

The Montrose Democrat.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL—DEVOTED TO POLITICS, NEWS, LITERATURE, AGRICULTURE, SCIENCE, AND MORALITY.

Chase & Day, Proprietors.

Montrose, Susquehanna County, Penn'a, Thursday Morning, February 22, 1855.

Volume 12, Number 8.

Select Poetry.

Visions of the Past.

BY R. M. LURE.

Up from the dim old Past our visions stealing,
Bright visions, tinged with memory's finest gold;
That wake within the throbbing heart a feeling,
Though in years grown old.
Oh silent Past! from out thy dark dominions,
What scenes forgotten in the world's great strife,
Come sweeping upward on wild fancy's pinions,
Once again to life.
Before we fit the friends of early childhood,
Each rose-bud cheek just bursting into bloom;
And by-gones come like flowers of the wildwood,
Yielding a rich perfume.
Here all my schoolmates, like the pearls of beauty,
Are clustering 'round me as they did of yore;
Soft blue-eyed maidens, with lashes long and luscious,
And bright boys a score.
And perch'd upon his quaint old oar, the master,
Demurely looks upon those bands of hope
That circle round him, and his heart beats faster
As they daily ope.
I see the river with its crystal waters
Still gliding onward through the field and wood;
Embosomed in its heaven's peerless daughters,
Starry sisterhood.
Around my chamber, like the mists of even,
Are flitting spirits of the long-gone dead;
Like angel visitants from far off heaven,
Sounding their fairy tread.
I hear their voices in the darkness 'round me,
As winds, deep-laden with the flowers' perfume,
Creep thro' the casement—read the spell that
bound me—
In through the gloom.
Here dimly seen the form of a lovely maiden,
Whose azure eyes are bright on memory's page;
Who, beautiful as was a flower of Aiden,
Died in springtime age.
Down in the churchyard where the tall wood
darkens
Around with shadows where the daisies are
long,
Friends weeping laid her when the yellow Au-
tumn
Waile'd its dying song.
No marble pile is reared above her bosom,
To tell the resting place of one so fair;
But sweet and snowy as the hawthorn's blossom
Are the flowers there.
Alas, that beauty in its first warm flush,
Should fade and wither as the forest leaf;
That hearts should die in their pure virgin
glush-
ings.
Ah! and die of grief!
But farewell visions of the dim old ocean,
That nightly reappear to me in dreams;
I turn away from these with sad emotion,
To my heart's own ages.
And there in secret do I read true histories
Of loves, hopes, dangers in the east and old;
Bright treasures, ever to the world great mys-
teries.
But the heart's pure gold,
Butler, Pa. January, 1855.

Miscellaneous.

MORAL CHARACTER AND THE SABBATH DAY.
No young man can hope to rise in society, or
act worthily his part in life, without a fair
character. The basis of such a char-
acter is a virtuous principle, or a deep fixed
sense of moral obligation, sustained and in-
tegrated by the fear and love of God. The
man who possesses such a character can be
tried in integrity, truth, benevolence, jus-
tice, are not worthily called upon. He
knows and feels that his duty is to
the whole tenor of his life to exemplify
the virtues he professes. Such a man has de-
cision of character; he knows what is right
and is firm in doing it. Such a man has in-
dependence of character; he thinks and acts
for himself, and is not to be made a tool to
serve the purposes of a party. Such a man
has consistency of character; he pursues a
straight-forward course, and what he is to-
day you are sure of finding him to-morrow.
Such a man has true worth of character, and
his life is a blessing to himself, to his family,
and to the world. Remember the Sabbath
day to keep it holy. This is the command-
ment from God; and were I to compromise all
my directions to you in one, it should be this.
Nothing furnishes so sure a protection against
the allurements of the world; nothing tends
so much to invigorate private virtue, and dif-
fuse around a healthy public spirit, as a
serious observance of the Lord's day. No
young man, who habitually keeps this day,
is in danger of having his principles undermined
or his morals corrupted. There is something
in the very act of ceasing from worldly occu-
pations on this holy day, and repairing with
the people of God to worship Him in the
sanctuary, which wonderfully tends to
strengthen all good habits, and to adorn the
character with the charms of a fair and low-
ly virtue.

Ms. PARTINGTON, reading an account
of a railroad accident, was much surprised to
learn that the locomotive had been driven off
the track by one of the switches. "She
shouldn't have thought," she said, "that the
great iron engine would mind such a little
thing as a switch?" "Yes, but you must re-
member, mamma," said the boy, "that the
locomotive has a tender behind it. Oh, that
indeed," replied the old lady, "assuming her
power, well, you needn't talk about it, my
son, go on with your lesson."

A Western Editor complaining that he
could not sleep one night, summed up the causes.
A walking bear overleaped months—dog howl-
ing under the window—a cat in the alley—a col-
ored woman at the door—a pig trying to get in at the back
door. Poor fellow!

A critic once, with indelible ill-na-
ture, picked out all the faults of a beautiful por-
trait, presented to Apollo. The god ordered a
boson of his best Persianian wheat to be care-
fully winnowed, and he presented the critic with
the chaff.

FOR THE DEMOCRAT.

Messrs. Editors:—When I last wrote you
on the subject of Intermitting Springs, I did not
intend again to trouble the publishers or the
public. But I have wished to correct two or
three of the errors which occurred in my last
communication, and to add a word or two
further of explanation. This I have long de-
ferred, because in a note received from Mr.
Clarke I understood him to express a design
to offer something more upon this topic,
which I should be glad to hear, as nothing is so
pleasing and satisfactory to me as to know
the reasons, the "why and wherefore," of
anything under consideration. Those who
receive things on the run, take them for granted
without stopping to investigate causes,
were doubtless wearied of this long ago, and
thought the subject exhausted. Those, also,
gifted with ability to perceive original truths
at a glance; may have the start of me—may
have viewed the whole, and are likewise tri-
ed. But I am confident that Dr. Constock's
theory elucidating this phenomena, has not
been at all generally, nor satisfactorily, nor
correctly understood. Even Mr. Clarke's first
proposition—in the one in general terms—I
conceive was but a reiteration of Dr. C's hy-
pothesis. Mr. Clarke's revised theory is a
beautiful one. Its contemplation affords de-
light. It is one of Nature's beneficent pro-
visions that minute tubes and porous substan-
ces have power to transmit and retain fluids
without the aid of the earth's attraction and
rin in opposition to the force of gravity. It
is probably in part (though likely in small
part) by help of this capillary attraction that
trees and plants draw their sustenance from
the ground, and carry their sap through their
poes. The primary cause of this capillary
action is not, so far as I know, understood
any more than is the principle of attraction
in general. True, Dr. Constock remarks in
relation to it, that "the cause of this seems
to be nothing more than the ordinary attrac-
tion of the particles of matter for each other.
The sides of a small orifice are near to each
other as to attract the particles of the fluid
on their opposite sides, and as all attraction
is the direction of the greatest quantity of
matter, the water is raised upwards, or in the
direction of the length of the tube." This ap-
pears plausible. But suppose a capillary tube
has one half its length plunged beneath the
surface of a vessel of liquid; would there not
be as much of the matter of the tube below
the surface, as above? And would not this
matter exert its attraction to draw the water
within the tube downward as much as up-
ward? How then does such attraction aid
the fluid to rise in the tube?
Some may deem such questions evadatory,
or trifling, but Dr. Constock will not. His
attainments and research are too substantial,
and he too much loves investigation for truth's
sake—for science's sake.
But it seems to me that Mr. Clarke's the-
ory, pretty and satisfactory as it is, is not Dr.
Constock's theory, notwithstanding Mr.
Clarke said that it vindicates the latter "most
triumphantly." I have been asked, you will
recollect, "Why reason against an establish-
ed fact? I am not aware that I have done so."
I have reasoned against an evident im-
possibility, viz: that the force of the siphon
above, as is plainly indicated by Dr. Con-
stock, could ever fill the siphonic channel so
as to set the siphon in operation, unless the
rills were at the same time able to keep the
siphon acting constantly. Dr. Constock says
that the siphon will begin to act as soon as the
rills have filled it to its apex. Now I have
yet to learn how this can be possible, with-
out the aid of more hocuspocus than ever the
ignorant and superstitious would be apt to at-
tribute. Whence comes the necessary pre-
ponderance of water? Indeed, the rills alone
could never fill the siphon to its vertex. Ca-
pillary attraction or some other cause must
co-operate to reach that point even, and when
that is gained siphonic action could not be-
gin till the same auxiliary cause should fill
the channel to a point just beyond this.

In my last communication to the Democrat
the following errors appeared:
"Dr. C. would despise literally all who go in
leading-strings." Not "literally," but "lit-
erally," a word used without authority to
signify "as regards erudition and science."
"The 18th chapter of 1st Corinthians."
"Mechanics (the science) has never" etc.
"Two or three" etc. occurred while the sub-
jects to which they relate was omitted.
The connection was in one place broken by
the insertion of what was intended for a mar-
ginal note.
Truly,
E. A. WESTON.

Brooklyn, Feb. 1855.
Two printers in the Plymouth Rock office
tired of taking impressions on the forms of that
paper, tried it on the heads of two ducks. Af-
ter several settings up they succeeded in getting
such fair proof of the matter that the minister of
the place was called in and worked off the whole
four forms in two full editions, leaving them
looked up for life. Now let them "circulate the
documents."—*American Banner.*

"Dean Sir," hissed a great lady, in wa-
tered silk, at the World's Fair, "have the good-
ness to inform me if there are noblemen in the
United States."
"Yes, ma'am," answered a full fed Jonathan
"I am one of them."
"William, I fear you are forgetting me,"
said a bright-eyed girl to her sweet heart the
other day.
"Yes, ma'am, I have been for getting you these
two years."

Political Articles.

Wilmot on the Tariff Question.

The subjoined extracts from a speech deliv-
ered by the Hon. DAVID WILMOT, in Con-
gress, July 1, 1846, we publish for the pur-
pose of giving our readers some idea of the
gross and manifest inconsistency between his
course then and the sentiments which he has
more recently expressed in his letter to Mr.
Laporte, and which we published some two
weeks since. We allow to every man, pub-
lic or private, the right to change his opin-
ions, provided he does so from honest convic-
tions of previous error; but we cannot sup-
pose, in Mr. Wilmot's case, that the free tra-
de of 1846 would be the tariff man of 1855,
if a United States Senator were not to be
elected by the present Legislature. The
change of sentiment in him has actively pro-
ceeded from an impure and selfish motive,
and we confide in the honesty and intelli-
gence of the Legislature to teach him, what
it does not appear to know, that under all
circumstances, in politics or trade, honest
and manly dealing are the only sure passport
to respect and confidence of the people:
"Sir, believing as I do, I cannot give the
influence of my voice, however humble it
may be, in support of the tariff of 1842. I
believe it unjust and oppressive, imposing
heavy burdens upon the labor and industry
of the country, for the purpose of building up
a monopolizing and privileged class. I am
opposed in principle to all partial legislation.
I believe it at war with the spirit and genius
of our institutions, and dangerous to the equal
rights and liberties of the people. This govern-
ment was established for the equal benefit
and protection of its citizens, and is confined
within its proper and legitimate limits. Its
duties are simple; regulating our intercourse
with foreign nations, affording protection to
person and property, leaving each to pursue
that particular employment or branch of in-
dustry which he may deem most profitable,
or best adapted to his tastes and habits."

"It is urged by the protectionists, that the
imposition of high restrictive and prohibitory
duties benefits the whole country, and every
branch of domestic industry. This, sir, I
deprecate. In my view the falsity of this propo-
sition is as clearly demonstrable as any mathe-
matical problem. If what was taken from one
man was returned to him by another, and so
on throughout the whole community or
State, it would benefit no one, but leave
each standing exactly where he was when the
process commenced. Again, all wealth is the
product of labor. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer? If so, it follows that those increas-
ed profits are drawn from some other depart-
ment of industry. It would really be a pro-
tection, you enhance the profits of a particu-
lar department of labor beyond what they would
otherwise be, you must of necessity draw
those increased profits from the labor of some
other. If this proposition be correct, the sub-
ject would resolve itself into an answer
of the simple question: Do high protec-
tive tariffs increase the profits of the manu-
facturer