, if refused. It has been refused, and the ambassador is about to depart without receding from his threat or demand.

Under these circumstances, and considering that the several provisions of the act of March 25, 1804, will cease in consequence of the ratification of the treaty of peace with Tripoli, now advised and consented to by the Senate, I have thought it my duty to communicate these facts, in order that Congress may consider the expediency of continuing the same provisions for a limited time, or making others equivalent.

TH: JEFFERSON.

APRIL 14, 1806.

Referred to the committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. Gregg, from the committee on public lands, made a report, recommending the indefinite postponement of the petition of Ann D. West, William Fitzhugh, Joseph Jackson, and Bushrod Washington and Laurence Lewis.

TUESDAY, APRIL 15.

The Speaker laid before the House a report from the secretary of the treasury, transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures for the year 1804.

The House took up the amendment proposed by the Senate to the bill authorising a detachment of the militia, to substitute, in that part of the bill relative to the militia to be called into active service, "as the President in his discretion shall deem most proper"—in the room of "which from their local situation shall be deemed most convenient."

The House concurred in this amendment. The bill has consequently passed both Houses.

A bill, from the Senate, for regulating the time of holding the courts in the district of Columbia and for other purposes, was referred to a committee of the whole to-morrow.

This bill alters the time of holding the court in Washington county to the first Monday in June, and in Alexandria county to the 1st Monday in July—& makes some further provision for insolvent debtors.

On motion of *Mr. Masters* the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole, MR. VARNUM in the chair, on the bill "for fortifying the ports and harbors of the United States, and for building gunboats."

The first section was read as follows:

Section 1. That a sum of money not exceeding 150,000 dollars, in addition to the sums heretofore appropriated, shall be, and the same is hereby appropriated, to enable the President of the United States to cause the ports and harbors of the United States to be better fortified and protected.

M. D. R. Williams moved to strike out this section, which motion was disagreed to—Ayes 20.

Mr. Masters moved to strike out the sum of "150,000 dollars," for the purpose of inserting "500,000."

A division of the question having been called for; the question was put on striking out, and lost—Ayes 27.

Mr. Masters moved a new section—viz. that a sum, not exceeding be appropriated to enable the President of the U. S. to cause the ports and harbors of New-York to be better fortified and protected.

Mr. Smilie opposed this motion.

Mr. D. R. Wliams moved to amend the motion by adding Charleston after New-York.

Mr. Eppes movod to add Norfolk.

Mr. Early moved to add New-Orleans.

Mr. R. Nelson moved to add Baltimore.

Mr. Goldsborough moved to add George town.

Mr Quincy spoke at considerable length in favor of making a liberal appropriation for the fortification and protection of our ports and harbors.

Messrs. Dawson, Smilie, Sloan, and Lyon spoke against Mr. Masters's motion, which was disagreed to—Ayes 31.

Mr. Dawson stated that the fate of the frigate Philadelphia was well known, and added that the frigates Boston and General Green had been condemned as unfit for service. To supply the deficiency in the naval establishment, he offered a new section appropriating a sum not exceeding 500,000 dollars to enable the President to cause three additional frigates to be built.

Mr. Lyon moved to add, after *frigates*, or two seventy fours. This amendment was disagreed to—Ayes 23.

When the section offered by *Mr. Dawson* was likewise disagreed to—Ayes 40—Noes 54.

A new section, offered by *Mr. R. Nelson*, authorising the President to sell such of the national vessels as in his opinion shall be in such a situation, as to make it the interest of the U. S. not to repair the same, was agreed to—Ayes 63.

The committee then rose and reported the bill, which the House took into consideration.

Mr. J. Clay moved to strike out the first section.

Messrs. J. Clay, R. Nelson, and Bedinger supported; and Messrs. Dawson, Varnum, Gregg, Dana, and Elmer opposed this motion, which was disagreed to—Yeas 24—Nays 76.

Mr. Masters then moved to strike out "150,000," and insert "500,000" dollars. Motion disagreed to—Yeas 2[illegible]—Nays 71.