Miners' Journal.

POTTSVILLE, PA.

SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1860.

THE HOSTILITY OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY TO THE TARIFF.

The vote in the House of Representatives at Washington on Monday last, on a motion to suspend the rules for the purpose of enabling Mr. Morrill to report the Tariff bill, shows conclusively that Democratic protestation of fealty to the Protective interests of the country, cannot be relied upon. On that occasion, the ayes were, 105; noes were 69; as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Adrian, Aldrich, William C. Anderson, Bailey, Babbitt, Bingham, Blake, Briggs, Bristow, Buffinton, Burnham, Burroughs, Campbell, Carey, Carter, Case, Colfax, Conkling, Corwin, Coyode, Curtis, H. Winter Davis, Dawes, Delano, Duell, Dunn, Edgerton, Eliot, Etheridge, Fenton, Ferry, Florence, Foster, Frank, French, Gilmer, Gooch, Grow, Gurley, Hale, Hall, J. Morrison Harris, Hastie, Hatton, Helmick, Hickman, Howard, Humphrey, Hutchins, Jenkins, Francis W. Kellogg, William Kellogg, Killinger, DeWitt C. Leach, Lee, Loomis, Lovejoy, Mallory, Marston, Maynard, McKean, McKnight, McPherson, Millward, Montgomery, Morehead, Morrill, Edward Joy Morris, Morse, Nelson, Olin, Perry, Porter, Potter, Potts, Rice, Riggs, Christopher Robinson, Royce, Schwartz, Scranton, Sherman, William N. H. Smith, Sweat, Stanton, Stokes, Stratton, Tappan, Thayer, Tompkins, Train, Trimble, Vandever, Van Wyck, Verree, Waldron, Walton, Cadwalader C. Washburn, Ellihu B. Washburne, Israel Washburn, Wells, Whiteley, Wilson, Windom, and Woodruff—105.

NAYS—Messrs. Thomas L. Anderson, Ashmore, Avery, Barksdale, Barr, Bocock, Branham, Branch, Barnett, Clopton, Cobb, John Cochrane, Cox, James Craig, Crawford, Curry, John G. Davis, Reuben Davis, De Jarnette, Edmundson, Foake, Garnett, Gartrell, Hamilton, Hardeman, Hill, Hindman, Holman, Houston, Howard, Hughes, Jackson, Jenkins, Jones, Keitt, Lamar, Landrum, Larrabee, Leake, Logan, Love, Maclay, Charles D. Martin, McClernand, McQueen, McRae, Miller, Millson, Sydenham, Moore, Niblack, Noell, Pendleton, Pryor, Pugh, Reagan, Ruffin, Scott, Sickles, Simms, Singleton, William Smith, Spinner, Stevenson, Stout, Underwood, Vallandigham, Vance, Woodson, and Wright—69.

The rules were not suspended, two-thirds not voting in favor thereof.

Now, what party defeated the presentation of the Tariff bill? Let us analyse the above vote and see. For receiving the bill there voted,

Republicans,	84
South Americans,	12
Anti-Lecompton Democrats,	5
North Americans,	1
Administration Democrats,	3
Yeas,	105

Against receiving the bill:

Republicans,	4
South Americans,	1
Anti-Lecompton Democrats,	1
Administration Democrats,	63
Nays,	69

We thus see that the vote of 105 to permit the Tariff Bill to be reported, was made up in the mass, of Republicans, only 3 Administration Democrats—notwithstanding Mr. Buchanan's seeming interest to have the Tariff modified—(Florence and Montgomery of Pennsylvania, and Whitely, of Delaware) voting in the affirmative. Of the 69 who voted against the interests of Pennsylvania, *all but 5 were Democrats.* The Republican who voted in the negative, is General Spinner of New York, who was *born* and bred a Free Trade Loco Foco, and who says he is a Democrat in everything but on the slavery question. Men of Pennsylvania—miners, mechanics and laborers—does not this record show conclusively, the hostility of the Democratic party to the Tariff? Does it not exhibit in all its flimsy colors, the poor farce enacted recently at Reading, when the Democratic party in Convention assembled adopted a resolution, declaring the party in favor of an adequate Protective Tariff. It is mockery; it is insulting, when our State is suffering severely from the effects of the Free Trade policy, which is one of the leading principles of the Democratic party.

If that party was as it professes falsely, to be, in favor of the measure, it had a chance on Wednesday, of proving it, for Mr. Morrill's bill from the Committee of Ways and Means, is considered eminently fair and just—the rates as far as Pennsylvania is concerned, being as follows: Pig Iron, $6 per ton; Railroad Bars, $12; Merchant Bar, $15; and other Iron ranging from $16 to $25. Anthracite Coal, 75 cents, and Bituminous Coal, $1 per ton.

Here we have a just and equitable bill, framed cautiously, so that the Free Trade principles of the Democratic party would not be offended. Yet on its first presentation it receives a check at the hands of the party, which is now endeavoring to make the workingmen of Pennsylvania believe that it is favorable to the enactment of an adequate Protective Tariff.

Men of Pennsylvania, you are suffering. Be not deceived by the sophistry of a corrupt party, which cares not for the interests of the people, while it fattens on the spoils of office. Remember the great deception practiced upon you in 1844 by the Democratic party. Can it again be successful in 1860? Assuredly, no.

THE USUAL GAME.

Sadly deficient in material for decent principles upon which to go into the campaign, misrepresentation perforce, must be drilled into service by the organs of the so-called Demo racy. Recognized as the Free Trade party of the country by its endorsement of the Cincinnati platform, which says that "*The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas, and*, PROGRESSIVE FREE TRADE THROUGHOUT THE WORLD," the Democracy find that they have a hard game to play this year in Pennsylvania, and are in proportion, desperate and unscrupulous.

Fully recognizing the strait to which the fallen fortunes of the Disunion, Free Trade Democracy have reduced them, we were not surprised to observe in the *Democratic Standard* of Saturday last, an article on "the Republican as a Tariff party," which requires some notice at our hands, in order that it may not mislead even a single person in the community. The antidote shall follow quickly upon and neutralize the poison.

Our neighbor selects as an illustration of its charge that the Republican party is not in favor of Protection, an article against that measure, published in the New York *Evening Post*—a paper published by William Cullen Bryant, and in regard to whose opinions on this great question, Mr. Carey is now publishing a series of papers in the MINERS' JOURNAL, and other journals of the Opposition, to the Democracy.

In its views against the enactment of a Protective Tariff, the *Evening Post* stands alone among the legion of Republican papers in the country. It cannot forget its first love. We will explain. The New York *Evening Post* has been an advocate of free-soil principles only during the past four years. Previous to that time it was identified with and advocated the principles of the so called Democratic party. Disgusted with the truckling of that party to the Slave power, the *Post* deserted it on the free-soil principle alone, retaining still the Free Trade ideas of the party with which it had been formerly allied. If it were necessary, we could point to a long and distinguished list of Republican journals, commencing with the New York *Tribune*, that are decidedly in favor of an adequate Protective Tariff. It would be insulting to the intelligence of the reader however, to do it; for it is a fact generally recognized, that the Republican party is Protective. As our neighbor, the *Standard*, is quick to misrepresent the Republican party in this matter, we would respectfully ask it to point to a single Democratic journal in New York City, or in fact, anywhere out of Pennsylvania, that advocates the passage of such a Tariff bill as we need at this period of business inactivity and distress among the working classes. In Pennsylvania, of course, some can be found, for they dare not come before the people of Pennsylvania, and advocate what is really the principle of the Democratic party in regard to a Tariff. Their course however, is a miserable subterfuge, as contemptible as the resolution adopted at Reading, expressing devotion to adequate Protection, and charging the Republicans with enacting the Tariff of 1857, when by turning to the record, the reader will find that in the Thirty-fourth Congress the Republicans were in a minority in both Houses—having but fifteen members in the Senate.

We owe an apology to our readers for devoting so much space to refuting the *Standard's* charge against the Republican party. That party is not responsible for what Mr. Bryant, the editor of the *Post*, or any other individual may say against Protection. Acts speak louder than words. The Republican party can be judged by its acts, which so far show it to be in favor of a Protective Tariff—our estate cotemporary to the contrary, notwithstanding.

EDITOR'S TABLE.

MILLETTE'S MAGAZINE for March contains a portrait of Franklin; a fashion, and numerous pattern plates, a piece of music, and the usual literary variety. This is a cheap and popular magazine.

GODEY'S LADY'S BOOK for April is a creditable sample of an American magazine. "Spring," a steel engraving, is remarkably fine. This number contains altogether, seventy-five engravings. We have frequently spoken in the highest terms of Godey, and we can only say, in addition, that it adds monthly to its reputation, and that the lady who does not receive it regularly, misses a treat.

FROM J. M. EMERSON & Co., 37 Park Row, New York, the enterprising publishers, we have received the March number of "All The Year Round," containing the continuation of the absorbing story, "The Woman in White," with much other readable matter. We know no publication more worthy of liberal patronage than this. It is cheap, useful and entertaining. We are also indebted to the same firm for the March number of the "United States Journal," a finely illustrated paper.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.—The February number of the American edition of this publication is on our table. The contents are—Salon Life—Madame Bécamier, a readable paper; Coast Defences and Rifle Corps; Erasmus as a Satirist; The Science of Scripture; Austria; Form and Color; Wesleyan Methodism; Ceylon and the Singhalese; Professor George Wilson; Fossil Footprints, and Recent Publications. We would again remind our readers in connection with these valuable publications that the new volumes of the four Reviews and Blackwood, commenced in January. They are furnished at $10 per annum, while a discount of twenty-five per cent. from this price will be allowed to clubs ordering four or more copies of any one or more of the works. Published by Leonard Scott & Co., 54 Gold street, New York.

Local Affairs.

WEEKLY ALMANAC.

1860.—March.	SUN RISES	SUN SETS	MOON'S CHANGES.	D. H. M.
17 SATURDAY,.....	6 9 6	8	Full M.	7 48 m
18 SUNDAY,.....	6 7 6	9	Third Q.	14 4 13 m
19 MONDAY,.....	6 5 6	10	New M.	22 8 59 m
20 TUESDAY,.....	6 3 6	12	First Q.	30 1 57 m
22 WEDNESDAY,..	6 2 6	13		
22 THURSDAY,....	6 0 6	14		
23 FRIDAY,.....	5 59 6	16		

Thermometrical Record for the Week.

P. R. & P. TELEGRAPH OFFICE, *Pennsylvania Hall, Pottsville.*

	8 A.M.	2 P.M.	7 P.M.	
Mar. 10—Saturday,	34°	37°	33°	clear.
" 11—Sunday,	39	43	37	snow.
" 13—Tuesday,	39	40	37	clear.
" 14—Wednesday,	46	47	44	"
" 15—Thursday,	47	54	50	"
" 16—Friday,	52	52	49	"

☞ *The weather is remarkably fine.*

☞ *To-day* is St. Patrick's Day. It will be observed here by the admirers of the Saint in the usual manner—a supper.

☞ *Messrs. Lykens and Work* of this Borough, will be engaged the coming season, in the erection of a bridge across the Delaware at Trenton.

☞ *Cricket.*—The admirers of this manly out door sport are preparing for the approaching season, which promises not only here but abroad, to be one of the most successful on record.

☞ *A waiter* at the Mount Carbon Hotel, lost in Centre street, this week, one hundred and fifty dollars in notes on the Miners' Bank, with which he had been entrusted. They dropped from his vest pocket. The money has been recovered.

☞ *Fire at Silver Creek.*—On Thursday afternoon, two frame dwellings at Silver Creek, owned by Mr. Neal, and occupied by Mrs. Young and Barnet Garvey, were completely destroyed by fire. Most of the furniture was saved. Loss small. The fire was accidental.

☞ *To Fruit Growers.*—The *Horticulturist* says that those who wish to have plums retained on their trees until ripe, can do so by digging up an inch or two in depth around the tree in the spring of the year, and then putting about a gallon of air-slacked lime in—then replace the ground taken out, or get fresh, and the tree will retain the fruit.

☞ *The Mutual Life Insurance Company*—Mr. H. P. Smith is agent in this County, for this New York Company. Its assets in December last were over six millions of dollars. This is a reliable Company, and offers strong inducements, as the rates of premiums are lower than those charged by many other companies. Mr. Smith will give full information in regard to the Company.

☞ *Death of a Centenarian in the Alms House.*—Jessie Moore, aged 101 years and 2 months, died in the Schuylkill County Alms House on Sunday evening, March 11. He was a native of Maryland. He removed to Pennsylvania and located himself in the Cattawissa Valley in the year 1800. He remained there up to the commencement of the War of 1812, in which he served as a soldier up to its close.

☞ *At a meeting* of the "Atlantic Cricket Club," held Thursday Evening, March 15th, 1860, the following officers were elected for the coming season:

President—O. SMITH.
Vice President—Wm. D. Hodgson.
Secretary—O. C. BONYSHELL.
Treasurer—S. R. Whitney.
Ground Committee—James Focht, Jno. T. Boyle, Jno. W. Rosenberry, D. D. McGinness.

☞ *Public Schools.*—The examinations in the Public Schools of this Borough will commence next week, and will be continued until all the pupils in the different schools are examined.

The Fishback School will be examined on Wednesday, March 21st, commencing at 2 o'clock, P. M.

Mr. German's and Miss Martin's on Thursday, March 22d.

Miss Wilson's and Miss Nimbleton's on Friday, March 23d.

The parents and citizens generally are invited to attend these examinations.

☞ In the horse-shoe matter the Reading *Times* remarks after reading Mr. Hause's affidavit, that he is "coming to the scratch;" which is a great deal more than Mr. Rambo is doing. The *Times* evidently, does not understand that as much work is required to fashion a good mule-shoe, as to make a horse-shoe. *N'importe.* Let Mr. Rambo, we repeat, beat Mr. Hause's 230 horse and mule shoes in six hours and fifty-nine minutes, and Mr. Hause will challenge him, with the requisite number of "crocks" to back the challenge. If Mr. Rambo refuses to comply, we will consider that he is afraid to meet in generous rivalry, a Schuylkill County blacksmith. At present the matter looks like a complete "back-down" on the part of the Reading champion.

☞ *Military and Masonic Funeral.*—The funeral of Mr. William H. Gore took place on Sunday afternoon last. The remains were interred in the Presbyterian Cemetery, with Masonic and military ceremonies. The military companies in line, were the First Troop, Schuylkill County Cavalry, and Washington Artillery Company.—The following staff and field officers were present in full uniform—Brigadier General Raifsnyder; Major General Wynkoop, and Brigade Inspector Nagle. The troops marched to the place of interment with reversed arms, while the Pottsville Cornet Band played a funeral dirge. At the grave after the touching and impressive Masonic ceremonies were concluded, the last honors were paid by the Artillerists.

☞ *Unruly Boys.*—We hear complaints of the conduct on each Sabbath, of some twenty half-grown boys, in the public streets. It seems that they are in the habit of congregating on Third street near Minersville Road, where they play marbles, hide-and-seek, and yell to the annoyance of persons residing in the vicinity. As the practice has been continued for some six months; as there have been three or four persons sick in that neighborhood at the same time, and efforts to stop the noise have proved unsuccessful, even when watchmen have attempted it, we call attention to the matter publicly, hoping that the police will abate the nuisance. The boys had better attend Sunday School, where they will learn truths which will benefit them in after life. Want of respect for the Sabbath is too often the first step in a criminal career.

☞ *Card of Thanks.*—At a meeting of the Managers of the Concert given for the benefit of Dr. H. Weiser, held at Lafayette Hotel, St. Clair, on Monday, March 12th, 1860, the following resolutions were adopted:

Resolved, That we tender our sincere thanks to the Pottsville Harmony Band, Pottsville Cornet Band, St. Clair Band, Messrs. Reimer, Stoermeister, Alstadt, and Tracy, Pottsville Glee Club and Signor Bernsdotti, for their valuable services in a charitable work.

Resolved, That we will show our gratitude substantially, to the above parties, should the occasion ever offer, and that we highly appreciate their musical ability.

Resolved, That we tender our thanks to Messrs. Kessngling, Philip Diehl and F. Gantert for the use of their vehicles on the occasion.

Resolved, That we are grateful to the papers of Pottsville for noticing the Concert appropriately.

N. OSTHEIMER, *Pres't.*
J. KEISO, *Sec'y.*

☞ *Plant! Plant!!*—As the season for transplanting is now about here, we would impress upon all ground owners—whether they have but half a lot or hundreds of acres—the duty of providing themselves with trees, bushes and plants. The value of fruits, large and small, are but just getting to be appreciated. Why, aside from the pleasure of cultivating such productions, they are really the most profitable crop that earth can produce; and that word "profit"—how it commands attention in our day, wherever sounded! Well, these fruit crops are the most profitable that can be cultivated. All small fruits, if properly attended to, produce prodigiously; and there is always a market for them at high prices. Take a grape vine, which if properly trained, will occupy but a few feet of space, and what a quantity of fine fruit it will yield! So with other fruits, with like attention. There's the blackberry—we have been assured by persons who cultivated the Lawton, that they have picked a peck from a single bush. Now, who would be without all these things, when they can be so easily had. Even if you do not wish to raise them for profit, raise them for your own use, and for the satisfaction their cultivation will afford you; for there is no doubt that an interest in the growing of such things will afford more pleasure than those who have never tried it have any idea of. Let us say again, then, plant!

☞ *A Brief History of the Washington Artillery Company.*—For some years this corps has been considered in point of discipline and in the precision of its evolutions on parade, an honor to the Brigade. On its visits abroad it has been the recipient of the highest encomiums, for its proficiency in those points which constitute a well-drilled corps, while at home our citizens are proud of the Artillerists. Under these circumstances we think that a brief history of the Company will not be unacceptable to our readers.

The Company was first organized as an Infantry corps, under the name of the Independent Blues. It was inspected by Major Sheppell on the 10th of September, 1842, and James Nagle was elected Captain.

The Company participated in the encampment held on Greenwood Hill, Pottsville—known as Camp De Kalb—which commenced on the 16th of August, 1843, and continued one week.

The corps had its name changed to Washington Artillery by an Act of Assembly, passed April 18th, 1844.

The Company made an excursion to Pinegrove in the Fall of 1844, and was received by the Pinegrove Guards. The Artillerists had a target practice with the Guards; the prize being a military cap. It was brought home by the Artillerists.

On the 6th of September, 1845, the corps made an excursion to Philadelphia, via. Schuylkill Canal. It arrived at Fairmount on Monday morning, September 8th; was received at the Wire Bridge by the State Fencibles, commanded by Col. James Page, and entertained the following day by the National Guards, commanded by Major Peter Fritz.

The Company volunteered its services upon the declaration of war with Mexico, and started for the seat of war on the 5th of December, 1846.—It landed at Vera Cruz, among the first troops, and during its term of service on the soil of Mexico, was engaged in the Siege of Vera Cruz, and battles of Cerro Gordo, La Hoya, Puebla, Huamantla and Atlixco. The corps returned at the close of the war, July 27th, 1848, and was disbanded.

The Company was re-organized by Major Krebs, on the 22d of February, 1850, and adopted the same style of uniform it wore in the army.—James Nagle was elected Captain, and resigned the command December 13th, 1850. Lofever Womelsdorf was elected Captain, January 8th, 1851, and remained in command until August 21st, 1854, when his commission expired. James Nagle was re-elected Captain August 21st, 1854.

While Womelsdorf was Captain the corps made an excursion to Mauch Chunk, June 16th, 1851, and was received by the firemen and citizens, there being at that time no military organization there. In the Autumn of 1851, it made an excursion to Philadelphia, to participate in the Kossuth reception.

On the 15th of May, 1855, the Artillerists started on an excursion to Pinegrove, Fredericksburg, Jonestown, Lebanon, Myerstown, Womelsdorf, Reading and Hamburg. At each place they were received by the military, and returned home on the evening of the 20th.

The Company made an excursion to Pinegrove on the 2d of August, 1858, to attend the Inspection of the Washington Light Infantry by Major James Nagle.

Target-practice at Middleport, September 1st, 1858.

On the 28th of September, 1858, the corps attended the Agricultural Fair at Orwigsburg, for the purpose of firing for a prize musket, got up by the Managers of the Society, for target competition by the military of the County. The best single shot took it. The Artillerist brought the musket home, Private George Hoffman winning it.

The Company made an excursion to Philadelphia, November 24, 1858. It was received by the Scott Legion and Minute Men of '76, and was entertained during its stay in the City by those companies; the Cadwalader Grays and State Fencibles. On leaving the City to return home it was escorted to the depot by the Cadwalader Grays.

On the 3d of October, 1859, the Artillerists started on an excursion to Easton and New York, via. Reading. They were received at Easton by the Citizen Artillery, National Guards and Easton Yeagers, and at New York by a detachment of the 71st Regiment, under Lieutenant Pride. On the day of its departure to return home, the corps was reviewed in the Park by the Mayor, and escorted to the boat by a battalion of the 71st Regiment, under command of Major Tomkins.

James Wren was elected Captain, September 6th, 1859. At the same time Major James Nagle was elected Instructor of the corps—the Major occupying the post of Brigade Inspector, could not hold the captaincy of the Company, under the decision of the Secretary of State.

In addition to the above historical facts briefly recapitulated, it may be proper to state that the corps has participated in public parades, and assisted in quelling riots, when its services have been demanded by the authorities. It has also, at various times, received and entertained visiting military companies, among which may be named, the State Fencibles, West Chester Grays, Reading Artillery, Cleaver Artillery, Scott Legion, Columbian Infantry, Scott Artillery and Wynkoop Artillery.

It is satisfactory to state as an indication of the military spirit which exists in this community, that the Washington Artillerists are at the present time, better disciplined, and numerically stronger, than they ever have been before, with the exception of the period when they were in active service in Mexico. The present uniform of the corps consists of a plain dark-blue frock-coat, buff fringe epaulettes, sky-blue pants, seal-skin shakoe and sky-blue over-coats. The commissioned and non-commissioned officers are,

Instructor, Major James Nagle.
Captain, James Wren.
First Lieutenant, D. A. Smith; Jr. First Lieutenant, F. B. Wallace; Second Lieutenant, J. M. Shomo.
Ensign, Peter Douty.
Quarter Master Sergeant, G. H. Gressang.
Orderly Sergeant, Cyrus Sheets.
Sergeants, S. M. Mortimer; Daniel Nagle; Val. Stichter.
Corporals, Philip Nagle; F. A. Benewitz; W. F. Patterson; L. W. Bosbyshell.
Musicians, Abraham Nagle; Aquilla Marsh; Charles Denser.
Privates, 65 men; total strength of company 85, all told.

[FOR THE MINERS' JOURNAL.]

FINANCIAL CRISES: THEIR CAUSES AND EFFECTS.

Letter to Hr. Bryant.—No. 11.

From the Evening Post, Tuesday, Feb. 28.

"AN EXAMPLE OF THE EFFECT OF PROTECTION.—Among the commodities which have hitherto not been permitted to be brought into France from foreign countries, is cutlery. It is now included in the list of merchandise to which the late treaty with Great Britain opens the ports of France.

"Those who have made a comparison of French cutlery with the cutlery of the British Islands, must have been at first surprised at the difference in the quality. Nothing can exceed the perfection of workmanship in the articles turned out from the workshops of Sheffield. The symmetry and perfect adaptation of the form, the excellence of the material, the freedom from flaws, and the mirror like polish which distinguish them, have for years past been the admiration of the world. French cutlery, placed by its side, has a ruder, rougher appearance, an unfinished look, as if the proper tools were wanting to the artisan, or as if it was the product of a race among whom the useful arts had made less progress.

"This is not owing to any parsimony of nature, either in supplying the material to be wrought, or the faculties of the artisan who brings it to a useful shape. The ores of the French mines yield metal of an excellent quality, and the French race is one of the most ingenious and dexterous in the world. In all manufactures requiring the nicest precision and the greatest delicacy of workmanship, the French may be said to excel the rest of mankind. Out of the most unpromising and apparently intractable materials, their skillful hands fabricate articles of use or ornament of the most pleasing and becoming forms. The question, then, arises, that their cutlery is so much inferior to that of Great Britain?

"In all probability the reason is that which at one time caused the silk trade to emigrate from Spitalfields, which at other times made the people of the same country complain that their glass was both bad in quality, and high in price. In both these instances the competition of foreign manufacturers was declined; the British manufacturers having the monopoly of the market, there was nothing to stimulate his ingenuity; he produced articles of inferior quality, his opinion did not suffer, and both he and the community were dissatisfied. So with regard to the cutlery of France, the difficulty has been the prohibition of the foreign article. Let the foreign and the French commodity be looked at side by side for a few years in the shop-windows of Paris, if the duty to which cutlery is still to be subject will permit it, and we think we may venture to pledge ourselves that the French workmen will show themselves in due time no way behind their English rivals. We may expect the same result to take place which has so much astonished and puzzled the friends of protection in Sardinia, where the removal of prohibitions and protective duties has caused a hundred different branches of manufacturing industry to spring to sudden and prosperous activity."

DEAR SIR:—Anxious that all the protectionists of the Union should, as far as possible, have it within their power to study both sides of the question, I here, as you see, lay before my readers your latest argument against protection, thereby affording them that opportunity of judging for themselves which you so systematically deny to the readers of the *Post*. Why is it that it is so denied? Is it that the British system can be maintained in no other manner than by such concealment of great facts as is here so clearly obvious? While enlarging upon the deficiencies of French cutlery, as resulting from protection, was it necessary to shut out from view the important fact, that under a protective system more complete, and more steadily maintained, than any other in the world, France has made such extraordinary progress in all textile manufactures, that she now exports of them to the extent of almost hundreds of millions of dollars annually—supplying them at home and abroad so cheaply, that she finds herself now ready to substitute protective duties for the prohibitions which have so long existed? Would it not be far more fair and honest were you to give your readers all the facts, instead of limiting yourself so the few that can be made to seem to furnish evidence of the truth of that system to which you are so much attached, and to which we are indebted for the financial crises whose ruinous effects you have so well described?

Why is it that the French people, while so successful with regard to silks and cottons, are so deficient in respect to the production and manufacture of the various metals? The cause of this is not, as you tell your readers, to be found in "the parsimony of nature," and yet, it is a well-known fact, that while the supply of coal and iron ore is very limited, others of the most useful metals are not to be found in France. This, however, is not all, "the parsimony of nature" which, notwithstanding your denial of it, so certainly exists, being here accompanied by restrictions on domestic commerce of the most injurious kind, an account of which, from a work of the highest character, will be found in the following paragraph:

"By the French law, *all minerals of every kind belong to the crown, and the only advantage the proprietor of the soil enjoys, is to have the refusal of the mines at the rent fixed upon it by the crown surveyors.* There is great difficulty sometimes in even obtaining the leave of the crown to sink a shaft upon the property of the individual who is anxious to undertake the speculation, and to pay the rent usually demanded, a certain portion of the gross product. The Comte Alexander de B——has been vainly seeking this permission for a leadmine on his estate in Brittany, for upwards of ten years."

Having read this, you cannot but be satisfied that it accounts most fully for French deficiencies in the mining and metallurgic arts. That such was the case, you knew at the time you wrote your article, or you did not know it. If you did, would it not have been far more fair and honest to have given all the facts? If you did not, is it not evident that you have need to study further, before undertaking to lecture upon questions of such high importance?

Turning now from French cutlery to British glass, I find you telling your readers that the deficiency in this latter had been "in all probability" due to the fact, that "the competition of foreign artisans" had been so entirely excluded. On the contrary, my dear sir, it was due to restrictions on internal commerce, glass having been, until within a few years past, subjected to an excise duty, yielding an annual revenue of more than $3,000,000. To secure the collection of that revenue, it had been found necessary to subject the manufacturer to such regulations in reference to his modes of operation as rendered improvement quite impossible. From the moment that domestic commerce became free, domestic competition grew, bringing with it the great changes that have since occurred. That such is the case, is known to all the world, and yet I find no mention of these important facts in this article intended for the readers of the *Post*. Would they not, my dear sir, be better instructed, were you to permit them to see and read both sides of this great question?

What has recently been done with British glass, is precisely what was sought to be done in France by Colbert and Turgot, both of whom saw in the removal of restrictions upon internal commerce the real road to an extended intercourse with other nations of the world. With us, the great obstacle standing in the way of domestic commerce, is found in those large British capitals which, as we are now officially informed, constitute "the great instruments of warfare against the competing capitals of other countries, and are the most essential instruments now remaining by which the manufacturing supremacy" of England "can be maintained;" and in protecting our people against that most destructive "warfare," we are but following in the direction indicated by the most eminent French economists, from Colbert to Chevalier. France has protected her people, and therefore is it, that agricultural products are high in price, while finished commodities are cheap, and that the country becomes more rich and independent from year to year. We refuse to grant protection to our people, and we sink deeper in colonial vassalage from day to day.

Foreign competition in the domestic market is, however, as we are told, indispensable to improvement in the modes of manufacture. This being really so, how is it, my dear sir, that France has so very much improved in the arts of manufactures, in which foreign competition has been so entirely *prohibited?* How is it, that Belgium and Germany have so far superseded England in regard to woolen cloths? How is it, that American newspapers have so much improved, while being cheapened? Have not these last an entire monopoly of the home market? Would it be possible for a *Tribune*, or a *Post*, in England, for New York consumption? Perfectly protected as you yourself are, is it not time that you should open your eyes to the fact that it is to the stimulation of domestic competition for the purchase of raw materials, and for the sale of finished commodities, we must look for any and every increase in the wealth, happiness, and freedom of our people?

The more perfect the possession of the domestic market, the greater is the power to supply the foreign one—the *Tribune* being enabled to supply its distant subscribers so very cheaply, for the reason that it and its fellows have to fear no competition for home advertisements from the London *Times*, or *Post*. "This principle," as you yourself have most truly said,

"is common to every business. Every manufacturer practices it, by always allowing the purchaser of large quantities of his surplus manufacture an advantage over the domestic consumer, for the simple reason that the domestic consumer must support the manufacturer, and as the quantity of goods consumed at home is very much larger than that sent abroad, it is the habit of the manufacturer to send his surplus abroad, and sell at any price, so as to relieve the market of a surplus which might depress prices at home, and compel him to work at little or no profit."

Admitting now that it were possible for the London *Times* to supply, on every evening, a paper precisely similar to yours—forcing abroad the surplus, and selling "at any price, so as to relieve the domestic market," would you not be among the first to demand protection against the system? Would you not assure your readers of the entire impossibility of maintaining competition against a journal, all of whose expenses of composition and editorship were paid by the home market—leaving the proprietors to look abroad for little more than the mere cost of paper and of presswork? Would you not demonstrate to them the absolute necessity of protecting *themselves* against a "warfare" that must inevitably result in the creation of a "little oligarchy" of monopolists who, when domestic competition had been finally broken down, would compel them to pay ten cents for a journal neither larger nor better than they now obtain for two? Assuredly, you would.

Adressing such arguments to your British free trade friends, they would, however, refer you to the columns of the *Post*, begging you to study the assurance that had there been given, that—

"Whenever the course of financial fluctuation shall have broken the hold of monopolists and speculators upon the mines of iron and coal, which the Almighty made for the common use of man, and whenever there shall be men of skill and enterprise to spare to go into the business of iron-making for a living, and not on speculation, who shall set their wits at it to find out the best ways and the cheapest processes, it must be that such an abundance both of ore and fuel can be made to yield plenty of iron, in spite of the competition of European iron-masters, who have to bring their products three thousand miles to find a market."

To all this you would, of course, reply that "financial fluctuations" created monopolists, and never "broke their hold;" that men of "skill and enterprise" were not generally rich enough to compete with such rivals as the London *Times*; that domestic competition had already given us "cheaper ways and cheaper processes" than any other country of the world; that the freight of a sheet of paper was as nothing compared with the cost of editorship and composition; that all these latter costs were, in the case of the British journals, paid by the domestic market; that "the domestic consumers supported the British manufacturer;" that the quantity of journals consumed at home was so very great that their producers could afford to sell abroad "at any price"—thereby "relieving the market of a surplus which might depress prices at home, and compel them to work at little or no profit;" and that, for all these reasons, it was absolutely necessary to grant you such protection as would give you the same security in the domestic market as was then enjoyed by your foreign rivals?

Would not all this be equally true if said to any of our producers of cloth and iron, coal and lead? Does the policy you advocate tend to place them in a position successfully to contend with those British manufacturers who "voluntarily incur immense losses, in bad times, in order to destroy foreign competition, and to gain and keep possession of foreign markets?" Can they resist the action of the owners of those "great accumulations of capital" which have been made at our cost, and are now being used to "enable a few of the most wealthy capitalists to overwhelm all foreign competition in times of great depression" —thereby largely adding to their already enormous fortune, "before foreign capital can again accumulate to such extent as to be able to establish a competition in prices with any chances of success?" Can it be to the interest of any country to leave its miners and manufacturers exposed to a "warfare" such as is here officially declared? Do not they stand as much in need of protection, for the sake of the consumers, as you would do in the case supposed? Does not your own experience prove that the more perfect the security of the manufacturer in the domestic market, the greater is the tendency to that increase of domestic competition which tends to increase the prices of raw materials, while lessening the cost of cloth and iron? Do not men, every where, become more free, as that competition grows, and as employments become more diversified? Is not, then, the question we are discussing, one of the freedom and happiness of your fellow-men? If so, is it worthy of you to offer to your readers such arguments as are contained in the article above reprinted?

Holding myself, as always heretofore, ready to give to my readers your replies to the questions I have put, I remain, my dear sir,

Yours very truly,
HENRY C. CAREY.

W. C. BRYANT, Esq.,
Philadelphia, March 13, 1860.

PROCEEDINGS OF COURT.

REPORTED FOR THE MINERS' JOURNAL.

Com. vs. Benj. Christian and Richard Edwards.—The defts. were indicted for the larceny of $55, belonging to Thomas Cowan, residing near Pottsville. On the morning of the larceny, Cowan went out gunning, leaving the defts. at his house. The prosecutor's wife testified that during his absence the defts. went up stairs, broke open the trunk and took the money. But the evidence showed that the defts. had not taken it, but that in some way or other Mrs. Cowan had obtained a considerable amount of money, with which she made very free in treating during the day. She had threatened to take the money. The jury found the defts. not guilty.

Com. vs. Daniel Eagen.—Surety of the peace on oath of Ellen Clancy. After a hearing, the case was dismissed and no order made as to the costs.

Com. vs. Thomas Campbell.—Surety of the peace on oath of Ann Campbell. This was disposed of like the preceding case.

Com. vs. George Hummel.—The deft. plead guilty to a charge of fornication and bastardy on Elizabeth Runkle, and the usual sentence was imposed.

Com. vs. Catherine Shean.—The deft. was charged with disturbing the peace. She appeared to be insane and was ordered to be taken to the Poor House.

Com. vs. Patrick McGeary.—Surety of the peace on oath of John Walsh. The deft. appeared to have made some drunken threats against the prosecutor. After a hearing the case was dismissed without regard to costs.

Com. vs. Margaret Adams and Jane Seltzinger.—The defts. were indicted for the larceny of about $50, belonging to John H. Weist, who resides in the western part of the county and came to Pottsville to buckster produce. He stopped at Hill's tavern. In the evening he went with some one to the house where the defts. were staying, sat down near the fire and went to sleep. After being there for some time he was taken out by one of his friends, and then he found out that his money had been stolen. The defts. were arrested, and part of the money found on Margaret Adams, who had been about Weist while he was asleep. The jury found Margaret Adams guilty and Jane Seltzinger not guilty.

Com. vs. George Albertson.—Larceny of a lot of wheat and buckwheat flour from the store of Henry F. Stedpole in Tamaqua. The deft. who it was said, had been a soldier in the Mexican war was found guilty, and was sentenced to an imprisonment of two months and to pay the costs.

Com. vs. Dennis McCarty.—Larceny on oath of Joseph Clark. After a hearing of the case the jury found the deft. not guilty.

Com. vs. Roland Zimmerman and Samuel P. Kehl.—The defts. were indicted for an assault and battery on Isaac Eisenhower. The parties met at a vendue in Union township, and after it was over went to Hannah's tavern, about one half mile distant. Eisenhower became considerably intoxicated, and made several assaults on different parties, knocking a quiet inoffensive man down on the floor. He then made an assault on Zimmerman, who told him to go away; that he was a hog. The landlady interfered, and Eisenhour stepped out of the house and challenged Zimmerman to fight, which he declined. Eisenhour entered the house again, seized Zimmerman by the hair with both hands, a scuffle ensued, and both went down, Eisenhour under; Zimmerman struggled to release himself, bracing his hands against Eisenhour's face, and at last succeeded. As soon as he was clear, he struck Eisenhour several blows in the face and the parties were then separated. During the scuffle Zimmerman was bitten in the neck and Eisenhour lost an eye, either from the blows received or when his pocket-knife—a hands were in his face. He was considerably injured. The evidence further showed that Zimmerman was a quiet, peaceable man, and that the prosecutor was intemperate, quarrelsome and, and notorious as a fighting man. Kehl took no part in the affray, except to encourage Zimmerman by his voice. The jury found the defendants not guilty, and put the costs on the prosecutor.

Com. vs. Jas. Duffy and Jno. Davis.—The defts. were indicted for the larceny of a fire hose belonging to the Independence Fire Company of Philadelphia. A committee from that company were sent to Pottsville for the purpose of presenting the hose to the Hydraulion Fire Co. of this place. They had left the hose at the Mansion House, and when the committee called for it for the purpose of making the presentation, it was gone. The defts. had taken it. It was subsequently returned. On the trial it appeared that defts. did not have the slightest intention of stealing it, but because of a dispute with reference to it, and for the joke of the thing. The jury acquitted the defendants.

Com. vs. Cornelius Curren, Wm. Sweeney, Patrick Furey and 24 others.—The defts., 27 in number, were indicted for riot at the Mahanoy Tunnel in December last. The facts of the case are already well known. Patrick J. Barry is