

THE BRADFORD REPORTER.

VOLUME VIII.

"REGARDLESS OF DENUNCIATION FROM ANY QUARTER."

NUMBER 420

PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY, AT TOWANDA, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA., BY E. S. GOODRICH & SON.

TOWANDA:

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1847.

Minority Report relative to the Tariff.

Mr. BIGLER, from the minority of the select committee, to which was referred so much of the Governor's Annual Message as relates to the tariff, made the following report:

The undersigned, a minority of the select committee to which was referred so much of the Governor's message as relates to the tariff, submit the following report:

That they regret there should have been any difference of opinion in the committee in reference to the duties assigned by the Senate; or that the majority should have deemed it necessary to depart from the usual course of legislative committees. If the subject was of sufficient importance to require a select reference, the Senate and the country had a right to expect a calm and logical discussion of the question of a tariff—its effects upon the people and the government, in order that the true principles of a just and equitable system of duties should be ascertained and set forth. The views of the Executive having been formally presented to the Senate, it was proper that a calm and deliberate reply should be made, either approving those views, if deemed reasonable and proper, or exposing their fallacies if found erroneous. It was scarcely necessary, in the opinion of the undersigned, to descend into the unexplored arena of political warfare; or to arraign, try and condemn the democracy of the country for the purpose of explaining the operation of tariff duties.

The warm, and perhaps intemperate, contest of 1844, for President of the Union and Governor of the State, is made a prominent, if not the principle feature in the report of the majority of your committee. Both political parties freely participated in the excitement and perhaps extravagancies of that period; and the undersigned have no wish to renew the angry recollections. In justice to themselves, however, as well as the great party thus harshly assigned and condemned, without even the usual formality of a trial, or the production of proof, by the majority of the committee, they must be permitted to say, that if in any instance adopted as the "battle cry" of the democracy, it was rather an idle bravado than the deliberate manifestation of political sentiment.

If any conclusion can legitimately result from the premises so broadly and authoritatively assumed by the majority, it is this: "That the act of 1842 should be regarded as the settled policy of the government—and therefore Pennsylvania should demand its restoration as a matter of right." That such conclusion, however, is in every respect erroneous, may be abundantly shown by a reference to the provisions of the law and the history of its passage.

It will not be denied, that the measure majorities in both branches of Congress, in favor of the measure, were not produced without extraordinary exertions and perhaps compromise of principles. Some of the most ardent friends of protection, regarded it but as a temporary expedient, and proposed to limit its existence to a brief term. Thus, Mr. Merrick, a most able member of the Senate, belonging to the same political party with the majority of your committee, designated the bill of 1842, pending its passage in the Senate, as a measure "to tax the interests of the agriculturists for the benefit of the manufacturers." That it was unjust and unequal, and moved "that it last but two years." Mr. Evans, belonging to the same party, regarded it much in the same light, and did not think "for the sake of some four or five manufacturers that the whole of the shipping interest ought to be sacrificed." The duty on railroad iron was regarded as excessive by the same gentleman, and who subsequently introduced a bill into the Senate to reduce the duties upon that article; iron not being one of the staples of his particular constituency. Mr. Preston also advocated its limitation; and for which Mr. Crittenden and eight others of the same political party voted. John M. Clayton, in a speech at Wilmington, in 1844, said—"In my humble opinion, had the tariff of 1842 passed simply in the spirit of the compromise act, it would have been better law for protection than the law now in force. It would have better guarded the revenue against fraud in the foreign valuation, and it would more effectually have checked excessive importations, which is one of the greatest curses of the country." In July last, a committee of gentlemen extensively engaged in manufacturing, in a letter to Mr. Webster, written in reference to a compromise bill, which he had in contemplation, expressed the opinion, "that a reduction of twenty-five per cent. on the duties, whether specific or ad valorem, charged by the law of 1842, on articles of imported merchandise, whereon the duty exceeded thirty per cent. ad valorem, might be made without seriously affecting the manufacturing interests of the country."

In September, 1841, Mr. Clay, when enforcing upon the Senate the necessity of abiding by the principles of the compromise act, said, "he would vote for the tax on tea and coffee; it was necessary under his calculation; and as he found that he was to be deserted by a portion of his friends, he trusted that some of those opposed to him, would vote for this bill. If they did not, the result would inevitably be that at the next session the tax would certainly be imposed; or a higher duty than is authorized by the compromise act, imposed on other articles. He thought tea and coffee the most desirable articles on which to raise revenue." And again, in March, 1842, upon the introduction of his programme of measures, he indicated clearly his policy in reference to the tariff, in the following emphatic language: "Let me not be misunderstood, and let me entreat that I may not be misrepresented. I am not advocating the revival of a high protective tariff. I am for abiding by the principles of the compromise act; I am for doing what no southern man, with a fair and candid mind, has ever yet denied; giving to the country a revenue which may provide for the economical

wants of the government, and at the same time give an incidental protection to our home industry. If there be here a single gentleman who will deny the fairness and propriety of this, I shall be glad to see and hear who he is." In 1843, after he had left the Senate, and speaking in reference to the impolicy of establishing a high protective tariff, as a permanent policy, he says, in a letter to Mr. Bronson: "I regarded it (the act of 1828) as highly disgraceful to American legislation."—"I think there is no danger of a high tariff being ever established."—"If there be any excesses or defects in the act of 1842, they ought to be corrected."

Such being the history of the act of 1842, confined alone to the views of its special friends, and without reference to the avowed hostility of the opposite political party, who supported the bill with so much reluctance; and its modification urged at every subsequent session of Congress, with the unceasing complaints of the south and the west against its provisions, where is the authority for the extraordinary declaration by the majority of the committee, that "no murmur was heard against its operations in any section of the country," or to justify the conclusion that the "law was designed to be the settled and permanent policy of the country." Such a declaration, and an inference so strained, can have but the effect to weaken the influence of their entire report.

The Governor says: "The history of our legislation on this subject, demonstrates most conclusively, that a tariff, to be permanent, which is so essential to the manufacturing as well as the other great interests of our country, must be reasonable and equitable. To the truth of this sentiment the undersigned yield a ready assent; and are at a loss to imagine why it should be unsatisfactory to the majority of the committee. The adjustment of a tariff for revenue, on the principles of discrimination in favor of home productions, becomes a question of conflicting interests, either real or imaginary, between different sections of the Union. Such always has been the case, and perhaps always will be. And who will say that a standard of equity between such conflicting interests ought not to be sought for and established? A district of the country producing a given article, will endeavor through its representatives in Congress, to have the rate of duty fixed as high as possible, whilst the representatives of another portion, consuming such article, will endeavor to establish the lowest rate of duty. In almost every instance of such conflict, both extremes are wrong and oppressive; and the only way of settling the question satisfactorily, and therefore permanently, is to make such adjustment of the rates of duty, in view of the effects upon the prosperity of the country, and the revenues of the government, as an honest and patriotic desire to do justice to all sections of the Union, and all classes of our people, may seem to indicate.

Charges upon imports are almost the only reliable source of revenue to sustain the National Government. This system has been practiced ever since the adoption of the constitution, and has given general satisfaction.—There are no considerable number of our people willing to adopt a system of direct taxation in its stead. We must, therefore, in the adjustment of such charges have due regard to the wants of the government. But in so arranging the charges on imports, it is the right and the duty of Congress, to extend all the aid and encouragement to the agricultural, manufacturing, mechanical, commercial and navigating interests of the country, that can properly result from such a system of revenue laws. If it is the duty of Congress, to protect one of the great interests of the nation, it is equally their duty to protect all; and if it is the right of one branch of industry to claim such fostering care, it is equally the right of all; and here again the necessity of a strict regard for the principles of equity, urged by the Governor, is made apparent. No branch of industry has a right to protection to the exclusion or injury of other interests. The manufacturer should not ask protection at the expense of the farmer and mechanic; but all should be allowed to participate equally in the advantages incident to the revenue laws of the country. All branches of industry, as all sections of the union, are alike entitled to the fostering care of Congress. Any law having a tendency to advance the interests of one section of the country, by making undue exactions from another, would be manifestly unjust, and could never become the settled policy of the government.

Your committee recognize the right of Congress to make discriminations in the adjustment of a tariff; and are of opinion, that discriminations may be made in favor of the labor and productions of our own country, without materially infringing the principles of justice or giving rise to discontent in the Union. The extent of these discriminations, says the Governor, "bearing as they do upon conflicting interests, and in some degree arraying those of one portion of the Union against another, can only be adjusted under the spirit of concession and compromise, which prevailed in the adoption of the Constitution itself." Discriminations should only be made in favor of interests truly national in their character; such as are adapted to our country, and where it is apparent that the productions of the country will at least approximate its consumption. On this point Gen. Jackson in his annual message of 1832, said: "that manufactures adequate to the supply of domestic consumption, would in the abstract be beneficial to our country, there is no reason to doubt; and as every citizen would not, there is no American citizen who would not for a while be willing to pay a higher price for them. But for this purpose, it is presumed a tariff of high duties, designed for perpetual protection, has entered into the minds of but few of our statesmen. The most they have anticipated, is a temporary and generally an incidental protection, which they maintain has the effect to reduce the prices by domestic competition, below that of the foreign article." The staples of Pennsylvania come within the foregoing principles. The production of her coal and iron, can be equal to the demands of the country, and the labor of such production is such as our people are willing to perform.

Perhaps no article can be named for which the discriminating principle may as readily and as justly be claimed, as that of iron. It is a great element of offensive and defensive warfare, and the encouragement of its production, may, therefore, be regarded as providing for the national defence. The increase of production is equal, if not in advance of the demand, and as the raw material exists in inexhaustible quantities, it wants but a fair reward for the capital and labor employed, to insure a production equal to the consumption of the country. Interests of this kind may, with propriety, in the opinion of your committee, claim the advantages of discrimination under the revenue standard. But government should never attempt by means of its revenue laws to sustain an artificial interest, not adapted to our climate, our soil, or the habits of our people. Such attempts should be looked upon as visionary. They can only be successful by making unjust exactions from other interests. For instance, if an association of individuals were to commence the growth of fruits adapted to the climate of the tropic; and after building hot-houses, and incurring other expenses necessary to the experiment, discover that they could grow oranges for three dollars per dozen. They then petition Congress to aid this branch of American industry, by putting such a rate of tariff on the foreign article, as would enable them to sell at the foregoing prices. The absurdity of such a requisition, will occur to the most dull of comprehension. It would be a direct burthen upon the consumer, from which he could see no escape, as competition could never come to his relief. Every effort to sustain an unnatural interest of this kind, must have an impoverishing effect upon the country. It would cost the people double the amount of labor that would be necessary to grow tobacco, cotton, wheat, flour, beef, &c., to exchange for these luxuries, and in the exchange, commerce and navigation receive their reward.

The majority of the committee have treated the subject as one of purely local character.—They seem to have forgotten that other States of the Union have interests involved, and have power to guard those interests as well as Pennsylvania; and that only by mutual concession and compromise can a permanent tariff system be established. The repeal of the act of 1842, and the substitution of that of 1846, was probably a too thorough and sudden change in the policy of the country. By this measure the interests of Pennsylvania may hereafter be affected. Her staple productions may require a higher rate of duty; but this change was not produced by her action. It was accomplished by the representatives of other States in Congress, representing, as they believed, the true interests of their constituents, and therefore, our "demands for repeal and restoration" might have but little influence.

The Governor says: "should the change in the rates of duty, by the act of 1846, affect, injuriously, any of the great interests of the country, we must unite our efforts to induce Congress, to whose care and discretion the subject is committed by the Constitution, and on whose wisdom and judgment we may safely rely, to make all just and reasonable amendments. The majority of your committee have declared, that the Governor, "in these sentiments" does not "represent the opinions of the people of Pennsylvania;—that they now demand the repeal of the odious act of 1846, and that the friends of protection "must regard all such proposals to amend as mere political tricks to divide and conquer them." How such bold conclusions were arrived at, the undersigned are left to conjecture. They can see nothing to warrant the conclusion, that if the act of 1846 should work injury to any of the great interests of the country, we are not to unite our efforts to produce a modification of its terms, but that we must "demand" the restoration of the law of 1842, in all its principles and details. This law has been emphatically condemned by a majority of the States in the Union; and if it be desirable, as your committee believe, to secure an increase of duties on the staple articles of this State, nothing, in the opinion of the undersigned, could have less tendency to accomplish such object than a restoration of the law of 1842, for a restoration of the law of 1842, and the repeal of that of 1846. If Pennsylvania were ever suffering from the enactment of the latter, such policy, on her part, could not fail to excite feelings of indignation and hostility, rather than those of friendship and conciliation.

The undersigned are willing to ask Congress to modify the act of 1846, so as to give greater encouragement to our staple productions. But is the restoration of such increased duties, or is that law so just and correct in all its principles and details, that it cannot be improved? The undersigned think not. That law contains principles and details, that should never be revived, and which, in their humble opinion, can never become the settled policy of the country."—And they will here briefly allude to, and discuss some of those principles and details.

The specific principle, as applied in many instances in the act of 1842, "imposes an equal duty on articles greatly unequal in value."

Thus, silks, for instance, are charged duty at the rate of two dollars and fifty cents per pound. Let us notice the practical operation of this provision. An individual in moderate circumstances, say ten yards, weighing one pound, at seventy-five cents per yard, costing in all, seven dollars and fifty cents. An other individual in affluent circumstances, also purchases ten yards of the finest texture, weighing one pound, at two dollars per yard, and costing twenty dollars. Thus it will be seen that under the specific principle, as applied in this instance, the mechanic or laborer, is taxed as much for the use of government, on his coarse dress costing seven dollars and fifty cents, as the rich banker is made to pay on his fine dress costing twenty dollars. On flannels, except cotton, which is an article of extensive importation, a specific duty of fourteen cents per square yard is charged. The original cost may be stated at from fifteen to sixty cents per square yard. The

consumer of coarse flannels pays to the government from sixty to one hundred per cent. whilst the consumer of the fine article pays but from fifteen to thirty per cent. As with flannels and silks, so with sugar, boots, shoes and other articles, under the act of 1842.

It scarcely necessary to enforce the injustice of this system by a single remark; the mere statement would seem to be sufficient; but suppose, for illustration, the Legislature of Pennsylvania were to pass a law directing all the farms in the state to be assessed at five thousand dollars each, and horses at one hundred dollars per head, and taxed accordingly. This would be applying the specific principle of taxation, to real and personal property; and whilst its operations would be more readily seen and felt, and therefore more generally complained of, its injustice would be but little more flagrant than as applied in the act of 1842. How long would the people submit to the provisions of such a law? The response of every man in the state would be, that a law so unequal and unjust, should not be enforced for a single day. These instances will suffice to show that the act of 1842 was wrong in principle; or that there was, at least, a misapplication of some of its principles. The specific principle may be applied to articles of equal and fixed value, without being liable to the foregoing objections. The undersigned would be glad to see that principle applied to coal, bar iron, pig metal, and other articles varying but little in value, under a given name. For whilst it would answer for the purposes of the government for revenue, and work no injustice to the consumer, it might be of vast importance to those interests, in case of a severe depression of prices in Europe.

The minimum principle in the act of 1842 is still more objectionable. The palpable injustice of its operations must be readily seen and acknowledged by all. It provides that "on all manufactures of cotton, or of which cotton is a component part, dyed, colored, printed or stained, not exceeding in value thirty cents per square yard, shall be charged at thirty cents, and made to pay duty accordingly." The same principle applies to cotton manufactures not dyed or colored, costing less than twenty cents per square yard. Let us notice the practical operations of this principle for a moment. A cargo of cotton goods, costing five cents per square yard, is presented at one of our ports for admission. They are not charged at the rate of thirty per cent. on five cents, but five hundred per cent. is first added to the original cost, and on that the duty of thirty per cent. is charged. A cargo is also presented, costing fifteen cents per square yard; one hundred per cent. is added to the original cost, and then trifled at thirty per cent. A cargo of the finest quality, actually costing thirty cents per square yard, is next presented, and on this a duty of thirty per cent. is charged. Thus it will be seen, that the rate of duty increases in the same ratio that the article becomes coarser and cheap.

And it does seem to the undersigned, that it matters not whether this principle be designed for revenue or for protection, it is equally unjust. If it be necessary to make exactions to encourage our manufacturing interests, let the burden fall upon those who are best able to bear it, and not upon the most helpless of our people. It is said that these principles have but little practical effect under the act of 1842. If so, why insist upon having them reinstated? It is the introduction of such odious features into our tariff law, that keeps up a constant discontent in relation to our revenue system. This law is also objectionable in many other provisions. In general, the rates of duty were high on the necessities of life, and in many instances low on luxuries.

The act of 1846 has the merit, at least, of taxing all articles according to their true value, and it may, therefore be the means of silencing some of the complaints that have been so strongly urged by the west and south against former revenue laws. It taxes all articles on the ad valorem principle. The act of 1842 was a mixture of the specific, minimum and ad valorem principles. In the schedule of articles enumerated under that law, about one thousand five hundred items are charged duty on the ad valorem principle, and about eight hundred and eighty on the specific and minimum. The imports for 1845, amounted to one hundred and eighty millions four hundred and thirty-five thousand and thirty-five dollars; of this amount, fifty-two millions three hundred and fifteen thousand two hundred and ninety-two dollars was charged duty on the ad valorem principle, thirty-one millions three hundred and fifty-two thousand eight hundred and sixty-three dollars on the specific and minimum, and about twenty-four millions admitted free of duty.

The act of 1846, on three hundred and twenty-three articles, charges ad valorem duties, at higher rates than were charged on the same articles in the law of 1842, and eight hundred and twenty-two articles are charged the same ad valorem duty in both laws; one hundred and twenty-seven articles admitted free of duty under the act of 1842, are tariffed by that of 1846. The act of 1842 charged on the aggregate imports into the country, about twenty-six millions annually. The act of 1846, with slight modifications, it is estimated, will bring into the treasury an enlarged amount on the whole amount of imports, may, therefore, be regarded as nearly the same under both acts; and by what process of reasoning certain statements fixing themselves to the conclusion, that one of these laws is an "odious, free trade measure," and the other a source of revenue to the government, and prosperity to the people, the undersigned are at a loss to determine.

The ad valorem principle is the leading objection urged against the tariff of 1840. It is not probable that any views that might be presented by the undersigned, would have much influence with the majority of your committee; and they have, therefore, concluded to address them through the "embodiment of the principles" of the great party to which they belong. The annexed extracts from a speech delivered

by Mr. Clay, in March, 1842, may perhaps allay some of the apprehensions of the majority of your committee on this point. This was Mr. Clay's last official expression of opinion on this subject. It will be seen that he was a bold and able advocate of the principles, if not of the very details of the act of 1840. Mr. Clay said:

"First, there is the principle that a fixed ad valorem duty shall prevail and be in force at all times. For one, I am willing to abide by that principle. There are certain vague notions about as to the utility and necessity of specific duties and discriminations, which I am persuaded, arise from a want of a right understanding of the subject. We have had the ad valorem principle practically in force ever since the compromise act was passed; and there has been no difficulty in administering the duties of the Treasury on that principle.

"It was necessary first to ascertain the value of the goods, and then to impose the duty upon them; and from the commencement of the act to this day, the ad valorem principle has been substantially in operation. Compare the difference between specific and the ad valorem system of duties, and I maintain that the latter is justly entitled to the preference. The one principle declares that the duty paid shall be upon the real value of the article taxed; the specific principle imposes an equal duty on articles greatly unequal in value. Coffee, for example, (and it is an article which always exists itself to my thoughts,) is one of the articles on which a specific duty has been levied. Now, it is perfectly well known that the Mocha coffee is worth at least twice as much as the coffee of St. Domingo or Cuba; yet both pay the same duty. The tax has no respect to the value, but is arbitrarily levied on all articles of a specific kind alike, however various and unequal may be their values. I say that, in theory, and according to every sound principle of justice, the ad valorem mode of taxation is entitled to the preference. There is, I admit, one objection to it: as the value of an article is a matter subject to opinion, and as opinions will ever vary, either honestly or fraudulently, there is some difficulty in preventing frauds. But, with the home valuation proposed by my friend from Rhode Island, (Mr. Simmons,) the ad valorem system can be adopted with all practicable safety, and will be liable to those chances only of fraud which are inevitable under any and every system.

"Again: what has been the fact from the origin of the government until now? The articles from which the greatest amount of revenue has been drawn, such as woollens, linens, silks, cottons, worsteds, and a few others, have all been taxed on the ad valorem principle, and there has been no difficulty in the operation. I believe, upon the whole, that it is the best mode. I believe that if we adopt a fixed rate ad valorem, wherever it can be done, the revenue will be subjected to fewer frauds than the injustice and frauds incident to specific duties: One of the most prolific sources of the violation of our revenue laws has been, as every body knows, the effort to get goods of a finer quality and higher value admitted under the lower rate of duty required for those of a lower value. The gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. Woodbury) and the honorable Senator from New York (Mr. Wright) both well know this. But if the duty was laid ad valorem, there could be no motive for such an effort, and the fraud, in its present form, would have no place. In England, (as all who have read the able report of made by Mr. Hume, a Scottish member in the House of Commons, must perceive,) they seem to be giving up specific duties; and the tendency in the public mind appears to be, instead of having a variety of specific duties and a variety of ad valorem duties, to have one permanent fixed rate of duty for all articles. I am willing, I repeat, to adhere to this principle as laid down in the compromise act. If there be those who suppose that, under the specific form of duty, a higher degree of protection can be secured than under the other mode, I would observe that the actual measure of protection does not depend upon the form, but on the amount, of the duty which is levied upon the foreign rival article."

The majority have endeavored to underrate the importance of the removal of duties upon broad stuffs by European governments, and attributed the increase of prices to a temporary scarcity. This is unquestionably the case to a great extent. Yet to those who give the present condition of European countries a calm and reflecting observation, great causes will become apparent, which will result in a permanent demand upon this or some other foreign country for supplies.

Thirty years of undisturbed peace have smelted their population to the utmost density; and whilst the capacity of the earth, to sustain a given population, must necessarily be limited; it has not escaped observation, that even this capacity is becoming gradually more uncertain. Grain growing districts, especially in the north of Europe, and hitherto the most prolific, exhibit a gradual decline in quantity of product, whether the result be attributed to exhaustion of soil, or inability to restore its diminished properties. In addition to this it is apprehended, by many most competent to judge, that the potato must inevitably become general. Scarcities of these articles are already supplying the place of this vegetable in Europe. It is moreover a principle in political economy, not to be controverted, that the consumption of an article is increased in proportion as its price is reduced. Hence, therefore, the removal of duties upon broad stuffs in Europe; which can only be regarded as a tax upon the consumer, must essentially contribute to the consumption of the article at a lower price. If these suggestions be true, whence will the people of Europe look for a little reading every day, if it is but a single sentence. If you can give fifteen minutes a day, it will be felt at the end of the year. Regulate your thought when not at a study. A man is thinking even while at work. Why may he not be thinking about something that is useful? Resolve in your mind what you have last been reading.

and industrious farmers. From the waters of the St. John's to the straits of Fuca, with here and there a resting place for the reaper. Agriculture being at once the noblest and most virtuous pursuit of man; and its hardy followers, in all countries, the most independent; who would deny to this important branch of our population an equal participation in the blessings of government?

Neither are the undersigned insensible to the vast importance of our manufacturing interests. They too have grown with our growth, and stand forth a proud monument of American skill and industry. All they need and perhaps wish, as a permanent and equitable system of duties, with suitable discrimination in their favor, under a proper revenue standard. This will be conceded them, and the undersigned deprecate the hostile attitude of those who demand more. By raising such an issue, such a broad and unqualified claim, may not the professed advocates of ultra protection, become the worst enemies of the manufacturers? By demanding too much, may not important advantages be lost, which otherwise would be willingly yielded to them?

England has been referred to as an illustration of the benefits of protection. There, indeed, the restrictive system has been fully tested. Under its blessings it has been said, that that empire has grown until "the sun never sets upon her possessions!" But whilst admiring the grandeur and power of that proud government, let us not be blind to the misery, distress, and the profound human degradation that settles at the base and encompass the colossal pyramid of her glory. The social condition of the mass of the people is the true standard by which to judge the character of a government, and not by its acquisitions, the magnitude of its power, or the wealth in its treasury. However important our home market may be, no one, who pays any regard to facts, can be blind to the absolute necessity for a foreign market for the surplus products of our country. In addition to the immense amount already shipped abroad, our depots and avenues to the Atlantic, are swelled to bursting with the varied products of the farmer, ready for exportation. Where else then, in a foreign market can purchasers be found for this immense surplus? And this is but the fore-shadowing of our agricultural capacity and resource. A dense stream of emigration flows into, and spreads over, the rich fields of the north and west. States rise up as if by magic, leaving like full grown giants upon the embrace of the Union. Agriculture must be the pursuit of the people of that wide spread region, and their surplus product added to that of the older States, can neither be purchased nor consumed in the narrow limits of a home market. In conclusion, the undersigned can see nothing, in the present nor prospective condition of the country, to justify the predictions of ruin and distress so frequently heard.

The elements of prosperity are neither in the government nor the laws, but in the energy, enterprise and industry of the people. If there are defects in the revenue, or indeed any other laws of the country, they can, and should be removed, with such improvements as experience may render necessary. And with the evidences of universal prosperity so abundant, such prophetic croakings, are neither patriotic nor reasonable. In what country do labor and skill meet with more certain reward? When were the great interests of the country in a more flourishing condition? The agriculturist finds a ready market for his produce, and at remunerating prices—the manufacturing interests are reaping rich harvests—the shipping interest is unable to supply the demand—and in a word every pursuit in life, if honestly and industriously exercised, is well and fairly rewarded.

WILLIAM BIGLER.
WILLIAM S. ROSS.

A GOOD ONE.—Hon. Andrew Stewart a distinguished member of Congress from Pennsylvania, has recently paid a visit to Lowell. He relates in a letter to the Uniontown (Pa.) Democrat, the following anecdote:

"In looking over the pay roll or note book, which I accidentally picked up from the table, I found on twenty-seven consecutive pages, containing eight hundred signatures, nearly all girls, but a single one that made a mark (r X), all written in a good, and many of them in a most elegant hand. The clerk observed to me that Lord Morphet, when on a visit to this country, some years ago, happened to be present on pay day, and with some surprise observed: "What do your operatives write?" "Certainly, sir," said the clerk, "the Americans all write." "Directly there came in a man who made his mark." "Ah!" said his Lordship with a smile. "I thought you said all wrote." "All Americans, your Lordship—this was an Englishman." Whereupon his Lordship grinned a ghastly smile."

NYRROCK.—Wheat exhausts soils, because it derives there from the large quantity of nitrogen which the grain contains; but it is this same quantity of nitrogen which renders it more valuable than other grains. Tobacco exhausts powerfully the soil, because it requires an abundance of nitrogen to form its nicotine; but on this principle its value in market depends. To produce nitrogen, nitrogen must be assimilated, and is more exhausting; but without the nitrogen no coloring matter could be formed.—The value is in proportion to the cost; and the success of the cultivator, depends on the skill with which he turns the nitrogen of waste and valueless substance into those of high price in market.

HINTS TO YOUNG MEN.—Always have a book within your reach, which you may catch up at your odd minutes. Resolve to read a little reading every day, if it is but a single sentence. If you can give fifteen minutes a day, it will be felt at the end of the year. Regulate your thought when not at a study. A man is thinking even while at work. Why may he not be thinking about something that is useful? Resolve in your mind what you have last been reading.