



"Ours are the plans of fair, delightful Peace,
"Unwarped by party rage, to live like Brothers."

HOME MANUFACTURES.

From the (N. Y.) Patron of Industry.

As an evidence that our Manufactories want no further protection, it is said that the Waltham factory which manufactures cotton, has made a profit the last year on their capital of 20 per cent. The conclusion is drawn at once, that our manufactories want no further protection, & that the advocates of protection are madmen. But by looking a little further into this thing it will be found that goods of the description made at the Waltham establishment are protected by a duty of more than 80 per cent. inasmuch as the goods that would interfere with them are rated as having cost 25 cents per square yard, and the duty imposed accordingly. What is the effect? Do the purchasers of the Waltham goods pay a higher price than when they bought foreign cotton under the former low rate of duties? Certainly not. What then is the fair inference from the case of the Waltham factory? If I understand the subject, it is—that the proprietors are making 20 per cent. on their capital, giving employment to a great number of hands that must otherwise be idle, or unprofitably employed in agriculture or commerce, both of which are overdone; and at the same time affording the manufactured goods to the consumer cheaper than they could be had before the high duties were imposed.

I would ask the opposers of national industry, whether it would be better to give the foreign manufacturer the 20 per cent. employ the poor of foreign countries, and burden the consumer with the additional charge they used to pay? The British agent will tell you it is; that trade then would regulate itself. The importers of British goods, who send away our cotton, will tell you, that labor is cheaper in England than here. Mr. Coleman will tell you, that although you buy Waltham goods cheaper than you formerly bought the imported ones in their place, that you are still taxed 80 per cent. for them; that commerce is the life of a nation; that manufacturers engender vice; that friends of national industry are mad; and that the only course is to employ our shipping in transporting our cotton abroad, and bringing back the goods, though the manufacturer here is making 20 per cent. idle population industriously employed, and the consumer has the benefit of reduced prices. But I trust there is good sense enough in the country to dissipate such delusions, and to see the benefit of the high protecting duties, as realized in the Waltham factory.

THE MEANING OF WORDS.

From Niles's Weekly Register.

In discussing matters of public or private concern, too little attention is paid to definition. When an expression is not fully understood, or both parties do not agree as to its meaning or application, it is impossible that two minds can come to the same conclusion; but when a proposition is explained, it is very common that a long argument terminates, not in convincing either party, but in both discovering that they had never differed. It seems to me, that the greatest question about the protection and encouragement of manufactures, is of this description:—What is meant by encouragement of manufactures by taxes, and protection to the domestic industry of the nation?

I admit that Congress ought not to impose other than revenue duties on manufactures, for the mere benefit of those engaged in any particular branch of business, if encouraging one, discourages another branch of industry; it is wrong or right, as it affects the country generally. Manufacturers, as a distinct class of society, are entitled to no especial favor, and duties should not be imposed for their sole protection. I thus throw one stumbling block out of the way, and agree with southern planters and chambers of commerce—so far as their opposition is to this kind of protection, there is no difference of opinion between us. Here is my doctrine—manufacturers are the instruments, the agents, through whom the people of the country are to be protected; the means by which raw materials and provisions are to find a market, and labor be secured in employment; the foundation on which the government is to build a permanent system of revenue, and on which alone it can rely in time of war or emergency.

The sure means by which the price of manufactured articles will be reduced & their quality improved—by which the farmer will be encouraged to raise raw materials, which cannot now be exported or used at home, and give him the means of exchange, which are now denied to him. I separate MANUFACTURERS from MANUFACTURES—as in the article of iron.—Iron ore has no value except for domestic use: the whole value of Iron is made up of labor and subsistence. I would then exclude foreign iron, not because I would enrich the iron master, but to give a market for iron ore and provisions, and employment for laborers. To make my ideas more precise, I will state a national account. A ton of iron is worth in Baltimore, 95 dollars. It costs in Russia or Sweden, from 60 to 65 dollars—the duty is 15, leaving the account thus:

Value given to a ton of iron, by foreign labor and subsistence	\$63 00
Additional value by American labor and subsistence in the freight	17 00
Duty to government	15 00
	\$95 00

Value given to a ton of iron by American labor and subsistence	\$95 00
--	---------

Then this ton of iron, made at home, employs 63 dollars more of our labor and subsistence, than if it was imported. Now I don't care whether the merchant or the iron master has more or less profit—it makes to the country a difference of 63 dollars a ton. With this illustration and practical definition of protection to manufactures, contend that Congress ought to put such a duty on iron as would give to the farmers and laborers of this country, the whole of the price of the iron; and not suffer 63 dollars on every ton, to be drawn from us in cash to other countries, when our laborers want employment, and farmers have no market. It is they who want and must have protection. On this ground I call on our opponents to meet us. If government is not bound to afford this protection, let the reason be given—let the merchants come out and meet us fairly: on these principles we stand or fall with them. Chambers of commerce may rant as they please, about bounties, monopolies, premiums and privileged orders—I shall not answer them: they may play with these toys, these rattle boxes, and they may have the game to themselves. They shall be silent, or meet us on the national principles we have assumed, and on which we will bring this great question home to every man in the nation. It is to the people, and not to the government, we are now appealing. The voice of the country must and shall be roused. I invite the Goliaths of commerce, to come out and discuss this question on plain practical grounds, and I will agree that the verdict of the farmers of the country shall be conclusive between us. The question is fairly stated—no one can doubt what I mean by protection and encouragement to manufacturers; it is to be hoped our opponents will come out as plainly—then we shall understand each other, and then the country will understand us all.

POLITICAL ECONOMY.

A number of interesting Essays have lately appeared in a Philadelphia paper, and have been copied into the National Intelligencer, on the subject of Agriculture and Manufactures. We cannot conveniently publish them at length (The following is a statement of the Facts and Assumptions on which these Essays are founded:

FACTS.

1. The farming interest throughout the United States is in a situation far from prosperous—and in the western and the interior of the middle states is generally in a state of suffering and embarrassment.
2. The situation of the planters is becoming equally gloomy.
3. This suffering arises from a superabundance of the fruits of the earth.
4. This superabundance is the consequence of the producers, or cultivators of the soil, being too numerous for the supply of the existing demand, foreign and domestic.
5. Until the restrictive system began, the important manufactures of wool, cotton, hosiery, glass, silk, linen, pottery, china, hardware, and a variety of others, for which the talents and industry of our citizens are admirably calculated, were not attempted in this country on a large scale, some of them scarcely at all, and others even now almost unknown.
6. Thousands of emigrants, brought up to those branches, and not finding employment at them, have devoted themselves to agriculture, from time to time, ever since the organization of the government.
7. The depression of manufactures in 1816—17—18, compelled numbers of persons employed in them to pursue the same course.

I presume these facts are of such public notoriety as not to admit of a doubt or uncertainty—of course to require no proof. A question may be made as to the number of persons embraced under No. 6 and No. 7, but none can deny that it has been very considerable.

I ASSUME AS A POSTULATA—

1. That every manufacturer who becomes a farmer or planter, is transformed from a customer to a rival of the farming interest.
2. That therefore our policy, which has steadily tended to the conversion of manufacturers into farmers, is one of the reasons why our surplus of the fruits of the earth is so great, and must operate perniciously on the agriculturists.
3. That nothing but a war in Europe affords a chance of increasing the demand of that surplus to a degree commensurate with its regular increase.
4. That policy predicated on the contingency of wars and desolation among our fellow men, is unworthy of such a great nation as the United States.
5. That we have advantages, natural, moral, and political, certainly never exceeded, perhaps never equalled.

6. That, notwithstanding all those advantages, the resources of the nation have been constantly impairing since the close of the war.

7. That nothing but an erroneous policy could prevent the efficacy, or mar the operation of the advantages we possess.

8. That a change of policy is at present as necessary to the agriculturists as to the manufacturers.

"VIOLATION OF CONFIDENCE!"

From the Morning Chronicle.

There is a strange phraseology adopted at the present day, by which actions, in themselves enormous, is attempted to be veiled over by smooth and delicate words. What is meant by the words *violation of confidence*? If this is urged in extenuation of an offence, we would ask, what can be urged in aggravation? It is called a criminal act for a man to rob on the highway. He attacks one who is sometimes armed for defence, and forces him to surrender his property. This act is deemed criminal in the eye of the law, and our penal code denounces the punishment.—But, it is said, that if a man comes honestly into the possession of property belonging to another; that is, if he is entrusted with this property to use for the benefit of another, and appropriates the whole or the greater part to his own benefit, he does not, in a legal sense, commit robbery; he only *violates confidence*. We will not pretend to say, but what this may be law; but the question occurs, is this justice? We subscribe readily to the doctrine delivered by lord chief justice Luffborough from the bench, that "legal obligations are, from their nature, more circumscribed than moral duties;" that is, that every moral offence cannot be reached by the arm of civil law. But let us look for a moment at the nature of the defence, that distinguishes *violation of confidence* from robbery. With the legal character of this discrimination, we have, as we before remarked, nothing to do.—But we would fain ask how much the moral guilt of the man is diminished, whose defence rests on such a foundation. Let us analyze this defence—in plain language, it is this—I have not committed robbery, because the property was not forcibly taken from the owner—I came into its possession by the consent of the owner—I was believed to be a man of honor and was chosen to use this property for the benefit of the owner. Thus far I have surely committed no offence, either in a moral or legal point of view. Now, I am perfectly free to confess, that after I did come into the possession of this property, I did violate the confidence reposed in me—I did appropriate this property to my own benefit—I did swindle and reduce to poverty and despair both the widow and the orphan—I introduced wretchedness and misery into the calm quietude of the family cottage; but shew me the law—point out a sacred precedent of this character amidst the alpine mass of English reporters, where such an act is denominated, technically denominated, *robbery*. No; in all this I have only *violated confidence*, and this confidence, I frankly & proudly acknowledge, that I *did violate*. My friends believed me a man of probity and honor. It was their fault, it was their own blunder, and it must be their loss; if they did entertain such opinions, they should have been more cautious; they should have known my character better; they should have known that I was not worthy of their confidence; & they have learnt now, by sad experience, how careful they ought to be in imparting their confidence—it will be a salutary lesson to them hereafter; they will learn the difference between the man who robs on the highway and he who more delicately violates their confidence—between the man who uses absolute force and he who only uses hypocrisy to deprive them of their property. It is true that the same injury is done; but thanks to the laxity of our criminal code, the laws of our country do not afford the same means of redress; they have made a pointed and broad distinction between a robber and a hypocrite. They can proudly say, that under the guise of hypocrisy, they have accomplished what the robber without hypocrisy has done—that the robber never added to the crime that he had committed a violation of confidence—that this superior enormity has been exclusively reserved for their perpetration, and that by this they have been saved from the grasp of criminal law—that they have only violated the law of God delivered amidst the thunders of Sinai. Now in answer to such an elaborate appeal to popular sensibility, we would humbly enquire, whether the man who makes such a plea is not urging his own iniquity in his own justification,—let such repose on their pillows—let the words *violated confidence* be inserted on their armorial bearings—let them enjoy the cries of the widow and the tears of the helpless orphans—the goads and stings of conscience—let them behold the blush on the cheek and the frown upon the brow of sacred honor—let them see and feel all this, and then sink into the arms of sleep under the soothing and consoling thought that they have only *violated the confidence of a friend*.

THE HOOPING-COUGH CURED BY VACCINATION.

From the Norfolk Beacon.

GENTLEMEN—Influenced by motives of humanity for a large and peculiarly interesting class of our community, who are now laboring under Hooping-Cough, I am induced to communicate the following, on the influence of Vaccination, in mitigating and finally removing the most tormenting disease of infantile nature. If parents and guardians will avail themselves of the practice recommended, I can assure them the results will be satisfactory and fully proved by experience. M.

That experienced and able physician, John Archer, M. D. of Hartford county, in Maryland, writes to his friend Dr. Mitchell, of N. York:

November 15, 1808.

"You may recollect that about 3 or 4 years ago, I mentioned to you that it was my opinion that vaccination would cure the Tussis Convulsiva; that I had made one experiment, and that it succeeded fully to my expectations. I mentioned the case to several physicians, & requested their making a trial of its effects, when they should have any patients with Hooping-cough. The beneficial effects of Vaccination above mentioned, determined me in every instance that occurred of the Hooping-cough to vaccinate. I therefore have vaccinated six or eight patients that had the Hooping-cough, and in every case it has succeeded in curing this most distressing disease.

The Hooping-cough does not come to its height in less than six weeks from its commencement, and then, when a favorable termination is expected, the declension of the disease is gradual, and it does not terminate in less than six weeks more. To arrest this afflicting disorder in its progress, I would recommend vaccination in the second or third week of the Hooping-cough, i.e. when the symptoms of the Hooping-cough are fully ascertained, then to vaccinate. Should the convulsive cough be violent, I should immediately vaccinate; being well assured that the distressing symptoms of the Hooping-cough are checked by vaccine disease.—The termination of the vaccine disease will be the termination of the Hooping-cough, that is, as soon as the vaccinated part loses the efflorescence, and the scab begins to dry and becomes of a blueish or brownish color, there will then be an evident change in the Hooping-cough for the better, and the severe symptoms will cease.

These observations, I conceived it my duty to communicate. You will dispose of them as may be most agreeable to you."

POLITICS OF EUROPE.

England.—The most prominent subject which still occupied the attention of the British Parliament at the latest dates, relating to the domestic politics of that nation, was the removal of the existing restrictions and disabilities upon the Catholics. Strange as it may seem, a petition was presented to the House of Commons, from Dr. Milner, the Apostolic Catholic Vicar of the midland district in England, and certain other Catholics, "against the bill for the removal of the Catholic disabilities, as tending to fetter them in points of conscience, and imposing such restrictions as were inconsistent with the profession of the Catholic faith." No doubt the proposed bill falls short of the complete emancipation of that sect; but it admits them to the enjoyment of important honors, rights, and privileges, to which they are not at present eligible. If they have not obtained every thing at once, they should not reject, they should not throw obstacles in the way of accomplishing, what is offered to them; they should accept the proffered rights, restricted as they may be, and trust to the gradual operation of reason, and to continued appeals to the good sense of the people of Great Britain, for the remainder. It is probable that this is the only mode by which they can succeed in achieving, for ages to come, their full emancipation. Sound policy suggests no other method, unless they appeal to the sword; and they might, in such a struggle, lose millions of lives, and shed oceans of blood, only to draw more tightly around them the cords of political prejudice and tyranny. In reference to the impolitic petition of Dr. Milner, Mr. Plunkett declared that it was in that individual "only an act of undervaluing,

consistent bigotry." "If he had felt some exultation in his mind that a measure of the highest possible public good was now apparently on the point of attainment, it was with the deepest regret that he witnessed an attempt to darken the prospect of happiness and security. The same evil spirit (Dr. Milner) which, in 1813, came forward to blast the hopes of the Catholics, and shake the public tranquility, was once more at work." By his interference the bill of that year had been abandoned. Seven of the eight Apostolic vicars in England had petitioned for the present measure; the eighth was the only one who had disclaimed the desire of peace, and the spirit of conciliation, which animated his brothers! "It was vain and visionary, said Mr. Plunkett, to expect in this measure the concurrence of Bigotry. Bigotry was unchangeable; he cared not whether it was Roman Catholic bigotry or Protestant bigotry—its charter was the same, its pursuits were the same; true to its aim, though besotted in its expectations; steady to its purpose, though blind to its interests, for bigotry *time flowed in vain*. It was abandoned by the tides of knowledge; it was left stranded by the waters of reason, and worshipped the figures imprinted on the sand, which were soon to be washed away. It was inaccessible to reason; it was irreclaimable by experience. To refuse it was only to exasperate it." The House of Commons were about to reject the Petition of Dr. Milner, but Mr. Plunkett did not press his motion to that effect, yielding to the suggestion of Mr. Wilberforce, that the rejection of the paper might give it an importance, and produce an exasperation, which its reception would prevent. Mr. Croker, a ministerial member, gave notice that in case the bill for the relief of the Catholics should pass, as he had no doubt it would, he should propose to vest authority in the King to make provision for the support of the Catholic clergy. Great efforts were made by the opposition, in the House of Commons, to reduce the British army; they did not succeed, but obtained a very respectable vote.

Ireland.—The people of the Emerald Isle were on the tip-toe of expectation concerning the expected visit of George the Fourth to that country.—If the bill for the relief of the Catholics should pass parliament, and be sanctioned by the King, the measure would render him very popular, & his reception extremely flattering, in Ireland. But the Orangemen were excessively alarmed at the prospect. The Hibernian Journal, one of their intolent organs, declared "that if the King should give the royal assent to the bill now pending in parliament, he would become the *executioner of his own existence*."

Austria.—The Austrian government has not only suppressed two Lancers schools of 500 boys each, in Milan, but has published a decree abolishing, through the whole of its Italian dominions, the schools established on the new system of speedy instruction.

Hungary.—A spirited and eloquent address had been circulated by the Neapolitans, among the Hungarians, denouncing the insidious and iniquitous attack on Austria upon Italian liberty, and imploring the Hungarians to imitate their ancestors, and not to become the instruments of a flagitious tyranny.—*Frank Gaz.*

TO JOURNEMEN HATTERS.

I WISH to employ a sober, steady Journeyman Hatter, who is a good Workman.—Such a one may have a steady shop and constant employ if application is made soon.
JOHN A. BROWN.
Smithfield May 30 33 St

NOTICE.

TAKEN up by the subscriber a small bay MARE, supposed to be between nine and eleven years old. No marks or brands perceivable. Appraised to thirty dollars.
THOMAS GRIBLE.
Haywood county, N. C. April 21 1t

NOTICE.

TAKEN up by the subscriber a bay MARE, with a small star in her forehead, her left fore foot and right hind foot white; had on a small bell, shod before, supposed to be 18 or 20 years old, about thirteen and a half hands high, neither docked nor branded.—Appraised to six dollars and fifty cents.
JOSEPH YOUNG.
Haywood county, N. C. May 20 1t