Terms.—Two Dollars per annum in advance. Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first, and 25 cents for each subsequent insertion. Court Orders charged 25 per cent higher.

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES, *Editors & Proprietors.*

"Keep a check upon all your Rulers. Do this, and Liberty is safe." *Gen'l. Harrison.*

NEW SERIES, NUMBER 24, OF VOLUME III.

SALISBURY, N. C., FRIDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1846.

COTTON:

ITS HISTORY, PRODUCTION, PROTECTION, AND MANUFACTURE, AND THE INTEREST OF ITS PRODUCERS.

[From a communication to the Editors of the National Intelligencer]

The objection urged against the tariff is, that trade is reciprocal, and that consequently every cent of duty levied by us upon the foreign fabric of cotton imported into this country recoils upon the cotton grower, who is compelled either to sell his cotton for so much less as the duty takes from the profit of the manufacturer, or to withdraw from the foreign market so much of the cotton as would be consumed in that portion of the foreign fabric which is substituted by the manufactures with which the duty levied enables us to furnish ourselves at home. The argument sounds well, and at first blush convincing; but we may readily find the reason why practical results falsify so well sounding a theory. As, in most cases of reasoning *a priori*, all the facts relevant to the issue are not brought before the mind. Those who urge this objection do not seem to have inquired into two very important matters of fact, viz: how far the people of England are under the necessity of manufacturing cotton; and how far, by reduction of duties in any way bearing on the manufacture, England is capable of reducing the cost of the fabric. These objectors had, even as many as fifteen or eighteen years ago, falsely assumed that the cost of fabricating in England was reduced to its lowest rates. We will inquire into this branch of the subject more fully presently. Nor do these same objectors seem to have looked into another question of fact equally important, and that is, whether our duties upon the imported fabric have ever affected the amount of American cotton consumed abroad. But suppose, for the sake of argument, that the protective duty takes from the cotton grower so much of the foreign market for his raw cotton as it affords home market for the domestic manufacture, it is palpable that it would, at the same time, give him a home market for fully the same amount of raw cotton, as it would be impossible for us to fabricate without the raw material. Besides, this home market must be, to the extent of it, a much better one than the foreign. The great profits of our factories are not the sheer *fabrications* of Southern politicians. You will pardon me for saying that these politicians must have a great deal of *raw material* to work upon at home, or they would never send so *gross a fabric* from their political factories.

History proves that England, the great cotton manufacturer, has never taken one pound the less of our cotton on account of any increased protection of our own manufactures, nor one pound the more because of any reduction of duties on our part. She has gone on from year to year rapidly increasing the quantity of her consumption of our staple, irrespective of our duties. She seems to have acted under a stern necessity, which impels her, under all circumstances, to manufacture this product of our soil, and beg for admittance at our ports with fabrics of her loom at any price. These statements are not loosely made. I write from the record, and to substantiate my position, refer to the table respecting raw cotton to be found in the National Intelligencer of September 8th, taken chiefly from McCulloch himself, the great champion of free trade.

If it is asked why it is that the expansion of the manufacture of this article has continued, notwithstanding the continual reduction of the price of the fabric? Perhaps we will find the true answer partly in the rapid development of this country itself, whose inexhaustible powers of production act, by means of the cotton trade, as a stimulus on the labor-craving population of England, which, in its still increasing demands for our raw material, reacts with Voltaic energy upon the productive spirit of our people. Production, manufacture and consumption of the fabric, have kept pace together. As an outlet for the swelling manufacture, reducing prices kept up a continually expanding consumption, and thus is explained the difficult problem why production, in the midst of its almost miraculous expansion, but slowly abated its extravagant profits. As the improvements in machinery, together with the reducing prices of the raw material, enabled the manufacturer to continue his reduction of price for the fabric, so likewise the improvement in the culture and the machinery for preparing the raw material for market enabled the planter to lop from his prices, and preserve his gains but little impaired, which still continued, and to this day remain greater than those of any other branch of agriculture, with perhaps the exception of the culture of sugar.

But I wish to show you, by a plain historic detail, that this splendidly acting and reacting system between the manufacturer in England and the producer in America would long since have ceased its wondrous action but for the protective arm of American Congress.

In 1774 England repealed the statute which made it *penal to manufacture any article wholly of cotton*: and from that time till 1806 levied a duty of 3d. sterling upon every square yard manufactured in the realm. In 1806 *this excise duty was raised to 3½d. per square yard.* Besides this excise duty, an impost duty of 9s. 4d. sterling per cwt. was paid upon raw cotton under the English tariff of 1787, which was raised to 9s. 7½d. under their tariff of 1819.

The truly wise men of this country, such as Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and, after them, even John C. Calhoun, Lowndes, Clay, and a host of others, saw at once how beneficial it would be to the consumer of the fabric, as also to the producer of the raw material, if we could but manufacture this cotton at home and thus save from eight to ten dollars per cwt. on the cotton in the coarser fabrics. Hence the protection of the earlier Administrations; and hence, among other reasons, the lively support which Lowndes and Calhoun gave to the tariff of 1816; and hence the frequent urging of this subject upon the consideration of Congress by Madison, and after him by Monroe.—Our manufactures had taken some hold during the restrictive system of Jefferson, and afterwards during the war; but, after peace was restored, the flooding importations from England seemed likely to overwhelm them in their infancy, until, by the tariffs of 1824 and 1828, adequate protection was given them. Now, mark the effect. Jackson, in his first message, I believe it was, adverts to the tariff of 1828, and accounts for the singular failure in the prediction of its opponents respecting the prices of protected articles by the extraordinary impetus given to manufactures thereby, increasing them so much as actually to reduce the price, notwithstanding the duty. (That mode of accounting for low prices under high duties was sound and true and republican in Jackson's message, but in the mouths of Whigs now it is false and absurd—aristocratic, federal, *British*, or any thing a demagogue chooses to call it.)

Now let us mark the effect of this same "bill of abominations" upon England, and we will soon see what a lever we held upon her on this subject. The great competition with England which that "bill" raised in our domestic manufactures so reduced the price that the English manufacturers, in 1829 and 1830, were compelled to commence a system of retrenchment, and throw out of employment a large number of laborers, and such distress and consequent disquietude resulted from this course, that if Parliament had not interfered so as to remove the cause of distress the English Government itself would in all probability have been overturned. The manufacturers insisted on the striking off the excise duty of 3½d. pr square yard, or they could not compete with the American factories, and the necessity of the case compelled England in 1831 to take off the excise duty entirely. Thus it is that the much-abused tariff of 1828 brought about a permanent reduction in the cost of the fabric in England amounting to more than the present price per square yard of the coarse fabrics—which reduction has done more to extend the consumption of cottons and to hold up the price of the raw material than any one thing in the course of its history. Shortly after this master result of our policy, which seems to have eluded the observation of our politicians, in which millions of revenue raised by England from our staple were released, our own disputes at home effected what England so anxiously desired. The tariff of 1832 made almost every hempen article free of duty, and otherwise affected the duties on manufactures; and in 1833 the compromise act established wholly a new system of duties, which the same author (McCulloch) hailed as the harbinger of prosperity to England. Indeed he exultingly declared that those modifications of the tariff had given a death blow to our manufactures. But fortunately for the country, the destructive period of that act was just before the close of its ten years' continuance, and we were not bound by the solemnity of its pledge long to bleed under the cruel stab. In 1832 the wound was stanched, but the whole politic was in the very last stages of sinking. Yet see how like a charm, with the returning smile of a fostering Government, life and activity returns, and every industrial interest springs to its feet again. But the grumbling cotton planter, like the elder brother in the parable of the prodigal son, stands off afar and refuses to join in the universal joy upon his brother's return. It seems to be the fate of Southern politicians to be embarrassed with signal failure in all their predictions. They complained that this tariff of 1842 would only cause England to lay countervailing duties, and to shut her ports in a measure against our produce; but, unfortunately for their reputation as prophets and wise men, the first thing we hear from England on the subject is that she has taken off the last penny of duty upon cotton, in order to sustain and encourage the manufacture there likewise. Here then is the remarkable spectacle of two of the most powerful nations on the globe, rivalling each other in encouraging the manufacture of a staple, the producers of which profess to regard that encouragement (by the nation which is foremost to act and compels its rival to do likewise) the greatest curse which legislation can bring down upon them.

What, then, have been the effects of our protective system on this staple in America?

1. By protective tariffs it was first planted here.

2. By protective tariffs a home market has been built up for this staple of greater importance than the English market was twenty years ago; for when the tariff of 1824 was passed, the whole amount of cotton manufactured in England was only 131,000,000 lbs., and the whole exported from the United States was 142 2-5 millions, while last year 489,000 bales were consumed by our manufactures, which, at an average of 173 lbs. per bale, amounts to upwards of 182,000,000 lbs.

3. By our protective duties, first the English excise duty on the manufacture and afterwards her impost duty on the raw cotton have been removed. As a corollary from this proposition, a permanent reduction in the price of the fabric has been effected by the same cause so that the cotton grower and the consumer of the fabrics have been equally benefitted.

While these results in the operation of that system were effected, the manufacture of this staple in England has progressed with the increase of the crop in the U. States without respect to the duties laid upon her fabrics.

In this view of the subject, (and I believe every word of this argument is sound and based upon established facts.) I ask you candidly to say, is not the cotton planter more indebted to protective duties than any other man, not excepting the manufacturer himself?

I have attempted to present this subject in a new light, by adverting to one important fact which had escaped the attention of our people. If I have succeeded in demonstrating the true effect of our protective duties upon British Legislation, I have brought to view a matter which demands the attentive consideration of statesmen. How far I have elucidated this subject you must judge.

OLD VIRGINIA.

The subject of the New Tariff is such a fruitful theme with the Democracy, that, although we published articles last week showing how false were their conclusions as to its effect upon the flour and grain market, yet we beg to present this additional one to our readers. They will find it very plain and clear, and will see how utterly unfounded are the reasonings and conclusions of those who are accrediting to the Tariff of '46, every good effect upon the markets.

From the Richmond Times.

THE BRITISH MARKET.

The unsettled effects of the recent intelligence from England, have set the Democratic journals very diligently to demonstrating the admirable effects of free trade. Their peculiar course of reasoning, may be stated, in a few words, thus: "Some weeks since, it was asked by the Whig journals, why agricultural produce was so low? They were told, the tariff of 1842 was in operation. But since they asked this question, there has been a rise in prices. The tariff of 1842 is still in operation, but it is the tariff of 1846 which has had the effect." Thus whatever is bad is due to the law of 1842, and whatever is good is due to the tariff of 1846. Or, to put the case differently, if flour, one week, falls five shillings a quarter, it is the abominable system of protection which causes it; but if the next week it rises five shillings, why it is Mr. Walker's free trade which is to be blessed for it, but if flour should again, in the third week, fall back five shillings, we should probably be called on to recollect that the tariff of 1842 is still in operation, and be assured that it has caused the depression.

This, we submit, as a fair sample of the argumentation of our opponents about the results of free trade. Their style is a perfect thermometer of the markets, and we may always know whether price's are bad or good, as the laws of 1842 and 1846 are alternately described as in the ascendant.

The Enquirer, of yesterday, falls very much into this manner of argument, but in one portion of the article expresses more reasonable views:

"Now, we do not contend (says that paper) that the recent rise of agricultural products is entirely owing to the revenue measures here and in England. *We are willing to give some credit to the potato failure, and to the axiom that prices depend upon the supply and demand.* But we are just as confident, that the more extended our market, the greater our demand, and more probable a rise in prices."

It is something to gain a concession that Mr. Walker is not entitled to all the credit. The absolute destruction of nearly all the food of the Irish is at last admitted, in Democratic estimation, to have a slight effect on prices, and what is more important, the law of supply and demand is not wholly discarded from the Enquirer's economy.

Nor are we disposed to dispute the Enquirer's axiom, that "the more extended our market the greater our demand, and more probable a rise in prices." Who ever objected to the British opening their ports to American corn? If the measure is to make their market available to us, who is there that will not be pleased at it? No Whig, we are sure, has ever argued that the repeal of the corn laws would be prejudiced to our people, unless they were allured by it into the adoption of unwise measures of their own. What we have contended for is, that the British measure conferred no manner of obligation on us; it was adopted from regard to British interests entirely; and was based on no enlarged system of commercial reciprocity, but strictly on considerations of internal policy; in a word, to give the British laborer cheap bread. We have maintained also that the advantage of the British market is much over-estimated by those who represent that it is to furnish a permanent and reliable demand for American corn. And we regard this as unquestionably established by the recent fluctuations of that market. Corn was exceedingly low notwithstanding the previous repeal of the corn laws, and the certain success of our tariff bill, until the ascertained failure of the potato crop, and the doubtful weather at the period of harvest, spread an alarm about a scarcity of provisions. Was it inquired whether the American supply would not meet the deficiency? Not at all. Prices immediately rose, because of the supposed insufficiency of the British supply. In another week, however, although the ravages of the potato disease were more certainly ascertained, the weather had proved to be unexpectedly favorable, and the harvest of wheat was pronounced to be an average one. The natural effect of a fall in price took place forthwith, and we deem it as yet entirely uncertain whether this fall has not more than counterbalanced the previous enhancement.

These fluctuations we say, prove that the British demand does not depend on the foreign, but on the domestic supply; and they show, further, that the British market is not expected, by its own dealers, to furnish a very reliable demand for the foreign supply.

So much for breadstuffs. A slight advance in *Cotton*, an article, which we freely concede, does find a most important market in Great Britain, which it found just as efficiently, long before the era of free trade, has been very naturally caused by the intelligence, that the cotton crop is to be a short one. Unlike the case of wheat, the demand for Cotton depends on the foreign supply, and an expected diminution of the supply has produced a slight advance in the price; not by any means such an advance as the Enquirer takes for granted, in adopting some statement of a New York paper. The Enquirer asks complacently, if this advance is to be ascribed, like the rise in wheat, *to the potato rot?* Assuredly not, but to the failure of the *cotton crop.* A deficiency in any kind of provisions will produce a demand for all kinds; and a deficiency of cotton will produce a demand for cotton. But, we doubt not, it is as pertinent to attribute the small enhancement of cotton to the potato rot, as to Mr. Walker's tariff, or to the repeal of the corn laws.

But how is it with *tobacco?* Here is another article not produced in England, and for which the demand, like that for cotton, depends on the foreign supply.—Unfortunately for our opponents, tobacco continues to be more and more depressed, in spite of Mr. Walker and the tariff of 1846. The excellent circular, from one of the most respectable houses in Liverpool, which we were permitted, by a house in this city, to copy in our yesterday's paper, gives this unpromising account of the British tobacco market:

"The heavy stock of tobacco in Europe, the large supplies still to come forward, and the reported luxurious state of the growing crop in the United States, forbid expectation of a satisfactory business in the article during the ensuing season, nor can any hope for future business be entertained until the culture of tobacco in the United States be discouraged by unremunerating prices—a result which, of necessity, must be near at hand."

Now gentle nen of the free trade school why is it that your free trade does not improve the prices of tobacco? We presume we shall be told, we ought not to expect any thing better as long as the tariff of 1842 is in force. But with wheat and cotton, it is perfectly clear that the tariff of 1842, though in force, is not working, and that the beneficent act of 1846 is the "full tide of successful experiment!" Truly, our free trade friends possess a wonderful facility of accommodating their arguments to circumstances.

KEEP IT BEFORE THE PEOPLE,

That Mr. Lewis, the Democratic Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, during the debate on the tariff bill, stated that the 8th and 9th sections of that bill, were both of them "*substantially* COPIES OF A BRITISH STATUTE *long in operation*,

KEEP IT BEFORE THE PEOPLE,

That Mr. Payne of Alabama, when asked how the country would get revenue, replied, "Easy enough—*we shall consume* FOREIGN GOODS *instead of goods made at home!* We shall derive a revenue of $100,000,000, if need be, by IMPORTING FIVE TIMES AS MANY AS WE NOW DO!!"

KEEP IT BEFORE THE PEOPLE,

That Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, in replying to Mr. Webster, made use of this extraordinory language:—"It was represented that the LABOR of the country would be effected by this bill—THAT, (said Mr. McDuffie, contemptuously) IS BUT A SMALL MATTER!!"

KEEP IT BEFORE THE PEOPLE,

That Senator Cameron, of Pennsylvania, said of the new tariff—"If the bill had been drawn by a British Statesman it could not have *discriminated more in favor of* British workmen."

LET THE PEOPLE REMEMBER,

That Mr. Haywood the Democratic Senator from North Carolina, who resigned his seat sooner than vote for the Tariff law of 1846, says, in his address to the people of North Carolina, that the Tariff of 1846, is the first ever passed by our Congress that discriminated *against* American industry.

DUTY UPON MADEIRA WINE.

We stated the duty upon Madeira Wine under the act of 1842, to be 60 cents per gallon, which is 50 per cent.

The Constitutionalist admits our statement to be correct, but says, under "the treaty of reciprocity with Portugal, the duty levied was only 7½ cents," which is 5 per cent. Well, then, if a treaty makes it 5 per cent., don't charge the Whigs with putting it at 5 per cent. If a Democratic Secretary will place upon the treaty a construction not warranted in the opinion of able judges, and put Madeira Wine at a duty of 5 per cent., for the sake of common justice, don't parade the duty in the papers as the work of the Whigs, and put by the side of it, a duty of 40 per cent, as the work of the Democrats. If a Democratic Administration will construe the treaty, so as to defeat the Whig duty of 50 per cent., perhaps it may do so to defeat the Democratic duty of 40 per cent.

Why put a duty of 40 per cent, upon Madeira Wine, in the act of 1846, when the Secretary will not permit it to be enforced?

Was it put there to cheat the people, and make them believe that the Democrats were willing to favor the poor, while the Whigs wished to oppress them?

The Whigs put a duty of 50 per cent, upon Madeira Wine. The Democrats charge them with putting a duty of 5 per cent. upon it, while they were willing to put one of 40, and now it turns out that the 5 per cent. duty is the work of a Democratic Secretary! That is, that much only is collected by his construction of the terms of a treaty with Portugal, to whom the Island of Madeira belongs.

Augusta Sentinel.

Maine Election.—The Boston Atlas of Thursday says:

"Our friends in Maine did nobly at the second trial on Monday. Thomaston, for the first time almost within the memory of man, has elected Whig Reprasentatives! This is almost equal to the election of a Whig in Nobleborough and Bremen. Belfast, too redeemed, and has elected Henry Colburn, Whig, by a handsome vote. Richmond and Bowdoinham have each elected a Whig. Lincoln county has done nobly, and has already elected more Whigs even than old Kennebec.

"So far as we have returns the Whigs have elected thirty-six to twenty-seven Locos and one Liberty. The classed towns do not vote again until a week from Monday. Portland and Bangor try again next Monday."

The Whig Convention which met yesterday at Utica has nominated Mr. Young, of Livingston, as a candidate for the office of Governor, and Hamilton Fish, Esq., of this city, for Lieutenant Governor.

The Massachusetts Whig Convention met in Boston yesterday, and by acclamation nominated Mr. Briggs for Governor, and Mr. Reid for Lieutenant Governor. They are the present able and esteemd incumbents.

A Disappointed Party.—The remnant of the *Fifty-four-forties* in the West are giving vent to their wrath in such manifestations as this, which the Ohio Statesman, (the organ of democracy in Ohio,) with some severe strictures of its own, copies from the proceedings of a Democratic meeting in that State:

"*Resolved*, That President Polk, in his truckling to the South, and his crouching to the growlings of the British lion, has been guilty of an inconsistency and treachery too base to be forgiven, and a wrong dishonorable to the nation, and has forfeited all claims to our confidence and respect."

The South Carolina papers are discussing with some warmth the expediency of transferring the appointment of Presidential Electors from the Legislature to the People. South Carolina is the only State in which the people are not permitted to vote in a Presidential election. The Charleston Mercury warmly resists the proposed change. It thinks that South Carolina is now the best governed Commonwealth in the Union, and it is content to keep her so. This may be the fact; but no State in the Union has a constitution so thoroughly aristocratic in its provisions, and by the operation of which the will of the majority of the white population is so effectually paralyzed. The State may be, for all this, well governed; but if it be, it only affords another illustration of the trifling influence of "forms of government" upon the prosperity and happiness of a commonwealth.

IMPROVEMENT ON THE WATER WHEEL.

We had an opportunity last week, of inspecting the model of an improved water wheel, the discovery of a worthy citizen of Kershaw District, which promises to be one of the most important improvements in this line ever given to the public. The improvement consists in a new mode of applying the power to the reaction wheel now generally in use, by which a vast increase is given to the motive power, or by which a mill can be constructed and worked with half the quantity of water now required by ordinary mills. The inventor, Mr. Emanuel Parker, has a mill constructed on this plan, whose operations have been witnessed by many of our citizens, who pronounce it to be the greatest improvement on the water wheel yet discovered. Mr. Parker has forwarded his model to Washington to obtain a patent, which no doubt will be speedily granted. It is but seldom that we have an opportunity to record a *Southern* invention of this nature, as the numerous Yankee mill wheels throughout the south, will amply prove. We therefore feel some pride in testifying, upon good authority, to the superiority of this discovery to all others now in use. We wish Mr. Parker all the success which he so richly deserves. After fifteen month's study and labor, he has at length, the gratification of seeing the *practical* operation of his improvements, which he tells us, exceeds even his own anticipations with regard to it.—*Camden Journal.*

The Rip Raps.—The fortifications at the Rip Raps, in Hampton Roads, are about two miles from Fortress Monroe. They enclose a space of about three acres, and nearly two millions have already been expended by the government in their construction. The water on the bar at the Rip Raps, was, at low water, at the time the works were commenced, from fifteen to twenty feet in depth, and to form the foundation of the superstructure, large blocks of granite were sunk, until the foundation, some four acres or more in extent, was formed. The building of the fortification was then commenced, and had progressed to the height of perhaps fifteen feet, when it was found that the foundation, under the weight, was sinking though so imperceptibly as at first to be scarcely noticeable. The further construction of the work was in consequence postponed, the first tier of port holes having been completed. The walls were then built up to the intended height, with the granite blocks designed for the fortification, but without using the usual cement, and so arranged that the weight upon the foundation is much greater than it will be when the fort is completed. Since the plan was adopted the foundation immediately beneath the walls has settled nearly ten feet so that the port holes completed are nearly on a level with the ocean at high water. Within the last year however, the walls have not settled more than an inch, and the work will probably now be recommenced and completed. For this perhaps $500,000 more will be required. When completed, it will contain five ranges of port holes, and about 250 guns of large calibre.

Effect of Cannon balls on Iron Steamers.—At Portsmouth some remarkable results have been produced by the experimental shot practice, from the Excellent, on the Iron Steamer Ruby, and it is expected that the Admiralty will in consequence, stop the building of iron steamers and other vessels for the present. The shot which hit the Ruby not enly penetrated the side first struck, but in some instances passed through the other side, carrying with it whole plates of iron. In action this would risk the total loss of the vessel, for on heeling over to the leeward such a body of water must rush in, that nothing could prevent her sinking, with all on board. A representation of this important circumstance arising from the recent trials, has been made to the Admiralty; and should further experimental firing prove that serious risk will be occasioned to iron vessels of war when exposed to the chance of being struck by heavy shot, it is doubtful if the Board will not abolish them as men-of-war.

California.—It is supposed that the Government at Washington has no other information respecting the action of our squadron on the coast of California than that which recently came to the British Minister. The Union of Monday night says—

The events and prospects on the coast of California are bright and cheering. There is reason to believe that before this time the whole of that coast has been occupied by our squadron. Montery is certainly taken, and Guimas, and it is certain that the Yerba Buena, on the bay of San Francisco, was summoned by Captain Montgomerey, and it is believed have been taken without any resistance.

"*Who Dar?*"—It is truly amusing to see "how *dark* the locofocos keep" upon the subject of the *British* Tariff. The people are beginning to realize its destructive influence on business already and the locofocos know it and fear the result. It would not be strange if they should pretend to be opposed to it. They are already as much frightened at its ravages upon business as Gumbo was by the fatal ravages of the Cholera, in 1832. It is old story but we will repeat it for it applies. Gumbo had been told of the havoc the cholera made among the intemperate, and he was a notorious drunkard himself, but he did not believe the story any more than the locos believe the injurious effects of the Tariff, till it began to be realized about home. Then Gumbo went on his knees at once and begged the cholera to spare him "dis one time" and he would be temperate ever afterwards. A wag heard the petition of Gumbo, for it was evening, and gave a loud knock at the door. Who dar? said Gumbo. The Cholera, replied the wag. What he want? Went Gumbo! Gumbo immediately blowed out his candle with a sigh and hurriedly replied "no such nigga here. Dat nigga been dead dis two, tree weeks—de truth—de fact!" So the locos, now the British Tariff begins to be felt near their doors, show their alarm by keeping dark, and telling their friends it shall be repudiated. No such nigga here—he been dead two week!"—*Bellows Fall Gazette.*