

HUNTINGDON JOURNAL.

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

Vol. XI, No. 33.

HUNTINGDON, Pa., September 2, 1846.

Whole No. 533

PUBLISHED BY
JAMES CLARK,

TERMS.

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 arrearages 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

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,

RACHEAL 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.

HOADLY, 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.

DR. H. H. 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.

SPEECH

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 26, 1846.

[CONCLUDED.]

I have, I trust, clearly shown that the eastern continent has the physical ability of supplying the English market with breadstuff. And what is their financial ability? Can the nations upon the Baltic afford their grain in the English market as low as the United States? This is the great question to be decided. I have taken pains to satisfy myself upon this subject, and I have come to the conclusion that they can undersell us in that market. In the first place, we see that they do so at present, when the corn laws operate equally upon them and upon us. So long as the laws are equally applicable to them and us, it matters not whether the duty is high or low, or whether there is any duty at all.—I say that they undersell us now, as appears by the fact that they supply 14 times as much as the United States.

The following table will show the price of wheat per bushel in the principal marts of trade on the Continent, from 1830 to 1843, inclusive:

| Year | Danish | Hamburg | Amsterdam | Antwerp | Odessa |
|---------|--------|---------|-----------|---------|--------|
| 1830 | \$1 07 | 93 | 1 13 | 95 | 63 |
| 1831 | 1 18 | 1 19 | 1 15 | 1 07 | 71 |
| 1832 | 93 | 90 | 1 10 | 90 | 62 |
| 1833 | 83 | 87 | 89 | 55 | 61 |
| 1834 | 70 | 67 | 66 | 50 | 77 |
| 1835 | 61 | 65 | 76 | 68 | 57 |
| 1836 | 70 | 79 | 76 | 70 | 52 |
| 1837 | 73 | 76 | 81 | 99 | 60 |
| 1838 | 94 | 79 | 1 20 | 1 48 | 65 |
| 1839 | 96 | 1 15 | 1 33 | 1 37 | 79 |
| 1840 | 1 07 | 1 30 | 1 11 | 1 48 | 71 |
| 1841 | 1 23 | 99 | 1 09 | 1 45 | 74 |
| 1842 | 1 10 | 1 11 | 1 11 | 95 | 65 |
| 1843 | 76 | 82 | 78 | 76 | 48 |
| Average | 91 | 90 | 99 | 98 | 64 |

Here we have the prices of wheat, at five great marts of the wheat trade, for 14 years, showing a general average of 88 cents per bushel.

The prices at our seaports during the same period, runs as follows:

| Year | Price | Year | Price |
|---------|--------|---------|--------|
| In 1830 | \$1 15 | In 1837 | \$1 63 |
| 1831 | 1 18 | 1838 | 1 64 |
| 1832 | 1 15 | 1839 | 1 42 |
| 1833 | 1 13 | 1840 | 1 10 |
| 1834 | 1 03 | 1841 | 1 03 |
| 1835 | 1 19 | 1842 | 1 16 |
| 1836 | 1 44 | 1843 | 1 00 |

The general average of the aforesaid prices is \$1 25; being 37 cents more than the average per bushel at the aforesaid ports on the Black Sea and Baltic. This shows demonstratively, that, in the first cost of grain, we are not able to come into fair competition with our trans-Atlantic wheat growers. And how is it with reference to freight? By official documents laid before Parliament it appears that the freight on the highest calculation cannot exceed, on an average, 13 cents per bushel. By the report of the Hon. Mr. Ellsworth, Commissioner of Patents, laid before Congress in 1843, where he examines this subject somewhat minutely, it appears that the average freight from New York to Liverpool is 35 or 36 cents per cwt. We cannot estimate what at less than 56 pounds per bushel; and hence the freight must amount to 17 or 18 cts. per bushel. The difference in the freight and first costs would make a balance against us of 41 cents per bushel. But as the year 1837 was one of uncommonly high prices in this country, I will omit that year in my estimate, which will reduce this balance down to about 36 cents; and from this I will deduct, for difference of exchange, 20 cents, which will bring the difference down to 26 cts. per bushel.

The English consul, writing from Odessa, at the close of 1843, says: "Under present circumstances, extraordinary low freight and favorable exchange, a shipment of the best wheat could now be made and delivered in England on the following terms, viz:

| | s. d. |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| First cost | 22 6 per quarter. |
| Charge of loading | 2 5 " |
| Freight | 6 7 " |
| Insurance & factorage in England | 4 0 " |
| Total | 35 8 " |

This reduced to our currency would amount to 97 cents per bushel delivered in England. And in 1843 there was still further reduction; so that wheat from the Baltic could be delivered at England without duty at 87 cents, and from the Black Sea at 78 or 80 cents per bushel. A price much less than our wheat could be purchased at our own ports.

This, as it appears to me, is a just and fair view of the subject. But it may be said that I have proved too much. And if the argument be sound, we cannot send any grain to Great Britain. But every practical man knows that, between two great commercial nations, an article will be exported from one to the other, when the prices in the two countries seem to forbid. The wheat that we have sent direct to Great Britain is to a considerable extent, the result of accidental causes. A merchant is indebted abroad, and must send forth something to discharge his debt, and not being able to meet the demand in specie, he sends forward a quantity of flour. Or, a vessel is going out without a full cargo, and will take grain for a mere trifle. Or, a speculator has a large amount of flour on hand, bought perhaps on six months, and is obliged to send it out at a sacrifice. Our grain goes to England mainly in the shape of flour, by which a saving of

10 or 15 per cent. over the export of wheat is realized. These are the causes more than any thing else, which enable us to supply the English market to the small extent we now do. Ask our merchants who have had experience in this trade, and they will generally tell you that it is a precarious business, and one in which much more has been lost than made.

But gentlemen seem to suppose that the repeal of the corn laws will give a new impulse to this trade. But how is this? On what principle, I demand, do they base their calculations? If these laws are modified or repealed, it will be done by a general law, applicable alike to all nations. The present law imposes no more duty upon wheat from the United States than upon wheat from the Baltic. Suppose those duties be reduced one-half, or annulled entirely, the north of Europe will enjoy all the advantages of these changes as well as we. The scarcity of grain in Europe, the partial failure of the wheat crop, and the disease among the potatoes, enables us at the present time to send forth an unusual quantity. But it is unsafe to reason from a single year. In 1837, as we have already seen, we imported 4,000,000 bushels of wheat into the United States; and were we to reason from that year, we should be compelled to admit that we could not raise our own bread stuffs. If we would reason correctly on subjects such as this, we must take successions of years into the account. And if we do this, we shall, I think, at once perceive that the modification of the English corn laws would not benefit us at all.

We have had a practical illustration of this principle. As I have before said, that the modification of the English corn laws in 1842 did not increase the demand for grain in Great Britain; on the contrary, in the first entire year after the reduction, the importation into Great Britain fell off more than one-half. And how was it with our exports to that market? The reduction in 1842 was about equal to the whole of the present duty; and Sir Robert Peel does not propose to take off all the duty at present. If the proposed reduction is to operate so much in our favor, we may expect to find that the greater reduction in 1842 proved a great blessing to the United States. And how was it with that modification?

I will tell you, Mr. Chairman. The reduction took place in April, 1842, and, falling in the midst of the commercial year, I have no means of determining its effect upon our exports for that year. I will, therefore, throw that year out of the account, and take the two years preceding, and the two succeeding, 1842. In the two preceding, viz: 1840 and 1841, we exported to Great Britain an average of 2,390,000 bushels a year; but in the two succeeding, viz: 1843 and 1844, we exported only an average of 464,800 bushels a year. But, sir, as I wish to do perfect justice to the subject, I readily admit that, by a change of a commercial year, the year 1843 consisted of only nine months. I wish, therefore, to add to it another quarter, so as to make it of the usual length. But if we add one-third to the imports of that year, so as to make up four quarters, or twelve months, we shall have even then an average for the two years of only 476,700 bushels a year, which is in fact less than one-fifth of the average export of the two years preceding the modification of the English corn laws. I am not superficial enough to ascribe this falling off of our export of wheat to the reduction of the British duties; but the case before us shows inconceivably that our wheat trade with England is governed by laws more efficient, more controlling, than any rate of duty. Is it not, then, perfectly preposterous to maintain, that the partial reduction, or prospective repeal of the British duty upon wheat, will by necessity enable us to send more of our bread-stuff to that kingdom?

But, sir, though no intelligent gentleman, can, I think, see any just cause for believing that we shall gain materially in the direct trade, it must be perfectly obvious that we shall lose in an indirect trade with Great Britain. Our best, and in fact our principal trade with the mother country in the article in question, has been through Canada. For the last seven years we have sent into Canada 12,586,892 bushels of wheat, while our direct trade to England, at the same time, has amounted to only 7,764,588 bushels, being 62 per cent. more to Canada than to England. Or, if we take the last three years, we have sent into Canada 6,325,607 bushels, and into England 2,097,598 bushels, being more than three times as much into Canada as into England. Here are facts, which no speculation can bend—which no theories can annul.

The questions which now present themselves for our consideration are these: Why have we sent so little to England direct? And why so much to England through Canada? The answer to each of these questions is obvious. In our direct trade we come in competition with the north of Europe; and the low price of labor enables them to undersell us in the English market. This is the reason, and the only satisfactory reason, why our direct trade with England has been so small. And the reason why we have sent so much to England through Canada is equally obvious. Our wheat which goes into Canada is, after being manufactured into flour, admitted into Great Britain on the colonial duty, which is much less than her duty on wheat or flour direct from this country. I have examined the English tables of actual duty paid during each week of 1843, and I find the mean difference between the duty actually paid on colonial and foreign wheat to be 14 shillings the quarter, or 33 cents the bushel. All the wheat, therefore, which we send through Canada, is admitted into the English market on

terms more favorable, by thirty-three cents a bushel, than the wheat which we send direct. From this, however, we must take the Canadian duty of the average of 8 cents per bushel, which reduces the sum to 25 cents.

Now this advantage of 25 cents per bushel—this monopoly of the colonial trade which we enjoy, and of which the north of Europe is deprived, is what enables us to send more than two-thirds of our export of wheat to Great Britain. But repeal the corn laws of England, and we are deprived of this monopoly, and are brought directly in competition with the great wheat-growing countries on the Baltic, where the agricultural laborers can be obtained for from 8 pence to a shilling a day, and board themselves. Are the independent yeomanry of the West prepared to yield all the benefits of the Canada trade, and thus lose two-thirds of the market which they now enjoy? Are they willing to be brought into competition with the down-trodden Poles and serfs of Russia, and so be compelled to labor for fifteen or twenty cents per day? Would devotion to party, or the satisfaction of following out the delusive theory of free trade, reconcile them to a condition so degraded? If they possess the independent spirit of freemen—if they are Americans—they will spurn such an idea.

But Mr. Secretary Walker, whose devotion to British interests has been complimented in that country by the publication of his report, would have us understand that the opening of the British ports to our grain would be a great blessing to this country. But on what principle does he found his theory? What facts does he adduce to sustain his position? None whatever. He asks us to believe, but furnishes us with no evidence to sustain our faith. In this respect he deals less fairly with us than Lord Ashburton himself. At a meeting at Winchester, Jan. 19, 1846, Lord Ashburton, when speaking on this very subject, said that "protection had existed in England from the days of Plantagenets, whilst the whole line of country opposite to us on the continent—France, Belgium, Holland, and Prussia; indeed, almost every country in the world—monarchical Europe as well as republican America—had its protective laws and regulations." "It was clear, that, in the event of a recurrence of difficulties, her (America's) first step would be again to shut her ports against us—in which case the supply from America would undoubtedly fail us. But the supply must not be expected from America, and we could not have a better proof of this than the fact that, at this moment, American corn could come here from Canada at a duty of four shillings; and yet, if the returns were examined, it would be found that nine-tenths of the foreign corn in England was from the Baltic, though the duty on the corn from its shores was 15 shillings a quarter. This was entirely owing to the low price of labor in the north of Europe."

Here Lord Ashburton, more frank than the American Secretary, admits that the United States would not derive any benefit from the proposed change in the laws. Speaking on this subject in Parliament, on the 29th of January, Lord Ashburton said, "the British farmer must not have his hands tied behind him. Did he meet the foreigner on equal terms? The farmer on the shores of the Baltic had his labor at 6 pence a day to compete with the farmer of this country, (England) with his labor at 2 shillings a day. It required no skill in political economy to discover that these two parties did not meet on equal terms."

These remarks in Parliament would apply with additional force in Congress. If the British farmer, whose labor costs him 2 shillings a day, cannot compete with the farmer on the Baltic, whose labor costs him 6 pence, how can the farmer in the United States, whose labor is worth 4 shillings a day, compete with the cheap labor on the Baltic? Lord Ashburton warns the people of England of their danger, but the advocate of British interests in this country would lead us blindly into the very jaws of this ruinous competition.

But, sir, this is not all. The very policy which would destroy the most important branch of our wheat trade, viz: that through Canada, would, at the same time, greatly impair our market at home. The best and the direct market for the wheat grower is found in the manufacturing districts in our country. This home market is near at hand, is not disturbed by ruinous foreign competition, is not subject to that fluctuation which has ever characterized the British market, and is, in fact, the principal market for our bread stuff. With our present protective policy, this market is constantly increasing. Sir Robert Peel has justly said, that the revenue and the demand, and the prices of labor and all commodities, seemed to depend upon the general prosperity of the country more than upon any particular legislation. Our present policy tends to produce that general prosperity, and so creates a demand for the agricultural products of the United States. The demand for wheat in this country is constantly increasing. Thousands who, ten years ago made rye and Indian corn their principal bread stuff, now consume a large quantity of wheat.—The State of Massachusetts alone consumes about three times as much wheat, the growth of our States, as we send to England direct, and the New England States more than our entire export to all foreign countries.

Let this position should be thought extravagant, let me present, in as brief a manner as I may, some of the facts on which this calculation is based. The present population of Massachusetts may safely be estimated at 815,000. More than half of our entire population are engaged in other callings than

agriculture; and to those thus employed I give one barrel of flour, or five bushels of wheat, per head. This estimate cannot be considered extravagant.—Those engaged directly or indirectly in manufactures and the mechanic arts, in trade and commerce in all its varieties, in navigation in all its forms, in the fisheries of all kinds, and those employed in the learned professions and as teachers—these with their families and dependants, would constitute at least 420,000 of our population, and would consume a barrel of flour per head. The other 395,000 of our population, employed in agriculture, may be assumed to consume a half barrel per head, which will give 197,500 barrels—making a total of 617,000 barrels of flour. Flour is also used in considerable quantities in manufactures. There is used in Lowell alone, for starch and sizing, at least 4,000 barrels annually which may be considered as one-fourth of the amount consumed in the State. The quantity thus consumed, when added to that used as bread stuff, would make the entire consumption 633,000 barrels, or 3,165,000 bushels. This estimate is fully sustained by the imports into the State. There was brought into Boston, in 1845, 730,138 barrels of flour; and although one-half of this may have been reshipped, or sent to Maine and New Hampshire, the flour brought into Salem, New Bedford, Fall River and other smaller ports, and by the several railroads, will make up the deficiency. The railroad from Albany to Boston, in 1844, distributed within the interior of the State, of flour brought from Albany, 144,754 barrels. There was also brought into Boston, from other States, in 1845, 2,371,406 bushels of Indian corn, 548,583 bushels of oats, 24,184 bushels of rye, and 65,530 bushels of shorts. Nearly the whole of this was consumed in the State, and large quantities of the same kinds of grain were brought into the State at other points.

I have no means of knowing the amount consumed in the other New England States, but, as their population is about 1,600,000, it will be safe to give them, upon an average, three bushels per head, which will make a consumption of 4,800,000 bushels a year. This, added to the consumption of Massachusetts, will give a total of 7,965,000 bushels, being at least half a million more than our average export to all foreign nations. I have estimated the consumption of the New England States, other than Massachusetts, at considerable less per head than my own State; because, with the exception of Rhode Island, they are more agricultural, and because they raise a greater proportion of wheat from their own soil. This estimate may not be entirely accurate, but I am confident that it cannot be far from the truth.

But manufactures are not by any means confined to New England. New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and several other States, are deeply engaged in them; and all these manufacturing establishments furnish so many markets for the wheat growers. If the repeal of the corn laws should cut off our trade through Canada, we should have a surplus which would reduce the price, and so injure the grain growing interest. Nay, if our duty on foreign wheat were repealed, the Eastern States would, when the crops are good in Europe, receive a portion of their supply from the Baltic: And if our present protective policy is to be battered for a repeal of the corn laws, and large quantities of British goods are to be thrown into our market, it will prostrate many of our manufactures, and thereby destroy the home market, which the grain growers now enjoy. Let our present policy be abandoned, and the surplus of Europe be thrown in upon us, and the balance of trade will soon be turned against us; in which case our specie will be sent abroad, our currency will be deranged, and all the evils we experienced a few years since will return. Individual enterprise will be paralyzed, our imports will fall off from our inability to purchase, and the Government will be bankrupt as it was in 1841-'2. These are the evils which the proposed policy will, in my estimation, bring in its train.

But we shall be told that Great Britain has set us a noble example, and we, as a free people, should follow it. But what is the example which Great Britain has set? She has consulted her own interest; and proposed to make such a modification of her policy as is, in the estimation of her ministry, best suited to her present condition and the condition of the world. She sees that her corn laws have excluded the wheat of Germany and Prussia, and have driven them into manufacturing. She sees, that instead of being her customers, they are beginning to become her competitors for the markets of the world, and she wishes to arrest their progress. She sees, also, in the United States a great and powerful rival, and she wishes to embrace the present opportunity to check our growth and impair our prosperity. She regards the present moment as peculiarly favorable to strike the fatal blow. She holds in our Chief Magistrate a leaning to a commercial policy which is well suited to her condition, but ill adapted to our own. She finds in the Secretary of the Treasury an advocate of her interests and she greets him with "well done, good and faithful servant."

But if gentlemen suppose that Great Britain has any special reference to the welfare of any other nation, let them undeceive themselves. All her proposed changes have reference to her own prosperity. She takes the duty off from American cotton, not to benefit our cotton growers, but to enable her own manufacturers to compete more successfully with the manufacturers of this country for our market, and the other markets into which our manufactures have found their way. If she wishes to pro-

mote the agricultural interests of this country, why does she not abate her 1200 per cent. duty upon American tobacco, and suffer it to come in at a moderate rate? No nation looks more carefully to her own interests than Great Britain; and no one legislates more understandingly. Her agriculture and manufactures have been carried to the highest point of perfection; and, seeing herself in advance of the nations, she now proposes free trade, with a full conviction that she will prove more than a match for them in such an unequal contest. She has built herself up by her Navigation act, and other restrictive measures, and now she proposes a partial abandonment of that policy, and kindly invites other nations to give up the very policy which has made her what she is. Free trade with such a nation would be like intercourse between the wolf and the lamb. To the one it might prove beneficial, but to the other it would be death. Free trade, in fact, can never exist between nations situated so differently as the United States and Great Britain. If both nations should model their revenue laws after the same standard, the trade between us would not be "free and equal." Her accumulated capital, her low rate of interest, the cheapness of her labor, the advanced state of her manufactures, would give her an advantage over us. You must make all things equal at home, by equivalents and balances, before any two nations can have a system of commercial intercourse which will be strictly reciprocal and equally productive of the prosperity of both.

I do not intend to censure Great Britain for the new policy which she proposes. She is the guardian of her own interests, and will see that they are well protected. In fact, I consider her example worthy of our imitation. She conforms to her condition, and it becomes us to conform to ours. The cheapness of capital and the low price of labor in that kingdom are the great characteristics, so far as this question is concerned; and, in order to meet her on an equal ground, our independent laborers must consent to come down to the low standard of the half-starved labor of England. They must be content to labor for from 30 to 50 cts per day, and board themselves. But are they willing to do it? Will the free born citizens of America consent to degradation like this? I trust they will not. The glory of our country consists in the fact that here "the laborer is worthy of his hire." The great mass of our people are born to no other inheritance than the privilege which our country holds out to every industrious man, of obtaining a comfortable living by the fruit of his own toil; and he is a free man, indeed, who is born to such a patrimony.—The consciousness that he can sustain himself by his own hands, and that well directed industry will enable him to provide for the maintenance of his family and the education of his children, more than any thing else, gives character to an American, and makes him what he is designed to be by his Creator, a man.

But if we are to adopt the principle of free trade, the many and independent character of our laborers must be given up; and they must content themselves with dragging out a miserable existence in poverty and wretchedness. This, after all, is the great objection to the policy which has been recommended. The rich man needs no sympathy. His wealth will give him consequence in any state of society; and a change, such as free trade will bring upon us, would increase the relative value of his treasures. Bring the laborer down to the English standard, reduce his wages to the low level of the old world, and you put him completely into the power of the capitalists of the country. Such a change would break up our small manufacturing establishments, and turn many an honest laborer out of employ. But the Lowell manufactures would go on; the price of labor would be reduced; and, having no competition, these wealthy establishments would continue to make fair dividends. The South and the West would suffer most. Their infant manufactures would be prostrated; but the older and more skillful establishments of New England would survive: Their currency would be deranged, but the accumulated wealth in the Eastern States would supply them with a sound circulating medium.—Born to toil, the hardy sons of New England would put forth their energy and enterprise; and, by that industry and frugality for which they are distinguished, they would obtain a comfortable livelihood; they would have "bread enough, and to spare;" while their brethren, in some other sections of the country, "would perish with hunger." New England desires no change. She believes that our present policy is best adapted to the interests of the whole country. Being laborers ourselves, our sympathies are with those who eat their bread in the sweat of their brows. We adhere to our present policy, because the interest of labor requires it; because a change would fall heaviest upon those who have no capital but their own hands. But if a change must come—if the prosperity of the country must be staked down, the sons of the pilgrims, ensued to toil, and familiar with hardships, will turn their attention to their ice and their granite, and convert them into bread. If folly must prevail in our national councils, and the storm of adversity ensues, they will endeavor to brave the tempest; and, though they have no desire to "ride upon the whirlwind," they will, as far as in them lies, so "direct the storm" that its pitiless peltings may fall upon other heads than their own.

A PENNSYLVANIAN.—"You ought to have a pension," said a wag to an unfortunate who was in the habit of taking a drop too much. "How so?" enquired the red-eye. "Why you fell at the battle of Brandy Wine!"