

# THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

VOLUME VIII.

"REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER."

NUMBER 3.

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY, AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. O. & H. P. GOODRICH.

## TOWANDA:

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1846.

(From Chambers' Journal.)  
Light for All.

You cannot pay with money  
The million sons of toil—  
The sailor on the ocean,  
The peasant on the soil,  
The laborer in the quarry,  
The heaver of the coal;  
Your money pays the hand,  
But it cannot pay the soul.

You gaze on the cathedral,  
Whose turrets meet the sky,  
Remember the foundations  
That in earth and darkness lie,  
For, were not these foundations  
So darkly resting here,  
You would never soar up  
So proudly in the air.

The workshop must be crowded  
That the palace may be bright,  
If the plough did not plough  
Then the poet could not write.  
Then let every toil be hallowed  
That man performs for man,  
And have its share of honor  
As a part of one great plan.

See, light darts down from Heaven,  
And enters where it may;  
The eyes of all earth's people  
Are cheered with one bright day,  
And let the mind's true sunshine  
Be spread o'er earth's fields,  
And fill the souls of men  
As waters fill the sea.

The man who turns the soil  
Need not have an earthly rival;  
The digger and the coal  
Need not have a spirit hind.  
The mind can shed a light  
On each worthy labor done,  
As lowest things are bright  
In the radiance of the sun.

The tailor, eye, the cobbler,  
May lift their heads as men—  
Better far than Alexander,  
Could he wake to life again,  
And thinking of his bloodshed,  
(And all for nothing, too,  
And ask himself—"What made He  
As useful as a shoe!")

What cheers the musing student?  
The poet, the divine?  
The thought that for his followers  
A brighter day will shine,  
Let every human laborer  
Enjoy the vision bright—  
Let the thought that comes from heaven  
Be spread like heaven's own light.

Ye men that hold the pen,  
Rise like a band inspired,  
And poets let your lyres  
With hope for man be fired;  
Till the earth becomes a temple,  
And in every human heart  
Shall join one great service,  
Each happy in his part.

HE IS ONLY A MECHANIC.—How frequent is the remark made by small aristocratic snobs, who have nothing to recommend themselves save their money and impudence, when the name of an honest intelligent mechanic happens to be mentioned in their presence. They consider it degrading to associate with those who do not, like themselves, possess wealth in the most respectable manner. Nothing is so disgusting to well-bred, well-informed people, as to hear an ignorant, conceited, puffed up, long hair, brainless, impudent dandy, talk about mechanics, as if they were no better than horses.

Notre lady or gentlemen would be guilty of such silliness. It is only spoiled beauty—the worthless, contemptible, soap-lock who would do so. Show us the man of the woman who would consider it a disgrace to associate with honest, well informed mechanics, and we will show you a poor, worthless, ignorant creature—worse to himself and the world, and a disgrace and encumbrance to his friends.—West. Lit. Messenger.

Don't know his own Son.—There is a good story told of Jarvis, the painter. Starting one day, with two or three companions, for a spree, the ever observing eye of the painter was attracted by some boys, actively engaged at play, and particularly one of those "born to rule" who was leading in their evolutions. "Come here my man," cried Jarvis, "what is your name?" "My name is John, and I am not your man," quickly answered the boy. "John? why that is my name," said Jarvis, "what is your other name?" "Weasley," said John. "John Weasley?" that is my name too. Any more names? the more the merrier. "Jarvis," said the boy. "Jarvis? John Weasley Jarvis! Why, who is your father?" was the earnest inquiry. "He's Jarvis, the painter, and mother says he's a very bad man, too."

A Word to the Wise.—The manufacturers should be greatly obliged to the North American, and other Whig papers, for their vigorous labors to create a panic. No men will suffer more by such a state of things than these very manufacturers. We think our neighbor will hardly succeed in his praiseworthy efforts.—The country is prosperous and happy, and though he may toil for weeks, we think he will scarcely be able to accomplish his wishes.—Pennsylvania.

What is it that pays less, in proportion to the amount of cultivation, than any thing else? It is "give it up." Whiskers!

## THE TARIFF

(From the Washington Union.)  
The Confessions of the Manufacturers.

We find in the Intelligence of this morning a column of correspondence in relation to the new tariff, and to Mr. Webster's proposed amendment of it, which we deem important and remarkable enough to be laid at length before our readers. The letters of the manufacturers and of Mr. Webster clearly establish, in the first place, that the protectionists reject the idea of a compromise between the tariff system embodied in the act of 1842, and that which is maintained in the act of 1846. Messrs. Chambers and Davis say that Mr. Webster's proposed amendment, "retained all the principles and all the regulations of the act of 1842."—Mr. Webster himself, in his reply, is equally explicit. He says "this amendment neither attacks nor abandons the principles of the policy of the act of 1842. On the contrary, it retains all the principles of that important law, and maintains its whole policy." This statement covers the whole ground. The protectionists go for the law of 1842, principles, policy, and all. The friends of the new tariff think those principles and that policy objectionable and unjust; and hereupon issue is joined.

What is meant by the advocates of the tariff of 1842, when they speak of its "principles and its policy?" They do not mean its rates of duty, it appears; because, while intending to retain all the "principles and policy" of the law, they propose to change its rates of duty. Now, besides these rates of duty, the law of 1842 presents two other leading and characteristic features. They are the specific principle, and the minimum principle—the principle, that is, of taxing, in some cases, articles according to their quality, and not according to their value, and the principle of affixing, in other cases, a false value to an article by law, in order thereby to tax it more heavily. These are the "principles" and the "policy" which the whigs seek to retain in our revenue system.

Now the first remark which occurs in relation to these two principles is, that they are wholly self-contradictory. The first principle denies that the tax should pay any regard to the value. The second principle recognizes value as the basis of taxation, and only claims that the law shall make that value enormously false, for the purpose of levying in an underhand way a tax two or three hundred per cent. higher than the country would endure if it were laid openly. And in support of such principles, they claim, should be permanent in our revenue system! And, be it observed, that the law of 1842 levies these specific and minimum duties just where they are not needed. The minimums, as being the greater outrage upon reason and justice, are applied to those forms of cotton manufacture which need the least protection; while the specific duties are laid generally upon those articles, equal quantities of which differ most in value, as silks for example, or else upon that class of articles whose value can be most easily ascertained—such, for example, as the various manufactures of iron.

The correspondence which we give below, make another admission which we deem yet more important than that above referred to.—The gentlemen representing the various branches of manufacturing industry all agree that the rates of duty in the law of 1842 may be reduced twenty-five dollars in every hundred, and yet leave the protection large enough to satisfy even the protected interests themselves. Mr. Webster accepts this view of the subject, and replies in substance that the high rates of 1842 were not intended to be permanent; that they were deemed essential when the law passed, as at that time all the great industrial interests of the country were depressed and prostrated. We look upon this admission, that the rates of duty in 1842 ought to be reduced one dollar in every four, when coming from the very men who now profess to stand up for the whole "principle and policy" of that law, as being a very striking admission.

The Secretary of the Treasury has proved in his report that the law of 1842 taxes the community to the amount of eighty millions in the shape of increased prices, for the sake of putting a net revenue of eighteen millions into the treasury. It is consulting now to hear from the manufacturers, and from Mr. Webster, that twenty millions of this enormous taxation subserves no good purpose whatsoever, not being at all wanted to sustain the protected interest. We submit to these advocates of the old tariff, that when a law taxes the people to such an amount, and yet collects not a dollar in every four of its taxation wholly without any good purpose, and that, too, on the admission of its friends themselves, we submit that the whole "principle and policy" of such a law cannot well be sustained before the country. We should imagine that the protectionists might make up their issue more prudently. But this is no affair of ours. They have made their election. They go for the restoration of the law of 1842. That is the question which they bring before the people. On that question we meet them with the most unflinching confidence. We commend this significant correspondence to the perusal of our readers.

To the Editors of the Intelligence:

WASHINGTON, July 30, 1846.

GENTLEMEN: In the letter of your New York correspondent, published in the National Intelligence of this morning, we find the following paragraph:

"New York, July 28, 1846.

"In a former letter I gave you my view of the new tariff bill, and the rumored proposition for a compromise. It remains unchanged.—A very large majority of the whigs are opposed, and most decidedly opposed, to any compromise bill which shall surrender the great and leading principles of specific duties.—Abandon that, and you abandon every hope of honestly collecting the duties. A majority of

the invoices presented at the custom-houses will be fraudulently and yet readily sworn to. On this point I can speak of facts within my own knowledge while deputy collector."

This would imply that the proposition which had been contemplated to be made for amending the bill lately passed was a proposition for a "compromise," and a proposition which "surrendered the great and leading principle of specific duties."

We cannot well conceive how your correspondent should have been so exceedingly uninformed in regard to the proposition of which he speaks, since it had been published in the New York papers, and might have been read by all.

That proposition was no compromise, either by name or character, in any other sense than as an amendment proposed to any bill, essentially altering its character and provisions, in order to make them more useful and more acceptable, may be called a compromise. The proposed amendment in this case surrendered no specific duty, not one; it retained all the principles and all the regulations of the act of 1842. Its only object was to reduce some of the higher rates of duties imposed by that act, which, however necessary when the act was passed, are deemed not necessary now. We cannot say whether it be true that a large majority of the whigs of the city of New York are opposed to this amendment or not. If they are, it must be because, like your correspondent, they have not made themselves acquainted with it. But we have the means of knowing, and we do know, that those interested in the protection of domestic manufactures, so far as there has been time for them to become acquainted with the proposed amendment, were decidedly in its favor, without an exception, to our knowledge.

We have seen and conversed with many persons, and have seen some hundreds of letters, and we say with confidence, that the men of business of the country were entirely satisfied with it, and that they do and will deeply regret that it was not adopted. The provisions of that amendment, carried into a law, under circumstances likely to make that law permanent, is exactly such an act of legislation as the great interests of the country now require. This is our opinion, and we believe it to be the general opinion among those who hold the protection of the domestic interests of the country in the highest degree of regard, and are most deeply committed to its continuance.

We will be obliged to you to give publicity to this note, and also to publish the correspondence which we herewith place in your hands; and remain, gentlemen, with much respect,

Your obedient servants,  
THO. CHAMBERS, of Pennsylvania.  
ISAAC DAVIS, of Philadelphia.

WASHINGTON, July 21, 1846.

Sir: We have been made acquainted with the substance of a proposition which it is understood you think of submitting to the Senate as an amendment to the bill now pending in that body for reducing the duties on imports and other purposes.

We understand the proposition to be in effect to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert: "That from and after the first day of December next, shall be a reduction of 25 per cent. of the duties, whether specific or ad valorem, now imposed by law, on articles of imported merchandise whereon duties exceeding 20 per cent. ad valorem are now charged, excepting brandy and other spirits distilled from grain or other material and on wines: Provided, nevertheless, that duties on articles now charged with more than 20 per cent. shall not be reduced below 30 per cent."

We are fully of the opinion, as persons deeply interested in the manufactures of the country, that if this amendment be adopted, and the bill so amended pass into a law, the various branches of domestic industry will be so far supported and sustained that those engaged in them can live, and if passed by such a majority as may promise steadiness and durability, we should hail the passage of the law with great gratification, and remain, most respectfully, your obedient servants.

THOMAS LAMB,  
President of the Boston sugar refinery.  
THOMAS LAMB,  
President of the N. England Worsted Co.  
THOMAS CHAMBERS,  
Anthracite coal and iron.  
WM. A. GROCKER,  
Representing all the manufactures of iron in Massachusetts; also, all the manufactures of steels in the United States.  
H. L. STEANS,  
Representing lined oil manufactures.  
JOSEPH S. LOVERING & Co.  
Sugar refining interest in Philadelphia.  
M. H. SIMPSON,  
Representing manufactures of wool cordage, cottons, and carpets.  
JOHN MARLAND,  
Representing worsted, mousselines de laines, and flannels.  
ELISHA PECK,  
Representing iron interest.  
MURDOCK, LEAVITT & CO.,  
For Railroad iron.  
EUSTAS CORNING,  
Representing iron interest.  
E. P. TILSON, } Paper interest.  
ALLEN C. CURTIS, } east of Mass.  
RUSSEL HUBBARD,  
Paper interest of Connecticut.  
DANIEL L. MILLER, Jr.,  
Philadelphia chemical manufacturing interest.

ROBT. G. RANKIN,  
Representing the iron and cotton interests of portions of Dutchess and Orange counties, New York.  
JOHN MCANNESS,  
Coal interest, Schuylkill co., Penna.  
ROBT. KILTON,  
Iron interest, Lancaster co., Penna.  
BENJ. F. POMROY,  
Anthracite iron interest, Pennsylvania.  
JOHN COOPER,  
Delegate from Columbia co., Penna.

WARREN MURDOCK,  
Manufacturer of iron in Wareham, Mass.  
GARRICK MALLERY,  
J. SCHOLFIELD, Jr., of Boston.

To Hon. DANIEL WEBSTER, U. S. Senate.  
WASHINGTON, July 21, 1846.

GENTLEMEN: I have received your letter of this date, and am happy to learn that you concur with me in thinking that the proposition which I have prepared as an amendment to the pending bill is suited to the present condition of the country, and will probably be acceptable, under the circumstances, to those concerned in all the great domestic and industrial pursuits, or at least that they can live under it.—My own judgment is entirely clear and satisfied on the subject. This amendment neither attacks nor abandons the principles or the policy of the act of 1842. On the contrary, it retains all the principles of that important law, and maintains its whole policy. It is true, it proposes a large reduction on the higher rates of duties imposed by that law. Those high rates were deemed essential when that law passed, as at that time all the great industrial interests of the country were depressed and prostrated. Under the benign influence of that law those interests have revived, and attained to such a degree of strength as to justify the hopes that, with strict economy, and by the progress of improvement, they may be able to sustain themselves with a reduced degree of protection. But this hope is very much founded on the idea that, if what is proposed be done, it shall be considered as an arrangement which is to be durable, and which shall relieve men engaged in these pursuits from the evils of constant uncertainty and apprehension.

But I cannot say, gentlemen, whether I shall move this proposition. Others must be consulted. If I should find among them the prevalence of such sentiments as I entertain myself, I shall bring the amendment forward, especially if it should appear that the very extraordinary and dangerous measure now before the Senate is likely to become a law. To the success of a great movement of this sort, union of purpose and harmony in action are essential. Without reasonable expectation that such union and harmony may be produced in a considerable degree among the friends of the present law, and the existing policy of the country, it would be imprudent to submit the proposition to the Senate.

I am, gentlemen, your obliged friend and very humble servant,  
DANIEL WEBSTER.

To Messrs. LAMB, CHAMBERS, CORNING and Others.

Mr. Clay's Tariff Proposal.

Nothing can exceed the indignation of the Whigs at the idea of the Democrats refusing to take it for granted that Mr. CLAY is the champion of the principle of protection; and there is no plea so strongly insisted upon as that his published opinions prove him to be so. They forget that Mr. CLAY's sentiments on this single subject form a complete salmagundi—a volume in which nearly every page advocates a different doctrine. Thus it would not be at all difficult for one to prove HENRY CLAY to have been in favor of FREE TRADE, INCIDENTAL PROTECTION, and a HIGH TARIFF, almost within as many consecutive years. His opinions are familiar to every reader of the newspapers. They have become threadbare by frequent reference, and there is not a tyro, however green, who does not know them almost by rote. A man has only to choose from this mass of inconsistencies. He can avow any notion upon the Tariff question; any dogma that has ever been broached, from the horizontal rate of duties to the prohibitory rate; and he has only to make his selection from the opinions of Mr. CLAY, to find one that agrees with it exactly. Like poor crazy Ophelia, in the play, as she bestows, from her basket of flowers and shrubs, a plant upon each of the company about her, significant of their virtues or their villainies, Mr. CLAY, in his national pedlar's pack, carries a partner for every variety of Tariff eructation, and matches the most absurd theories of the wildest political economist that ever rested of the laws of revenue. Thus, a Whig in Pennsylvania could prove him to be eminently high protective in his inclinations, while a Whig in Georgia or South Carolina had only to quote Daniel Webster to show that he was far worse than free trade in his compromise expedient. He has been for duties specific and for duties ad valorem—for discrimination and against discrimination—in a word, for high, low, jack and the game. He has been the most expert chameleon on this subject; and it is not a little remarkable that, in his anxiety to remain true to his character for inconsistency, he wrote against the modification of the Tariff of 1842 on one day, and in favor of it on another, as his letters prove. He has been everything "by turns, and nothing long," and our Whig friends must keep their temper when they see him re-placed in the various attitudes he has at times assumed himself, and quoted as the advocate of the most antagonistic opinions.—Pennsylvania.

LETTER FROM A FARMER.—An old farmer writes us as follows:—"The heavy labor of harvest and fire from incessant toil, have prevented me, up to this moment, from writing you. Feeling confident that a short interval will not have brought about forgetfulness, you shall have a scrawl from the stiff fingers of a farmer, who has been obliged to encounter the sun with the thermometer at 97 deg., coolly pointing out the injustice of letting the American farmer toil thus all day, under a burning sun, while the wealthy, bloated manufacturer makes his thousands and tens of thousands, aided by laws that entirely overlook the farmer. Why, sir, the farmer makes no more than three per cent. upon his investment under present prices, while the manufacturer makes his twenty and thirty? And yet the farmer is neglected by the Whigs, in their appeals in favor of the present tariff, and Congress is called upon to legislate only for the manufacturer! Is this justice?"

(From the Washington Union.)  
Protectionist's Consistency.

Consistency is the simplest, most obvious, and most common test of firm principles, and sound judgment in a statesman. Let us apply it a little to some of the men who take the lead at present in sustaining the tariff of 1842.—Let us see what was thought to be wisdom on this subject of a protective tariff by the wise men of Boston in 1820. Be it remembered, the tariff of 1816 was then in force. A proposition was pending before Congress in 1820 to expatriate its provisions. Consistent with the present tariff, the then existing tariff was as a mole-hill to a mountain in its pressure upon the industry of the country. The tariff of 1816—in itself a comparative moderate application of the protective principle—was succeeded by the higher and more stringent protection of the tariff of 1824; and it again gave place to the "bill of abominations" of 1828, which roused the whole South to a pitch of indignation that almost shook the pillars of the Union. And even the bill of 1828 is, in most respects, outdone by the tariff of 1842. Mr. Wm. C. Rives, the modern correspondent of the great protectionist, Abbot Lawrence, positively declared in his speech in the Senate of the United States, that in many respects the tariff of 1842 (then under debate) was worse than the tariff of '28. The country now stands, therefore, three removes farther from the constitutional point of justice and equality than it stood in 1816; yet it was at the commencement of the first of these removes—at the opening of the agitation which substituted the tariff of 1824 in place of that of 1816—that the leading public men of Boston—among them Daniel Webster, Nathan Appleton, and Abbot Lawrence—convened the meeting in Faneuil Hall, the report of which we give below. We ask the attention of our readers to the whole proceeding, and especially to the resolutions, then submitted by Mr. Webster, and unanimously adopted:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FANEUIL HALL MEETING IN THE YEAR 1820.

At a meeting of the merchants and others interested in the prosperity of the commerce and agriculture of the State of Massachusetts, and of the United States, convened at Concert Hall, in the town of Boston, the 17th day of August, 1820, to take into consideration a communication from the chamber of commerce of Philadelphia:

The honorable William Gray in the chair, William Foster, jr., secretary.  
Resolved, That the honorable William Gray, John Parker, esq., and William Sturgis, esq., be a committee of nomination to designate and to fix the number of a committee.

Resolved, On the report of the committee of nominations, that the following persons be a committee: William Gray, James Perkins, John Dorr, Nathaniel Goodard, Benjamin Rich, Israel Thordike, jr., William Shimmis, Thomas W. Ward, William Harris, Daniel Webster, Nathan Appleton, Abbot Lawrence, Joseph Sewall, Jonathan Phillips.

Resolved, That a committee of 23 be appointed to consider what measures are proper to be pursued in order to avert the calamity which must eventually flow from the passage of the tariff bill referred to in the ensuing session of Congress; and this committee be invested with plenary powers to carry into effect such means as may by them be deemed most expedient on the occasion.

Resolved, That this meeting be adjourned to the first Monday in October next, there to meet at Faneuil Hall, at 11 o'clock, A. M., for the purpose of receiving the report of their committee, and adopting such further measures as the meeting may think expedient.

Resolved, That this committee be authorized to call the meeting together at an earlier period, if they should think it necessary.

(Signed) WILLIAM FOSTER, jr., Secretary.  
Mr. Webster having been the first named upon a committee subsequently appointed "to prepare and publish an address," it is understood to have been the author of the address which may be found in the papers of the day, and also of the following resolutions:

(From the N. E. Palladium & Commercial Advertiser.)  
TUESDAY, October 3, 1820.  
GENERAL MEETING.  
Yesterday an adjourned meeting on the subject of the proposed tariff was held at Faneuil Hall, Hon. Wm. Gray chairman, and Wm. Foster, jr., secretary.

A long and interesting report was read from the respectable committee appointed at a former meeting, which concluded with the following resolves:

1st. Resolved, That we have regarded with pleasure the establishment and success of manufactures among us, and consider their growth when natural and spontaneous, and not the effect of a system of bounties and protection, as an evidence of general wealth and prosperity.

2d. That, relying on the ingenuity, enterprise, and skill of our fellow-citizens, we believe that all manufactures adapted to our characters and circumstances will be introduced and extended as soon and as fast as will promote the public interest, without any further protection than they now receive.

3d. That no objection ought ever to be made in any amount of taxes equally apportioned, and imposed for the purpose of raising revenue necessary for the support of government, but that taxes imposed on the people for the sole benefit of any one class of men are equally inconsistent with the principles of our constitution and with sound policy.

4th. That the supposition that, until the proposed tariff or some similar measure be adopted, we are, and shall be, dependent on

foreigners for the means of subsistence and defence, is, in our opinion, altogether fallacious and fanciful, and derogatory to the character of the nation.

5th. That high bounties on such domestic manufactures as are principally benefited by that tariff (as our great capitalists rather than personal industry, or the owners of small capitals, and therefore that we do not perceive its tendency to promote national industry.

6th. That we are equally incapable of discovering its beneficial effects on agriculture, since the obvious consequence of its adoption would be that the farmer must give more than he now does for all he buys, and receive less for all he sells.

7th. That the imposition of duties which are enormous, and deemed by a large portion of the people to be unequal and unjust, is dangerous, as it encourages the practice of smuggling.

8th. That, in our opinion, the proposed tariff, and the principles on which it is avowedly founded, would, if adopted, have a tendency, however different may be the notions of those who recommend, them to diminish the industry, impede the prosperity, and corrupt the morals of the people.

James T. Austin, esq., and the Hon. Daniel Webster addressed their fellow-citizens in favor of the report and resolves in speeches which were distinguished for closeness of argument, variety of illustrations, and abundance of facts.

The report was then accepted, and the resolves recommended by the committee unanimously passed.

A vote of thanks to the Hon. Mr. Otis, of the Senate, and to those members from this State in the House of Representatives of the United States who opposed the new tariff, was unanimously agreed to.

The report constituting the preamble to the above resolutions is too long for insertion this day, forming 23 manuscript pages. It is to be printed in a pamphlet.

Here is wholesome truth plainly and cogently spoken. It reads strangely by the side of the recent Lawrence letters and the subsequent speeches and votes of Mr. Webster.

But let us see on what grounds these free-trade resolutions were then commended to the unanimous judgment of the good people of Boston. Here is a passage from the argument of the master-spirit of the occasion. In addressing that Faneuil Hall meeting on the 2d October, 1820, Mr. Webster said:

"There is a power in names; and those who had pressed the Tariff on Congress, and on the country, had represented it as immediately, and almost exclusively, connected with domestic industry and national independence. In his opinion, no measure could prove more injurious to the industry of the country and nothing was more fanciful than the opinion that national independence rendered such a measure necessary. He certainly thought it might be doubted whether Congress would not be acting somewhat against the spirit and intention of the constitution in exercising a power to control essentially the pursuits and occupations of individuals in their private concerns; a power to force great and sudden changes, both of occupation and property, upon individuals, not as incidental to the exercise of any other power, but as a substantial and direct power. If such changes were incidentally only, and were the necessary consequence of such impost as Congress, for the leading purpose of revenue, should enact, then they could not be complained of. But he doubted whether Congress fairly possessed the power of turning the incident into the principal, and instead of leaving manufacturers to the protection of such laws as should be passed with a primary regard to revenue, of enacting laws with the avowed object of giving a preference to particular manufactures, with an entire disregard to all the considerations of revenue; and instead of laying such imposts as would best answer the purpose of raising revenue, with the least burden on the public, carrying the impost on certain articles to a burdensome excess, with a full knowledge that the increase of duty will diminish the amount of revenue raised."

It is quite unnecessary for us to add anything to this. It sets forth with admirable precision & energy the reasons of the free-trade faith then professed so ardently by the great tariff champions. They have eaten their own words since; that, we all know. But have they ever ANSWERED—CAN they EVER ANSWER—THEIR OWN ARGUMENTS? "I hope," says a correspondent, "you will completely expose the conduct of those DISTRESSED, patriotic men, Abbot Lawrence and Nathan Appleton, formerly importers of British dry goods at Boston. You will also notice the BEAUTIFUL, DISTRESSED conduct of a certain Daniel Webster, who figures largely in said pamphlet AT ONE PERIOD, encouraged by Abbot Lawrence N. Appleton, & Co., (when they were importers) to denounce additional duties on foreign coarse wullens and cottons, when our manufacturers were in their infancy; and now (said Daniel) bought over by the same Lawrence, Appleton, and Co., (become cotton spinners) to defend enormous extra duties on certain descriptions of cotton goods! What a beautiful spectacle we have of an American reasoner!"

"WAIT A LITTLE LONGER."—"To our friends we say, hold firm. Let the first blast pass over you. Let the new bill be tried fairly.—Do not be led by the estimates and prophecies of the Whigs into the ranks of the enemy. Be calm—be true. A little patience, and a very little time, and you shall see the country settling down calmly in support of the measure of the Government. At all events, do not condemn before a trial. Wait a little longer."—Pennsylvania.

A SURE METHOD TO PURIFY WATER WITHOUT A FILTER.—To a common sized pail full of water put into it as much powdered alum as will lay upon a six-cent piece. Let it stand all night and in the morning you will have pure water as clear as crystal, and tasteless as before the alum was applied.