

# HUNTINGDON JOURNAL.

A Family Newspaper—Devoted to General Intelligence, Advertising, Politics, Literature, Morality, Arts, Sciences, Agriculture, Amusement, &c., &c.

Vol. XI, No. 62.

HUNTINGDON, Pa., August 26, 1846.

Whole No. 532

PUBLISHED BY  
**JAMES CLARK.**

**SPECIAL**

OF THE  
**HON. CHARLES HUDSON,**  
Of Massachusetts, on the WHEAT TRADE of the Country, delivered in the House of Representatives of the United States, February 20, 1846.

The "JOURNAL" will be published every Wednesday morning, at \$2 00 a year, if paid in advance, and if not paid within six months, \$2 50.

No subscription received for a shorter period than six months, nor any paper discontinued till all arrears are paid.

Advertisements not exceeding one square, will be inserted three times for \$1 00, and for every subsequent insertion 25 cents. If no definite orders are given as to the time an advertisement is to be continued, it will be kept in till ordered out, and charged accordingly.

V. B. PALMER, Esq., is authorized to act as Agent for this paper, to procure subscriptions and advertisements in Philadelphia, New York, Baltimore and Boston.

OFFICES:  
Philadelphia—Number 59 Pine street.  
Baltimore—S. E. corner of Baltimore and Calvert streets.  
New York—Number 160 Nassau street.  
Boston—Number 16 State street.

**STANTON'S EXTERNAL REMEDY**  
CALLED

**HUNT'S LINIMENT.**  
IS NOW UNIVERSALLY ACKNOWLEDGED TO BE  
The Infallible Remedy.

For Rheumatism, Spinal Affections, Contractions of the Muscles, Sore Throat and Quinsy, Issues, Old Ulcers, Pains in the Breast and Chest, Ague in the Breast and Face, Tooth Ache, Sprains, Bruises, Salt Rheum, Burns, Frosted Feet, and all Nervous diseases.

THE following certificate of the restoration to health and the perfect cure of a deformed and crippled child, who was thought to be beyond the reach of hope, shows that, no matter how appalling the case may be, there is a remedy in HUNT'S LINIMENT, that will conquer the most desperate cases, and that, if the disease be curable, this celebrated external remedy will do it. It has never failed in giving immediate relief if timely applied, as proved by the abundance of high and unimpeachable testimony, the particulars of which are to be found in the pamphlets which are to be had of every agent.

Ossining, June 10, 1845.

GEORGE E. STANTON, Esq.—Sir—I feel called upon by the tie of gratitude, to offer the following testimony in favor of Hunt's Liniment. My grandson, Clarke E. Evans, who is now ten years of age, has been for the last eight years a cripple, caused by falling from a chair when he was two years old, and wrenching his spine. From the time of the occurrence, we have tried every means to restore him to his natural shape, but all without avail. We took him to New York and placed him under the care of a physician of skill, and after remaining there some time, we brought him home no better than when we took him there. For several days at times he was so helpless that he could only walk by placing his hands upon his knees for support, giving him the appearance of a deformed hunchback. He was also taken to Newburg and prescribed for without any better success. At times he would be strong enough to go out doors, but after playing an hour would come in perfectly exhausted, and for several days would be again perfectly helpless. We had lost all hope of ever again seeing him restored to his natural strength or shape—but a kind Providence placed your external remedy in my hands. I have used four bottles, and I am rejoiced to say that the boy is now as straight and strong as any boy of his age. Any of my neighbors will testify to the truth of this statement. I take sincere pleasure in stating these facts for the benefit of those who are suffering under the like calamity.

Yours respectfully,  
**RACHEL SHUTE.**

This is to certify, That I am personally acquainted with the subscriber, Mrs. Shute, as well as the boy alluded to, and frankly bear witness to the deformity of which he was seriously afflicted, apparently for life.—Dated Sing-Sing, June 9, 1845.

**HENRY HARRIS,**  
Justice of the Peace.

For particulars of cures, see the certificate accompanying each bottle.  
**ROADLY, PHELPS & CO.,** 142 Water street, wholesale Agents. Orders addressed to them, or to the proprietor, Sing-Sing, will be attended to.

**GEORGE E. STANTON.**  
Dated March 19, 1846.

For sale by Thomas Read & Son, Huntingdon, and the principal Stores and Druggists throughout the country.  
July 15, 1846.

**DR. H. K. NEFF,**  
**SURGEON DENTIST,**  
Huntingdon, Pa.

**JOHN SCOTT, JR.,**  
**ATTORNEY AT LAW,**  
HUNTINGDON, PA.

Will attend with promptness and fidelity to all business with which he may be entrusted in Huntingdon or the adjoining counties.  
His office is the one formerly occupied by James Steel, Esq., nearly opposite Jackson's Hotel.  
Huntingdon March 11, 1846.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and having under consideration the bill making appropriation for the improvement of harbors and rivers—

Mr. HUDSON, of Massachusetts, obtained the floor, and, after a few preliminary remarks, said:

The present, Mr. Chairman, is an important era in the history of our country. The President, at the opening of the session, recommended the abandonment of that policy which is coeval with our Government—a policy under which the nation has grown and prospered. We have also been told by the Secretary of the Treasury that we must abandon all protection of domestic industry, in order to procure the repeal of the English Corn laws. The British ministry approve of the policy recommended, endorse the doctrines of the American Secretary, and order his report to be published and laid upon the desks of the members of Parliament, as a valuable document to promote British interests. An effort has been made on both sides of the Atlantic to change fundamentally the policy of this country, by the introduction of a system which would check the prosperity of the people, paralyze every interest, and so greatly impair that very commerce which these improvements are calculated to promote.—We see Sir Robert Peel and Sir Robert Walker in what the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RUTLEDGE) calls "a disastrous conjunction," to bring about this result—a result truly disastrous to our beloved country, but to Great Britain a "consummation devoutly to be wished."

As the subject of the Corn Laws has been presented for consideration by both Governments, I propose to call the attention of this committee to this subject, and to the effect which the repeal or modification of these laws would have upon the commerce of our country. And I regard this question as strictly pertinent to the subject before us.—The grain of the West must find its way to the Atlantic through the very channels which this bill is designed to improve. The wheat trade is an important item in our commerce, and everything which affects that trade will render these improvements more or less necessary.

The subject of the corn trade of the United States has of late attracted the attention of our people; and, although it is one of importance, I am confident that its importance has been greatly overrated.—From the language which is sometimes employed, we might naturally infer that wheat and flour constituted a great portion of the exports of the country. But a recurrence to official documents will show that, for a series of years, our export of wheat and flour does not exceed one-twentieth of our whole export.

I propose, Mr. Chairman, to take a brief view of the wheat trade of the United States. And here I will state, once for all, that I shall use the term wheat to include flour; and, in all my estimates, I make a barrel of flour equal to five bushels of wheat.—The Wheat crop of the United States, in 1840, according to the census returns, amounted to 84,823,000 bushels, and in 1844, according to the report of the Commissioner of Patents, to 95,607,000 bushels. Of this, 96,000,000 bushels, which is about the average for the last five years, we have exported about one-thirtieth, or 7,400,000 bushels. Nearly one-tenth of the whole crop will be required for seed. In Great Britain the estimate has been about three bushels of seed to the acre, but with us two bushels to the acre would be a fair average for all parts of the country. Now, if we should take from the whole crop the amount required for seed, and the amount exported, it would leave for home consumption 79,000,000 bushels. This amount divided among our population, say 19,600,000, would give 3 9-10ths to every man, woman, and child, in the country. But it is manifest that the consumption of wheat is not equal in every section. The black population at the south consume but little wheat, and the agriculturalists in the New England States make considerable use of Rye and Indian corn for bread; though the consumption of wheat is becoming every year more general. As far as I am acquainted, in all communities which purchase their breadstuff, wheat is the principle article of consumption; and we may safely estimate this consumption at one barrel of flour or five bushels of wheat a year per head. This class will include the manufacturers and mechanics—those engaged in mining, in commerce, in navigation, in all its forms; and if we add to these those engaged in the various professions and callings, other than agriculture, and all those residing in the wheat growing sections of the country, it will constitute about three-fifths of our entire population; and these will consume about 58,800,000 bushels of wheat, leaving for the other two-fifths 20,200,000 bushels, being about 2 1/2 bushels per head. This calculation, being general, will not hold good in every case. A soldier's rations, for example, would amount to 9 bushels of wheat per year, and some of our population engaged in the fisheries would consume as much. Flour is also largely consumed in our manufactories in the form of starch and sizing. The manufactories at Lowell alone consume between four and five thousand barrels of flour annually.

I have been thus particular, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of showing that the greater part of our

wheat is consumed at home, and that the home market is the great source whence the wheat growers derive their support. The quantity of wheat which we have sent abroad, for the last 12 or fifteen years, will not exceed 6 or 7 per cent. of the quantity produced, as will be seen by the following table made up from the commercial documents:

[Here follows a table showing the Imports and Exports of Wheat and Flour, in bushels, together with the value of the same from 1831 to 1844 inclusive. We have only room for the average, which is as follows: Exports, 5,505,162 bushels, Value \$6,233,533. Imports, 425,442, Value \$437,897. Excess of exports over imports 5,065,390 bushels.]

Here, sir, it will be seen that our average export of wheat to all foreign countries, for the last fourteen years, amounts to only 5,505,162 bushels; or if we deduct the average imports, it will amount to only about 5,000,000 bushels. It will also be seen that our exports do not keep pace with our population. In 1831, we sent abroad, with a population of 13,000,000, 9,441,000 bushels, being 23 quarts per head upon our population; but in 1844, with a population of 19,600,000, we sent abroad 7,751,000 bushels, being only 13 quarts per head.—Here is a falling off in our surplus of nearly fifty per cent. But as it is unfair to reason from a single year, and 1831 being one of an unusually large crop, we will take an average of three years. Take the years 1831, '32, and '33, and we have an average exports of 6,220,000 bushels; while the years 1841, '42, and '43, give an average of 6,967,000 bushels, being an increase of 11 per cent., while our population has increased about 33 per cent.—For the last ten years, our surplus for export has not increased in the ratio of our population; and the same causes which have operated for the last ten years, will be likely to operate for years to come. We have had, and, if peace continues, shall be likely to have, a large flood of foreign emigration to the country. But as these emigrants generally settle upon new lands they do not, for the first year or two, add to the wheat product of the country.—On the contrary, while clearing their lands, and building their cabins, they are consumers, and constitute a considerable market for the grain of the West. And while the new wheat lands are being brought into the market, the old wheat lands of the Atlantic States are becoming exhausted, and so yield a less crop. It is also true, that as population increases in the West, and settlements become more dense, a larger per cent. of the people leave the pursuit of agriculture, and engage in other callings; and hence the demand will increase as rapidly as the supply. We must also expect deficient crops from time to time. The past year is an example of this. In some parts of the country, the drought of the past season had greatly reduced the wheat crop; and the disease of the potato will increase the demand for wheat at home as well as abroad.

I have no disposition to undervalue the wheat trade of the country. It furnishes an important item in our exports. But, at the same time, I must be permitted to say, that its importance is frequently exaggerated. From language which is frequently employed, I should be led to conclude that wheat, next to cotton, was the great export from the country; and that these, with perhaps tobacco, constituted nearly our whole export. But, by reference to the commercial document from year to year, it will be seen that, for fifteen years, our wheat and flour have not amounted to more than about one-twentieth of our export. That the committee may see the relative importance of the wheat trade, I have prepared a table from the commercial documents, which I will read:

[Mr. H. here read his statement, which is printed in the pamphlet speech, and then argued as follows:]

This summary view of certain articles of export, shows that the value of wheat and flour sent to all foreign countries, for the last fourteen years, will average \$5,233,000 a year. During the same period, our beef and pork, including all the avails and product of cattle and swine, have amounted to \$2,980,000, and the product of the fisheries to \$2,556,000; each of these articles being nearly half as much as our entire export of wheat. And even cotton piece goods, the product of our despised manufactures which are represented as being injurious to commerce, have amounted on an average, to \$2,674,000, nearly half as much as the wheat sent from the country. But if we add to cotton piece goods all other manufactures exported, we have a total of \$7,987,000, annually, being more than the value of wheat exported.

But, sir, this is not all. I have followed the classification of the commercial document; but every gentleman acquainted with the subject knows that there are articles, some of which are strictly, and others substantially, manufactured articles, which are not, in that document, placed under the head of manufactures. In the commercial document of last year, I find the following articles, with their values placed under other heads:

Spermaceti candles	\$180,492
Staves, shingles, boards, hewn timber, masts, spars, &c.	2,022,498
All manufactures of wood	919,100
Naval stores, tar, pitch, rosin and turpentine	818,692
Ashes, pot and pearl	1,140,894
Total	\$5,081,666

Here we have a total of more than five millions of manufactured articles, which, in the commercial documents, are placed under the head of products, of the forest and of the fisheries. Add these to the articles set down as manufactures, and we have an export of more than thirteen millions, the product of our infant manufactures.

I have no disposition to disparage the wheat trade of the country. It is an important trade, and one which should be cherished with the greatest care. But devotion to any cause should never lead us to overlook an important fact. I rejoice that we are able to export wheat at the average rate of \$6,000,000 a year; and I rejoice, also, that our infant manufactures are able to send forth to foreign countries fabrics to twice that amount. I am in favor of the corn trade of the country; &, for that very reason, I wish to inform the wheat growers that the proposed change in the British corn laws will probably operate against them, and may prove highly detrimental to their interests.

I am confident, Mr. Chairman, that there is a great misapprehension on this subject of trade.—Some gentlemen seem to take it for granted that Great Britain is the principal, and almost the only market for our breadstuff. But nothing can be more false. I have data, drawn from the official documents of the Government, which confute any such hypothesis.

[Here follows a table of exports of wheat and flour for fourteen consecutive years, which we condense as follows: Average export per year to Great Britain 944,536 bushels; to British North American Colonies 1,166,048; to Cuba 388,155; to Brazil 896,711; to all foreign countries 5,505,162.]

Here we have the authority of the commercial document, made up at the Treasury Department, showing the direction of the trade in question.—And what does it prove? Why, sir, that the total average of the export of wheat, for the last fourteen years, is 5,505,000 bushels, and that the average of export to Great Britain is only 944,000, being about one sixth of the whole. Our trade with Great Britain in this article is greatly overrated.—For the last fourteen years, we have sent to England only 8 per cent. more than to Brazil; and for the last three years, Brazil has taken 60 per cent. more than England. Our trade with Canada, for a number of years past, has been greater than with England itself. For the last seven years, we have sent into the British North American colonies 12,526,990 bushels; and to England at the same time, 7,764,600 bushels; showing a greater demand in Canada than in England by 62 per cent. I am sure that it will be said that most of the wheat sent into Canada finds its way into Great Britain. I admit it; and shall endeavor to show hereafter, that, in this indirect trade, we now enjoy a sort of monopoly, by the operation of the present corn laws of Great Britain, but of which we should be deprived by a repeal of those laws. This is, in fact, the point to which I wish to call your attention—the great question for the committee and the country to consider.

But let us now inquire into the capacity of the English market. What amount of wheat of foreign growth, does she consume annually? I have compiled the following table from the parliamentary reports of Great Britain:

Amount of wheat and wheat flour, imported into Great Britain, for home consumption from 1829 to 1843, inclusive, distinguishing foreign from colonial.

Year.	Foreign Bushels.	Colonial Bushels.	Total Bushels.
1829	11,504,768	68,840	11,573,608
1830	13,398,304	484,472	13,882,776
1831	10,952,852	1,101,568	12,054,420
1832	15,101,160	1,551,880	16,653,040
1833	10,560,000	651,648	11,211,648
1834	2,320,000	517,472	2,837,472
1835	960,000	227,440	1,187,440
1836	8,360,000	232,400	8,592,400
1837	1,686,176	293,000	1,979,176
1838	14,550,624	237,176	14,787,800
1839	21,592,848	101,920	21,694,768
1840	18,291,096	190,392	18,481,488
1841	19,105,264	2,076,896	21,182,160
1842	22,202,512	1,714,648	23,917,160
1843	7,586,472	1,953,912	9,540,384

Average, 9,489,518 Foreign, 703,911 Colonial, 10,966,866

Here, it will be seen, that, for the last fifteen years, the average import into Great Britain is 10,966,866 bushels. It will also be seen, by an inspection of the table, that her demand has been exceedingly variable, ranging from 228,400 to 23,917,100 bushels. Nor is this all. In 1835 and 1836, she actually exported a large amount to this and other countries. In price, too, there has been a great fluctuation. In 1825, the average price of wheat in Great Britain was \$1 07, and in 1829, \$1 02 per bushel. But not to rely upon single years. In 1829, '30, and '31, she imported on an average, 12,482,700 bushels; in 1834, '35, and '36, an average of only 329,900; and in 1840, '41, and '42, an average of 21,434,000. From this view of the subject, it will be seen that but little dependence can be placed upon that market. At one time she requires a considerable supply of foreign grain; at another she raises more than she consumes. In 1830, '31, and '32, she supplied us with an average of 445,403 bushels a year direct; and we obtained nearly half as much more from her Canadian possessions. The demand of the English market is not only fluctuating, but, as a general truth, we may say that her supply at home is gaining upon her demand, rather than otherwise. In 1829, '30, and '31, with a population of about 23,000,000, she consumed, as we have already seen, an average of 12,482,700 bushels; and in 1843, with a population of about 27,000,000, she consumed 9,540,300 bushels of foreign wheat.

Tooke, an experienced English writer, informs us that, from 1832 to 1838, the crops in Great Britain and Ireland were so abundant, that wheat was fed out to cattle, sheep, and swine, and even used for distillation. This induced the farmer to sow less; and for several succeeding years, the winters were unfavorable for the crops, and the season of harvest was unpropitious, so as to increase the de-

mand for foreign grain. Every man acquainted with English agriculture knows that great improvements are constantly taking place in her mode of cultivation. Docks and swamps are being reclaimed, barren hill sides are being converted into fruitful fields, and her waste places are being made to blossom like the rose. She has also adopted an improved mode of seeding. Until quite recently, the wheat growers were in the habit of sowing about three bushels of grain to the acre. But Mr. Drummond, a late English writer, says that, by the introduction of a new machine for sowing wheat, which distributes the grain equally over the whole surface of the ground, they have found that a less quantity of seed will answer equally well; and that this improvement alone will save to the United Kingdom five or six millions of bushels, and thus supply at least one-third of her deficiency. Under these circumstances, it is not probable that her demand for foreign grain will materially increase. Her own supply will increase with her demand. The means of the mass of her people are limited; and we cannot expect that, under any circumstances, she will take a quantity of foreign grain much, if any, larger than she does at present.

But suppose that her demand increases, she will obtain her supply? Where has she obtained it in years past? In 1841, '42, and '43, when she made her largest importations, averaging 18,300,000 bushels, or about 64,000,000 for the three years, her supply was obtained from the following nations, in the following proportion:

Country.	1841.	1842.	1843.	Total.
Russia	582,205	1,894,688	969,388	3,446,281
Denmark	1,915,279	517,656	563,298	3,096,233
Prussia	7,131,400	5,998,065	5,211,000	18,338,465
France	5,252,674	1,629,172	1,027,224	7,919,070
Holland	813,564	73,979	6,844	894,587
Belgium	1,613,932	4,216,107	29,285	5,859,324
Italy and Sicily	901,700	4,878,597	21,840	5,780,137
Spain and Portugal	2,990,600	2,790,500	6,528,578	12,309,678
United States	1,107,640	1,195,873	1,195,873	3,509,386
All other countries	866,838	1,816,340	272,407	2,955,600

Here, sir, we have a view of the demand and supply of the English market for three successive years. And does it appear that that market is to be regarded as ours? And is the United States the only country on which Great Britain is to depend for her breadstuff? A glance at this table will show at once that our supply, when compared with that of the continent, dwindles almost to insignificance.—Russia supplies nearly as much as the United States; Denmark a trifle more; Prussia almost six times as much; Germany and Holland nearly three times as much; France and Italy each nearly twice as much; and the British North American colonies more than twice as much as this boasted granary of the world. To show the relative importance of our trade to Great Britain, it is barely necessary to say that, of every hundred bushels sent to the English market, we supply only five.

We have seen that the importations of wheat into Great Britain has been exceedingly fluctuating, ranging from 228,000 to 23,917,000 bushels. A fair estimate of the English demand, for a term of years to come, may, I think, be put down at 15,000,000 bushels annually. And where will she obtain her supply? From the United States?—Why have they not supplied that market in years past? Will it be said that the corn laws have operated against us? But those laws have been general in their operation. Why have not these restrictions operated against the nations on the continent? The thirty-three millions of bushels brought from the north, during the three years, and the twelve millions from the South of Europe, have been subjected to the same duty as the three millions from the United States. And if they can supply more than nine tenths of the wheat under the present law—they can do the same under a less restricted dispensation; or a system of perfect free trade.

I say, sir, for years to come we may fairly estimate the demand in Great Britain at 15,000,000 of bushels annually; and, judging from the past, we may say that the United States will supply 1,000,000, and the continent the other 14,000,000. And there can be no doubt but that the continent can furnish that supply, and even more if it were required.—In 1840 the British Government called upon their consuls, at some of the principal ports of the corn trade, to inform them what amount of grain could be sent to the English market in case the English duty were reduced to a nominal sum. The substance of their replies will be seen in the following table, (submitted, with their report, to Parliament in 1841):

Country.	Bushels.
St. Petersburg	1,540,000
Liebau	240,000
Warsaw	2,400,000
Odessa	1,200,000
Stockholm	8,000
Dantzic	2,520,000
Konigsburg	520,000
Stettin	2,000,000

Memel	47,712
Hamburg	4,304,000
Elsmore	1,400,000
Palermo	1,600,000
Total	17,779,712

From these twelve ports it appears that a supply of 17,779,700 bushels of wheat could be obtained annually; and it further appears that 7,298,000 bushels of rye, 6,820,600 bushels of barley, and 6,445,700 bushels of oats, could be supplied. In this list is not included Riga, Rotterdam, Antwerp, and several other important ports for the corn trade.

In answer to the inquiry, whether the quantity could be increased if there were a steady demand in Great Britain, the consul at St. Petersburg says: "There are extensive tracts of land in the provinces that now supply St. Petersburg, which would no doubt be brought into cultivation were a steady and certain market for wheat opened in this place. In years of abundance the quantity which could be exported would be three times as great as is stated in the table." From Riga the consul writes:—

"When the foreign demand is very urgent the distant provinces of Smolensk, Kaluga, and Orel, send supplies to Riga. The principal wheat districts are too remote from the ports to enable the farmers to get their crops to the market sufficiently early for exportation the same year; and, therefore, they cannot profit so decidedly by the occurrence of a bad harvest in England as those in the neighborhood of some other of the Baltic ports." From Memel, the reply is: "In four or five years about a fourth more of grain will be cultivated." From Warsaw, the answer is: "The quantity of wheat grown in Poland has increased considerably for the last six years—and the production might no doubt be further gradually increased if there were a steady demand for foreign corn in England." The consul from Biaisore reports as follows: "In case of a steady and regular demand in England for foreign corn, the quantity produced in Denmark would, without difficulty, and in a short space of time, be materially increased."

Thus it appears that the nations upon the Baltic can, in addition to the 17 or 18 millions of bushels of wheat set down in the table, contribute a still further supply. One of the great difficulties under which the north of Europe has labored, is the want of communication with the Baltic. The consuls, in their statements, frequently allude to the fact that large sections of wheat lands in the interior are neglected, for the want of cheap and ready communication with the seaports. But this difficulty is fast being removed. The numerous plans for railroads, which have been adopted in Russia, Germany, and all the northern and interior States, will bring large quantities of wheat lands into cultivation and so enable them to supply a still larger amount of grain, should the English market require it.

It also appears, by returns made to Parliament, that the English East India possessions supply a portion of her breadstuff. In 1842 they sent to England 170,000 bushels of wheat, and, as the business intercourse increases, the supplies will increase.

From this glance at the subject—it appears that the whole demand of the English market could be supplied, and more than supplied, from the eastern continent. If the United States should withhold every bushel, there would, in ordinary cases, be no lack of grain for the English market. But we are told that the repeal of the English corn laws would increase the consumption, and hence a larger quantity would be required in that market. As a general rule a reduction of price will increase the consumption of an article, and this principle will apply to the subject before us, as well as to any other. But still there are causes which will, in my estimation, tend to counteract this effect. If the price of wheat is reduced in Great Britain, as her dependence is mainly upon her own crops, it will tend to reduce the price of labor, and hence diminish the ability of the laboring classes to purchase. This may operate to the full amount of the reduction, and so prevent any increased consumption. Any thing which promotes general prosperity will increase the ability of the people to purchase, and whatever paralyzes business necessarily produces a diminished consumption. The price of wheat depends upon many causes other than the operation of enactments. In 1842 Sir Robert Peel adopted an important change in the corn laws of the Kingdom, a change by which the duties were reduced at once about one half. This law took effect in April, 1842, and yet, in the first entire year after this change had taken place, viz: in 1843, the import of wheat fell off more than one-half, the import of 1843 being only 9,340,000 bushels, while the average import for the three years preceding this change of the law was 20,692,000 bushels. I do not suppose that this falling off in 1843 was produced by the reduction of duties, but this example clearly shows that the quantity of foreign grain consumed in Great Britain is controlled by laws more efficient than the corn laws. Judging from this experiment, we have no reason to believe that the opening of her ports would have any considerable effect upon the demand for foreign grain. [CONCLUSION NEXT WEEK.]

TAKES TWO TO MAKE A SLANDER.—"My dear friend, that man has been talking about you so again! He has been telling some of the awfulest lies you ever heard. Why he railed about you for an hour!"  
"And you heard it all, did you?"  
"Yes."  
"Well, after this just bear in mind that it takes two to make a slander—one to tell it—and one to listen to it."