


54-3



0409

SOME *R*  
REFLECTIONS  
ON A  
Pamphlet,  
INTITLED,  
*England and East-India*  
*Inconsistent in Their*  
*Manufactures.*

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed Anno MDCXCVI.

1  
11

SOME  
REFLECTIONS  
ON A

**Damphlet,**

INTITULED,

*England and East India Incon-*  
*sistent in Their Manufactures.*

**I**T would require more time than I have at present to spare in Writing, and I fear, more than the Lords and Commons in Parliament Assembled can now well spare, in deliberately Reading and Considering all that might be said on this Subject, and particularly in Replying to what has been Answered to a Treatise, Intituled, *An Essay on the East-India Trade*; and the Author thereof, though no Trader, has written

on the Point, with so much solid Judgment, that he is well able to defend it, if he thinks any thing considerable that is offered against what he has laid down. My Business at present shall be only to take notice of what seems to carry any weight in the last Answer to the *Essay*. In a former, Intituled, *An Answer to a late Tract, Intituled, An Essay, &c.* the Author ingenuously confesses, in his Address to the *Clothiers and Weavers*, That he has not strength of Judgment to manage Controversies; which he has in his Answer fully enough proved, tho', I think, he gives but little Proof for the Cause he has undertaken; and almost his whole Book consists of Quotations out of the *Essay*, and offers of overthrowing the Computations made in the *Essay*, which he intirely mistakes. So that upon the whole, that Answer has little in it, as they who will take the trouble of sedately Reading and Comparing one with the other will find. The last Answer is more regular, and looks more plausible, but being Examined will not, I think, with submission, appear to carry any great weight, and will be found to contain many Mistakes.

The Author asserts, *That it has been said formerly by the Advocates for the East-India Trade, That their Manufactures and Toyes were*

( 5 )

*were not spent in England, but Transported to Foreign Markets, and thereby occasioned the Importation of more Bullion than ever was Exported; and that therefore that Trade was no damage to England; but that the Truth is now owned, That half of the said Goods are consumed at Home, which, he says, was formerly denied.* But he ought to have given more Proof thereof then only saying so, before he had grounded such an insinuation thereon; as if what is said in Defence of the *East-India Trade* needed to be supported with Falsities. For my part, I believe there has been no other Argument made use of in its behalf, but what was then, and is still true, That the *East-India Trade* is the means of bringing much more Bullion into *England* than it carries out; which I shall endeavour to prove. And I must deny what he asserts also in the beginning, That the *India Manufactured Goods* do hinder the Consumption of what are Fabrickt by our own People to that degree, or in that sense, which he suggests. But with the Author I do agree, That the Landed Men are more concerned in this Contest than the *Weavers*: For if the Proposed Prohibition pass it will only enrich a few Master *Silk Weavers*, and their Factors, and at the same time take away the Means

of Increasing the Stock of the Nation, which alone can raise the Value of the Lands of *England*. I go on therefore to consider the *East-India* Trade.

The Author of the Answer, *pa* 4. finds fault with the Computation of our Exports to *India*, and the Profit upon the Returns, and offers another Account, which I conceive very Erroneous, at least it is far from warranting the Conclusion he draws, *That this Trade has exhausted 400000 l. per Annum of our Treasure, pa. 6.* which shall be examined presently; in the mean time, I can by no means agree with him, That nothing is the Treasure of a Nation but Gold and Silver. The Treasure of a Nation not only consists in Money, but in Monneys worth. Silver and Gold serve as the measure of other Commodities, and is valuable only in proportion to them. Jewels, Lead, Tin, Iron, Silks, Woollen Goods, Shipping, &c. ought to be Valued according to their worth; that is, what they would yield in Money; and all go to make up the Riches and Stock of a Nation. The Nation that has in it Five Millions of Pounds Sterling Silver, and Ten Millions worth of any Goods or Commodities whatsoever one Year, and the next Year shall have Eight Millions of Money, and but Four Millions worth

worth of Goods, is poorer the last Year than the former, by Three Millions. If it were as the Answerer says, *That Goods are not the Riches of a Nation, till by Exportation to Foreign Countries they are converted into Gold and Silver.* No more then is Money Riches; for you are not sure you shall purchase with that whatever you have occasion for. There is no other use of Riches but to purchase what serves our Necessity and Delight, or to enable us to preserve our Possessions when they are gotten; and some Goods are more acceptable in some Countries, at some times, than Money, and therefore are as well adapted to answer the aforesaid ends, tho' as the Author sayes, they are not so convenient for Trade; and whether they are perishable or not, their Value is according to what they will yield in Money.

I think it does not concern the Truth of the Proposition, That the *East-India* Trade is Beneficial to the Nation, (though as to the *quantum* it may) whether the Computation in the *Essay* be exact or no, nor to examine the Grounds of the Answerers Account; though, by the way, I must note, that the last Answerer, *pa. 7.* as well as the former, *pa. 14.* quite mistakes, in saying the *Essay* asserts, *That the Nation did increase in Riches from Anno 1656 to Anno 1688, Two*

( 8 )  
*Millions per Annum*; and upon that Mistake both seem to triumph: But if they had perused the said Treatise more carefully, they would have found, that the Author of the *Essay* only says, *That he believes from about Anno 1656 to Anno 1688, this Nation has every Year gradually increased in Riches*: And that about Anno 1688, the increase and addition to the Wealth and general Stock of England, arising from Foreign Trade and Home Manufactures, was at least Two Millions Yearly. Which intimates only that about that time there was such an Increase, and not Yearly from Anno 1656. So that all the Answerer says, on that Mistaken Head, falls to the Ground.

I shall therefore leave both the Accounts, because I think the certainty of the Sum does not so much concern the Point in question, as the Proportion; and I will take the Matter both ways: First, Suppose that One Thousand Pounds be sent out to *India*  $\frac{1}{8}$  to  $\frac{1}{4}$  part in Goods, it will be allow'd me on all hands, that the Value of about Four Thousand Pounds, that is, Four for One more or less, shall be Returned in *Indian Silks, &c.* If all these should be spent at Home, yet is not the Thousand Pounds lost to *England*, because the said Commodities serve in the room, either of others that  
 are

( 9 )  
 are much dearer made at Home, and must else have been used in their stead, or of others from *European Countries*, which also come much dearer: So that here is Three Fourth Parts Additional Return, out of which the Shipping, and Provision, and Furniture, and Seamens Wages, and others employed therein, the Customs and Overplus is a clear Advantage to the Nation. But to this the Answerer, and others, who plead for the Prohibition, say, *What Foreign Commodities are spent in the Nation, add nothing to its Stock*: And at the same time acknowledge, That what is spent at Home of our Manufacture adds nothing neither to the Nations Stock; which is true: Only say they, *By wearing your own Manufacture you employ your own People*. But if the Case be, as is owned by all, that we want People for our Work; and not Work for our People, then the bringing in Foreign Manufactures at half the Price we can make them here at Home, whilst at the same time we can find Employment for our People, we by that Means save so much Money. This I take to be very clear. And the only Question is then, What other Employment we have for our People? And the Answerer says in *pa. 24.* and again in *pa. 31.* that it should have been told: Whereas  
 the

the *Essay*, pag. 36, 37. does give sufficient Hints, to which I shall add, That we want Seamen, we want Hands in the *West-Indies*, we want Husbandmen, we want many more Hands in the Woollen Manufacture that it might be wrought Cheaper, and carried on to such a degree as it is capable to be improved; and the Linnen Manufacture which the Answerer thinks may do well here in time will employ more hands; not to mention the Fishery and other things.

That there are many *Weavers* now that want work, I believe, and so there is of many other Trades: This tedious War falls heavier upon some than others, and when Persons enter into a Trade they must be content to take their Fortune in it. Some thrive most in time of Peace, and some in time of War. But what was it increased the number of *Weavers* so much? Was it not a good Trade which they had even at the time when *East-India* Goods came in in greatest plenty, and were sold at half the Price they now are, as the Answerer also owns pag. 33. and did not the Trade visibly fall off last Summer, when there was the greatest Scarcity of *East-India* Goods that has been known for many Years? The Seamen who have encreased in their numbers this War time, when it is over, may as well Mutiny if  
Goods

Goods and Passengers are permitted to come and go by Land Carriage, and not by Sea; or that one fourth part of their number in *English* Ships are by the Act of Navigation allowed to be Foreigners, because they are now become Seamen, and when Peace comes there may not be employment for them all, and some must starve, or turn their Hands to something else, but this complaint I believe would not be countenanced, and it seems as unreasonable now upon the complaint and uneasiness of the *Weavers* to Ruin a great number of People whose livelihood depends not only on the fetching and vending these *India* Goods, but in the further Manufacturing them here at home for their sake and advantage whose present want of Work, is apparently not occasion'd by the late coming in of *India* Goods, but by the dearness of Silk, the alteration of the Coyn, and Calamities of the War, and the Distress brought upon a great many Families by it. This as to what *East-India* Goods are spent at Home.

Then as to the Computation of what *East-India* Goods are Exported to Foreign Markets, whether it be one half or no is not much material: All Merchants know that a considerable quantity goes abroad, and even to *France* it self, though they, as we, do not  
openly

openly permit them to be brought in by any other Nation than their own. In this Case then, if only one quarter part goes abroad, that being the prime cost in *India* upon the aforementioned supposition; the other three fourths remaining to be spent in *England* is clear gains to the Nation, and the hands that would have been employed to make such things as are supplied by the *East-India* Goods, by that means are or might be used in other Work, which turns to the Profit of the Nation.

The Answerer says, *pag. 9.* That it does not appear that 200000 *l.* worth *per annum* of *East-India* Goods were ever Exported to *Spain*, or any Country from whence we usually Import Bullion; and thereby seems to insinuate as if it were not the same thing whether we send them to *Spain* from whence Bullion comes, or to *Holland* or *France* from whence it comes more seldom: But surely he understands that our general ballance of Trade and the Profit made by it, is to be made as the general Ballance of a Private Trader. If by the Course of our Trade to *Holland*, we take more Goods than we send, and so want Money there, we must send the ballance from hence in *Specie*, or have it remitted thither from *Spain* or some other parts where we have Effects. So that  
if

if upon the general Trade of *England* to all Parts, we Export a greater value than we Import, the rest comes in in Bullion; and on the contrary, if our Imports exceed our Exports, the ballance must be sent out in Money. So that let our *East-India* Goods be sent to what place soever, their produce will be answered to us in Money at long run, if our other Trades do not require that Money abroad; for all Goods now in all parts of *Europe* are sold for Money. And if I send *East-India* Goods to *Holland*, I receive Money for them, and may bring it over if I will; but if others upon their Trade for Goods from thence, or the King for payment of the Army, want the Money there, I deliver it to them, and receive it here; and to this purpose serves the *Exchange*. I think what has been said, clearly removes the Objections *pag. 9, 10.*

The Answerers, I think, both mistake the *Essay* as to the Profit made by the *East-India* Trade, which they seem to take as meant so much Profit to the Company, whereas it is plain it is intended so much advance to the Nation; as in the said *Essay*, *pag. 52.* it is expressed, That into that advance comes in the King for his Customs, Owners of Ships, such as got by victualing them, Seamen for Wages, and lastly  
Factors

Factors and Servants both Abroad and at Home. And so distinguishes between the Gain made by the Company, and the increase to the Nation. So that all the Answerers Observations drawn from thence are to no purpose.

The Answerers and Favourers of this Prohibition make a great cry, as if the Woollen Manufacture is prejudiced by these Goods; whereas the Woollen Manufacture has great advantage by it on sundry Accounts.

1. A great quantity of Woollen Manufacture, and our Native Product, is Exported to the *East-Indies*; and at *China*, which is a cold Country, they like our Woollen Goods, and the Expence thereof is like greatly to encrease, if we our selves be not the hinderance.

2. It keeps the Workers of Wooll to their own Employment, which they would else in probability leave, and turn to the Silk-Weaving Trade as some have done.

3. The Freedom of Trade here causes People to Flock into *England*, whereby the Expence of our own Product and Manufacture is increased: Our Wooll needs not Fall to nothing as the Answerer says, *Page 17.* to keep on our Woollen Manufacture, but Wooll may bear a good Price, if the working it up be Cheap as it ought to be, and as every one

one agrees, and as the Committee of Trade in their answer to the Honourable House of Commons have very well observed, and then there's no fear of loosing our Woollen Manufacture, but I am afraid that will not be the way to have Wooll wrought up cheap to employ the Hands that should do it, in other Manufactures, and it is a sign we want people and not work, since the price of Labour and Servants Wages is no where in *Europe* so dear as in *England*.

The Answerer by what he said, *pag. 17.* about Wooll led me to that head before it came regularly on according to the Answerers Order and Method, but this was not designed a full, exact, and methodical Discourse for the reasons mentioned at the beginning. However I shall not need to repeat any thing, only shall further add, That when those who are of Opinion with me say, *That it is not the Interest of the Landed Gentlemen that Wooll should be dear*; the Answerer, as many others have done, mistook, when they suggest, that we do not think it most for the advantage of land for Wooll to be dear, if the expence would continue as great and the Price keep up, but our meaning is that it is not the Interest of Landed Men to raise their Wooll for a Year or two to a High Price, whereby the Expence would be lessened,



sened, because the Consequence would be, that then it would fall much lower than before; and therefore all that is intended by not desiring Wooll to be dear is, that it is best to be kept at such a moderate Price as may not discourage the Working it up; and that being Wrought up, it might come so Cheap to Foreign Markets, that others might not under-sell us, and so lessen its future Vent.

The Answerer is mistaken in his Assertion, *pa. 21. That the generality of Merchants will own that they have not got by Trading in Woollen Goods for these Thirty Years past 6 per Cent. per Annum, the Insurance of Adventures paid*: The contrary whereof many Merchants know; and greater Profit might be made thereby, if our Wooll was Manufactured Cheaper: and the way to have that done, is not to draw off our People from that Employment to other Manufactures: For, the Poor, if Two Dayes work will maintain them, will not work Three: And our Manufactures are never so well Wrought as in a time of dull Trade, when we pay less for Workmanship, and yet the Poor live as well then as in time of greatest Plenty, if they have but a full stroke of Work. And it is too true what an Advocate for the Weavers in-  
genuously

genuously confessed before the Honourable House of Commons, *That in times of Plenty (which is when the Price of Work is high) they will spend the more in Drinking, and thereby indeed increase the Kings Revenue, whatever the other ill Consequences of it are.*

The Answerer *pa. 21.* desires to know in what places we can consume more Woollen Goods Abroad; and I must acquaint him that very often in *Germany, Holland, Portugal, Spain, Italy and Turkey*, as well as in the *West-Indies*, our Woollen Goods are scarce, and therefore sold dear, and much more would vend if they were upon the place, and yet more considerable quantities if we could afford them Cheaper; which might be done by the Method the Author of the *Essay* proposes, *pa. 27.* And whereas the Answerer says, *pa. 21. That the Manufactures of Wooll are increased in Ireland, Holland, France, Germany, Spain, and Portugal, and our Manufactured Goods become a Drugg beyond Sea.* It is more than probable that the taking off our People from the Woollen Manufactory to other Manufactures, has been in a great measure the occasion of it. I confess I wonder to find the Answerer call it a Project, to work up our Woollen Manufactures Cheap, and to  
B doubt

doubt whether that would increase their Expenſe Abroad, to the leſſening of that of other Nations. I wiſh there had been no more uncertain Projects ſet on foot in Trade in this Kingdom, and then, I am apt to think, our Trade would have been in a better condition. I think the Project of Ruining immediately a great number of Traders, and others, that depend upon the *East-India* Trade, and putting the Nation to 3 or 400000 *l. per Annum* certain greater Expenſe than at preſent it is at, and running the hazard of loſing all, or the greateſt part of our *East-India* Trade, only to employ People at Home in a Silk Manu- factory that would be with more Profit to the Nation employed in the Woollen Manu- factory, is by far the more dangerous and doubtful Project. The Inſtance which the Anſwerer brings, *pa. 23.* of a Country Gentleman that hath all Conveniences about his Houſe of his own, and ſhould inſtead of uſing them for himſelf and Family, ſend his Money to Market to buy, and then ſend his Products Abroad in hopes of making Money of them, though he do not know of any Market or Buyer for them, will prove juſt the contrary of what he intends it for, if it be rightly applyed to our Caſe; for it is certainly the Country Gentlemans Inter-  
reſt

reſt ſo to do, if he can buy at Market what will ſerve himſelf and Family for half the Money for which he can ſell his own Products; which is plainly our Caſe: For we never want ſome Price or other for our Product and Manufacture. And if we can ſell them dearer to others than we can in their room purchaſe other Neceſſaries, it is a clear Profit to us.

The Anſwerer does again, *pa. 23, 24.* as he often does beg the Queſtion, when he ſayes, *That we ſpend Indian Goods at Home that we may ſave our Woollen Goods to have the more for Exportation.* We ſay that the *Indian* Goods do very little interfere with our Woollen Manufacture; and by the bringing in of *Indian* Goods more of our Woollen Manufacture, which goes towards the Purchaſing of them, is conſumed, then would be at Home in their ſtead: And the Anſwerer himſelf, *pa. 25.* acknowledges, that the Conſumption of our *English* Cloth was never underſtood to be much prejudiced by theſe Goods. And then again he takes up the Miſtake of very great Gain made by the *East-India* Trade, taking it in another ſenſe than the *Essay* intends; and his Suppoſitions drawn from thence need not therefore to be conſidered.

The Answerer, *pa.* 25. and elsewhere, seems angry, without Reason, that the *Dutch* are quoted in this Controversie. Tho' they are our Allies, they alone are our chief Competitors in the *East-India* Trade : And if they never had done any thing to supplant us in any part of our Trade, we should have the less Reason to be jealous ; but since their and our Interest in Trade is distinct, if not opposite, I think he shows himself no great Friend to *England* that will not calmly admit the *English* to argue on that Head ; and it is so natural and necessary a Consideration to the *English* in all Foreign Trade, that I wonder any one should be frightned at the mention of it, as the Answerer seems to be, *pa.* 25.

Upon the second Head, *pa.* 26, 27. the Answerer again mistakes the *Essay*, when he says, *Silks and Linnen Manufactured in India are no more the genuine Off-spring of this Kingdom, than our Silks and Linnen Manufactured at Home* : For I take that to be a Mistake in any one that writes, when by his Answer he perverts the design and meaning of him he answers. The *Essay* did not, as it seems plain to me, intend to oppose *English* Silks to *Indian* Silks, as if the latter were more the genuine Off-spring of this Nation than the former, as the Answerer

swerer seems to take it ; but he opposes *English* Silks and Linnen to *English* Woollen Manufacture, and thence argues, with great Reason, that the Woollen Manufacture ought above, and before all other Manufactures to be encouraged.

How it can ruin young Gentlemen (as the Answerer alledges, *pa.* 28.) to spend Foreign Product that cost them but half the Price, rather than our own, which costs at least double, I own is a Paradox to me ; and I think there is nothing of boldness in the attempt, to perswade the whole Nation to do the like, whilst our own will find vent Abroad, and our People Employment enough at Home, as they may certainly do.

*Pa.* 28. and 29. Again he falls to arguing upon his old Mistake, of the Gains of the *East-India* Trade, being 300 per Cent. and asks why the Author of the *Essay* does not propose the opening the *East-India* Trade? A Subject he was not upon. I may as well ask, why the Answerer does not in his Discourse give Arguments to oppose a General Naturalization, if he thinks our People want work.

What the Answerer says about the Linnen Manufacture, *pa.* 30. I pass over, because I would not lengthen out this Discourse ; and cannot allow what he says,

( 22 )  
 pa. 31. *That the original or chief cause or means of Riches must be from the Labour of our People.* By which, without doubt, he means the Labour of the Hand; for it is evident, that a People may grow Rich without much of such Labour. It is the Product of the Earth, and the well and advantageous Management of Trade in and to Foreign Parts, that is a means and great means of enriching a Nation. I confess if a Nation be well Peopled, imploying the Poor in Manufactures rather than to live in Idleness is an addition to the Riches of a Nation; for what any one, or any number of Persons get more than they spend, adds so much to the Stock and Riches of the Nation: And if 10000 People living in *England* could get more at the Years end by driving a Trade from *Holland* to the *East-Country* and back to *Holland*, then the same 10000 People could get by Working, or Manufacture, it is more the Interest of the Nation, and a greater increase to its Riches, that these People continue that Foreign Trade (whilst their Gains come over to *England*, as it must do) then to imploy them in Manufactures. Nay, if they Trade only with Money, and the *Dutch* (if I may not offend the Answerer with naming them) will find at the winding up their Account, that

( 23 )  
 that the Money they have during this War sent over hither, and Lent the Government, and otherwise, at excessive Interest, will bring a considerable addition to the Riches of their State without the Exporting their Product for it, or the Labour of their People.

What the Answerer argues under the Third Head, I think has not much in it, only the continual cry of sending out Money to the *East-Indies*; which is taken notice of before; and he, or any other, that will take the pains but to make up an Account in Figures (and not loofely in their Heads by speculation, which causes many Mistakes) will find that 10000 *l.* sent out in Specie to the *East-Indies*, and Returned in Goods to the value of 40 or 50000 *l.* and those Goods Exported, or but one quarter part of them (though much more of them are sent out) and the rest used here at Home in the room of others to be Imported from Abroad, or in the room of others made here in *England*, whilst our Hands may be otherwise imployed than in the Silk Manufactury, as certainly they may, though our People were double. I say, they will find that this is a certain Increase, even to the Money in Specie to the Nation. But it has been asserted in Tracts concerning this matter,

( 24 )

and the truth is as has been before-mentioned, that the Importation of these *East-India* Silks for wear in *England*, as well as for Exportation, has bettered the Trade of the *Silk-Weavers*, by lowering the Price of Silk, and whetting their Industry and Inventions, and on many other Accounts. But this, and many Arguments brought on the side of those who are against a Prohibition, the contrary Party are pleased to take no notice of.

The Answerer commends the frugality of the *Dutch*, and no doubt it is a commendable thing, but where People grow Rich, they will spend more largely, and it is better they should do so than to slacken their Industry and Diligence in Trade. When the *Dutch* come once to enjoy their great Increase in a long Peace, you will find them extravagant in one kind of Expence or another as well as other Nations, but it would swell this beyond my intention to enlarge on this Head, therefore I will only add, that in discoursing of this the Answerer I think would have done well to have told what the *Essay* desires to know why upon the same, and much stronger Reasons we don't prohibit Wine, Fruit, Spice, &c. but indeed three quarter parts of the *Essay* and the Reasons there set down are left unanswered, and therefore I shall not I hope be blamed in not  
Re-

( 25 )

Replying particularly to every Passage in the Answer, though I think whatever is material will have been Considered in what has been said before, and what will be Subjoyn'd before I end.

The Answerer again *Page, 56, 57.* again asserts what he should have proved, that we send out 600000 *l. per Annum* in Bullion, and it has never yet been made out that those Goods bring us back again in Bullion the Value of 200000 *l.* and then Argues upon it; whereas all Traders in the Exportation of *India* Goods know the Fact to be quite otherwise, and therefore not to swell this too much I shall only add some Articles which the Opposers of this Prohibition offered to the most Honourable House of Lords to prove upon Oath before them, and distinguish between what part of them the *Weavers* Advocates in their Printed Answer allowed, and what part they Contradicted, though the Persons Concerned are yet ready to prove and make out the whole.

1. That near half the Wollen Manufacture sent to *India*, is vended at *China*, *Surrat*, *Fort St. George*, and the *Bay of Bengal*, as well as at *Persia*, and is used for Covering of Rooms, Tents, Covers for Camels, and abundance of other uses, as well as Garments;

ments; And that the *Indians* like our Manufacture so well, that the Vent thereof is Daily increasing, and the Goods proposed to be Prohibited, are in great part the Product of the said Woollen Manufacture.

2. That the Value of One Hundred Thousand Pounds per Annum, in Woollen Manufacture, and other the product of England, has actually been Exported to India.

3. That a great Quantity of Money is sent to *Turkey* to help off our Woollen Manufacture, as well as to *India*.

4. That in *Holland* there are many more Looms going than in England, and notwithstanding they have a Manufacture of their own much nearer to the *Indian* than we, yet they not only Import these Goods from *India* themselves, but permit them to be Imported into *Holland* from all other Parts.

5. That the *Weavers* in *Holland*, some Years since, Petitioned the *States* to make such a Prohibition as is Proposed here: But upon a full Hearing of the Matter, it was rejected.

6. That the *French* have mightily Courted the Trade from *India*, and Settled the Company Trading thither, with great Advantages; and in *France* these Goods are every where Publickly Sold and Worn: So that either there is no such *Edict* in *France*, as is pretended, or it is Dispensed withal, or some New *Edict* has been since emitted.

7. That

7. That the *Weavers* had a good Trade here in *England*, and increased in their Numbers, whilst these *East-India* Goods came over in greatest plenty, and when they were sold at half the Prices they are now at; and there is at present a Duty of 20 per Cent. upon them more than was then.

8. That it is not the Importation of these Goods which decays their Trade, if it be Bad, but the Calamity of the War, Alteration of the Coyn, and Scarcity of Money, which equally affects other Trades. For that upon the Alteration of the Coyn, our *Weavers* Goods fell in their Prizes, and their Work fell off; whilst at the same time *East-India* Goods being scarce, grew dearer and dearer.

9. That at this present Time, at *Norwich* they begin to have a brisk Trade, and their Goods are Risen 10 per Cent. lately, and in great Demand, notwithstanding the Companies late Sale of *Silks*, which they Complain of.

10. That though *Mercers* bespeak Goods of the *Weavers*, the *Weavers* will not make them, but keep their Men out of Work, that they may Clamour for this Bill.

11. That it is only the *Silks-Weavers* that are concerned in this Matter, and not the Staple *Woollen-Manufacture*, which this Bill will rather lessen and obstruct than promote;

( 28 )

mote: So that the Clamour about the *Woollen* Manufacture is all out of doors in this Case. For if this Bill pass, many *Weavers* of *Wooll* would turn to be *Silk-Weavers*, as some already have.

12. That the *Weavers* concerned in this *Affair* are nothing near so Numerous as is pretended: And, That the *Linnen-Drapers*, and other Trades depending thereon, who would be Hurt by this Prohibition, are as Numerous, as those who would receive Benefit by it.

13. That the *Indian Wrought Silks* are very much Improved here by a further Manufacturing; and great Numbers of our People Employed therein.

14. That the Poverty and Misery amongst the *Weavers* is very much misrepresented; and that it is no greater, in proportion, with them, than amongst other sort of poor Trading People.

15. That notwithstanding all, the *Master Weavers* have in few Years last past got great Estates, and continue to Thrive well.

16. That if *East-India Silks* are Prohibited, and not those from *Holland, France and Italy, and other Parts*, We shall only Wear the latter in the room of the former, to the far greater Expence of the Nation.

17. That

( 29 )

17. That if this Bill pass, these Goods will be made and imitated in *Holland* so like, that it will be impossible (when Sold here) for the *Drapers* to prove they are not *East-India* Goods.

18. That great Quantities of these Goods are sold for Exportation to *Cadiz, Lisbon, the Canaries, Maderas*, and other Foreign Parts, under the Value of 50 l.

19. That if this Bill pass for Prohibiting the Selling and Wearing *Persian Silks*, it is probable the *Persians* will Prohibit Our Manufactory, which will not only affect the *East-India*, but also the *Turkey Trade*.

20. That a Ship lately in *China* could not put off our Manufactory without taking their Manufactory: And that if this Bill passes, we shall probably lose the Trade for *Saltpetre*, as well as the other part of the Trade to *India*.

I would not alter any thing from these Articles as they were deliver'd to the Lords and offer'd to be proved, only in the second, after *Woollen Manufactory*, is added, And other the Product of England, which was by oversight omitted before, but alters not the Case, for that *Tin, Lead*, and such like is as well a Manufactory of England as *Woollen* Goods; and you have the Articles, or such part of them as the Friends of the Bill in their Printed Paper deny, Printed in an *Italic* Letter,

( 30 )

Letter, to distinguish them from the other Articles, and such part of them as they allow. And I shall only add, That I wish the Lords or Commons would be pleased now or hereafter, to give an opportunity to have the whole matter publickly discuss'd before them, and to have such things enquired into as would give the best light to make a Judgment thereof, I should not doubt but it would plainly appear, That they are very wrong Notions of Trade that are advanced in favour of this bill. And that the *East-India* Trade, and particularly this part of it, is of very great advantage to this Kingdom. Nay, if our *Silk Weavers* should have twice the Work they have usually had, they would encrease soon to twice the Numbers, which would not only as is said before draw them from Employments more Beneficial to the Nation, but upon any sudden Emergency, as War, &c. their Numbers being encreased, their distress would be also encreased.

F I N I S.