

Business Notices.

INDIA RUBBER BOOTS AND OVERSHOES.—A choice assortment of Ladies' and Gentlemen's RUBBER BOOTS and OVERSHOES, manufactured by the...

LADIES' DRESS FURS.—Wishing to dispose of the balance of our stock of LADIES' DRESS FURS, we offer them to buyers at our store...

RUBBER BOOTS—Ladies', Gentlemen's and Children's. The best article manufactured may be obtained...

SINGER'S SEWING MACHINES.—Our liberal and admirable plan of exchanging our new and latest improved SEWING MACHINES for other kinds...

A WORK ON THE HISTORY, PREVENTION AND CURE OF A Chronic Disease of the Respiratory, Circulatory, Digestive, Secretory and Absorbent (including the lungs and skin) Nervous and Motor Systems of the Human Organism...

HERNIA.—Only Prize Medal awarded to MARSH & CO. by the Industrial Exhibition of all Nations for their PATENT LIGATURE CURE TALKS. Also, the PAW of the American Institute awarded the First Premium to this Treatise in 1854...

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT AND PILLS.—The brother of His Holiness the Pope was advised the use of these Medicines in 1854 for a morbid condition of a serious nature. He was completely cured. No other person can bear witness to their combined healing influence...

New-York Daily Tribune.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 10, 1856.

The weather continues severely cold, the mercury ranging some distance below zero. The sleighing is very fine, though not many people venture to brave the frost to enjoy it.

The steamship Atlantic, from Liverpool for this port, is now in her twelfth day out, and is therefore nearly due. Her news will be to the 29th ult., one week later than that by the Canada arrived at Halifax on Tuesday.

We learn that Mr. Parker H. French, the President-elect of Gen. Walker, the conqueror of Nicaragua, is to be arrested this morning on a Bench warrant from the United States District Court, for a violation of the neutrality laws.

The infection of disagreement upon presiding officers has reached our City Board of Education. Twenty-two unsuccessful ballots were had last night, and then the Board adjourned to Wednesday next.

The Brooklyn Common Council succeeded in electing a President at the adjourned meeting last night. The choice fell upon Edward T. Backhouse, Whig, who was elected on the fortieth ballot. He received nineteen votes out of the thirty-eight cast.

The Cattle market yesterday exhibited the effects of the great snow-storm upon railroad transportation, as well as how dependent we have become upon this mode of conveyance for our weekly supply. Until after three o'clock, there were only 800 bullocks in the pens, while there were over a thousand head in the cars, that were delayed on the roads. One of the Harlem trains reached Forty-fourth street after two o'clock, with about 200 of 600 head on the road, due in the morning or night before. The others were expected some time after that. The 800 in the pens had been previously nearly all sold at 11 and 12 cents generally, for all that were fit to kill. The lowest number in the pens any day last year was 854, and the average of each market day was 1,875, and the weekly average in the city, 3,565 bullocks. It is in the memory of some of the men still in the cattle-selling business, of a time when eight hundred bullocks would glut the market. In speaking of the small number of bullocks on sale yesterday, a hale and hearty gentleman present, who is still engaged in the active business of life as a very large packer of beef and pork, related an anecdote very illustrative of the growth of New-York, and the condition of markets now and forty-five years ago. He was then engaged as a drover, and on his way to the city met some of the principal drovers at West Farms, in Westchester County, where it was ascertained there would be 800 beeves in market that week. It was also known that others were expected from Dutchess County, and it was agreed to hire an express to ride back that night, "without sparing horseflesh," to stop these cattle from coming down, as a greater number than eight hundred, it was thought, would so glut the market that prices would be ruinous to owners. At that time ten cents would have been ruinous to buyers. Now, nothing fit to eat sells so low as that. These drovers were alarmed at the prospect of having 800 beeves for sale in the city at one time. Now, butchers are alarmed at the short supply occasioned by a report that three times that number in a week, or twice eight hundred in a single day, are all that will be offered.

A dreadful accident occurred on the Hudson River Railroad yesterday, being the first very serious one since the road was made. The Albany morning train for New-York had stopped two miles below Poughkeepsie in consequence of some defect in the track, and while standing there was run into by the Poughkeepsie train for New-York. The rear car of the Albany train was demolished, one man and two women killed, and more than a dozen others injured, some of them seriously. We give by telegraph and otherwise all the particulars that could be gathered last night.

We give in another column a dispatch from our correspondent at Washington, containing the information that the Administration have categorically demanded the recall of Mr. Crampton, and at the same time have intimated to the British Government that the exequatur of Messrs. Barclay, Mathew, and Baycroft, are to be withdrawn. If Mr. Crampton is not recalled, his passports will be given to him. This step we have all along anticipated.

A spicy correspondence between the Hon. RICHARD W. THOMPSON of Indiana and HORACE GREELEY with respect to the Political History of the last ten years, appears on another page of this paper. It will reward attention mainly as throwing light on this question—"Do the Republican stand now on the platform of the Northern Whigs of the Free States in 1846-7-8-9?"—or do the so-called 'National' Whigs more faithfully embody and reflect the Whig spirit of those years?" Whoever reads this correspondence will find there in some plain landmarks to guide him in the decision of this question.

—Let us here observe that, while we yield the space, we repeat most emphatically the claim of Mr. Thompson to occupy our columns at such length. He had made and printed a Political Speech, which is a labored and bitter attack on the great mass of his old compatriots in the Free States. That speech invited criticism, and received it in these columns. Here was no case of a private man dragged unwillingly before the public; on the contrary, Mr. Thompson volunteered his appearance as a gladiator and assailant. We have just the same right to demand that our strictures shall be bound up and circulated with his printed speech as he has that his reply shall appear in the THE TRIBUNE. No matter—his letter appears in full in this paper, and we hope it will attract the attention at least of political readers.

THE CAT AND THE MONKEY.

It is now currently stated and generally believed that at least the closing part of the President's Message, in which an historical development is attempted of our form of government, is not the work of Mr. Pierce, but of Caleb Cushing, who is laboring to succeed Judge Taney as the Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court. This probable paternity of that part of the Message both warrants and demands a more particular examination of it than as the mere offspring of the President's own legal and historical studies could have been reasonably bestowed upon it. Whatever might have been the accomplishments which induced the Baltimore Convention to confer the Presidency upon Mr. Pierce, it certainly was not any special proficiency as a constitutional lawyer. His county court practice had led him but seldom in that direction, and his being at one and the same time almost equally an admirer and humble scholar of Calhoun and Webster, for both of whom as expounders of the Constitution, he expressed the deepest reverence, is proof enough that a jumble of his ideas on that subject must have been.

A constitutional and historical essay, the bona fide production of Franklin Pierce, would be entitled to pretty much the same indulgent consideration as a boy's college theme on that subject; and the misstatements and false quotations by which its reasoning might be vitiated, might fairly claim the indulgence of being set down rather to ignorant haste and want of familiarity with the subject than from any disposition willfully to misrepresent. But since we are to regard the historical and legal dissertation appended to the Message, not as the production of the President, but as having been put into his mouth by Mr. Cushing, its misquotations and misrepresentations may justly be looked at with very different eyes, and in a spirit of criticism much more severe. Mr. Cushing is well read in history and learned in the law. Mr. Cushing is Attorney-General of the United States, in which capacity he has favored the public with a great many ex-cathedra legal opinions, beside those set out in Mr. Pierce's Message. Having been a Judge of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, through the favor of the Free-Soil party of that State, with whom he intrigued desperately to get that place, deceiving some of the very elect, he is now intriguing no less desperately with the slaveholders to get from them the position expected soon to be vacant, of Chief-Justice of the United States. To be able on occasion to misquote the Constitution and the statutes may possibly be a recommendation in the slaveholders' eyes, though if they are wise men they ought to recollect that he who can and will misquote for them, can also, occasion serving, misquote against them. But however it may be with the slaveholders, the people at large will certainly be of opinion that such a habit of miscitation is, rather a disqualification for high judicial office than otherwise.

The lecture which President Pierce, acting as Mr. Cushing's mouth-piece, undertakes to read to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on the subject of her Person Liberty Law is wholly founded upon the following thesis:— "Each State expressly stipulated, as well for itself as for each and all of its citizens, and every citizen of each State, to be solemnly bound by his allegiance to the Constitution, that any person held to service or labor in one State, escaping into another, should not, in consequence of any law or regulation thereof, be discharged from such service or labor, but should be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor might be due by the laws of his State."

But in this undertaking to state the constitutional provision, instead of quoting the section as should have been done, the Message omits the most essential clause, in which is involved one of the greatest questions in dispute as to the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave acts, and the obligation of Massachusetts and other States to submit to, and to aid in their enforcement. The first objection to those acts is, that Congress has no power to legislate on the subject at all—the surrender of fugitives being an obligation imposed by the Constitution not on Congress or the Federal Government, but in terms on the States, and therefore resting wholly with them for its execution. This is a point to which the Message has made no allusion—a very discreet omission, truly, since it is impossible to reconcile any such assumption of power by the General Government with that strict limitation of its authority upon which the Message so strenuously insists.

The other objection to the Fugitive act of 1850 is this: that even admitting the power of Congress to legislate for the return of fugitives, the act in question goes far beyond anything which the Constitution contemplated. The Constitution provides only for the return of persons held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another; and it is therefore an essential preliminary to the surrender of anybody that it should first be proved, not only that he was held to labor in one State and escaped into another, but also that he was held to labor under the laws of the State whence he escaped; in other words, not merely that somebody in that State claimed him and held him, but that somebody had a legal right to hold him. Now the Fugitive act of 1850 provides for the surrender of fugitives from labor, upon the bare proof—and ex-parte proof at that—of flight, and of the fact of having been held to labor. It provides no means whatever for adjudicating the other all-important and essential fact that the person so held and so flying did actually owe labor. The Act of 1850, by the confession of all its juridical apologetics, prescribes no process of adjudication, but only a process of extradition. The United States under that act lays her hand upon a resident of Massachusetts, and without stopping to inquire whether he actually owes service to anybody, this man thus unconstitutionally seized is delivered over as to some

South Carolina slaveholder who claims him, to be carried out of the State, remitting him for the restoration of his rights, if he has any, to the Courts of whatever State the claimant may take him to, and to the forlorn hope of getting his case before those Courts. This is the monstrous Federal usurpation against which the Massachusetts Personal Liberty Law is aimed—a usurpation for which it is only possible to apologise by first mutilating and misquoting the Constitution of the United States. Daniel Webster set the example of this mutilation and misquotation in his speech in favor of the bill, and, though public attention was repeatedly called to the subject on that occasion, the conceiters of the Message find it necessary to repeat the same cheat. Fraud in itself is base enough, but fraud and petty larceny combined are odd recommendations for a seat upon the bench, to which which Mr. Cushing aspires.

Another misrepresentation of the law, put forward by the Message as a basis of argument, relates to the prohibition of Slavery in the territory north-west of the Ohio. The Message, at the commencement of its apology for the Kansas-Nebraska bill, makes in reference to that subject the following statement:— "The ordinance for the Government of the Territory north-west of the River Ohio had contained a provision, which prohibited the use of slave labor therein, subject to the condition of its extension to territories from services due in any other part of the United States. Subsequently to the adoption of the Constitution, this provision ceased to remain as a law; for its operation as such was absolutely superseded by the Constitution. But the recollection of the fact excited the zeal of social propagandism in some sections of the Confederation; and when a second State—that of Missouri—came to be formed in the Territory of Louisiana, proposition was made to extend to the latter Territory the restriction originally applied to the country situated between the rivers Ohio and Mississippi."

The evident and intended implication of this passage plainly is, that from the adoption of the Constitution down to the adoption of the Missouri Compromise in 1820, there was no law of the United States in force prohibiting Slavery in any of the Territories. But, without stopping to discuss the question of the effort of the adoption of the Federal Constitution on the legal binding force of the ordinances of the Continental Congress—though Mr. Pierce may be ignorant, Mr. Cushing must be well aware, that one of the acts of the first Congress re-enacted in express terms the perpetual prohibition of Slavery north-west of the Ohio. So drops the pretense and so is exposed the willful falsehood of putting forward the Missouri Compromise as having been the first act of Congress in which was contained any restriction on Slavery in the Territories.

Poor Mr. Pierce! He reminds us of nothing but the miserable cat in the fable in the hands of the ruthless monkey, that cared nothing whose hands were burnt in raking his (the monkey's) chestnuts out of the fire.

THE CENTRAL PARK.

We publish in another column a communication from a source which we deem proper to say is of the most respectable character, intimating nothing less than that certain judges of the Supreme Court have conspired to defeat the public will in the matter of the Central Park. This is a grave imputation, and we are sorry to say, appears not to be without justification in the facts of the case. It is well known to our readers that the establishment of this Park was secured through a powerful manifestation of the public desire for it. The vast majority of the citizens of New-York, and among them the most intelligent and far-seeing, were of opinion that a metropolis such as this is destined to be, should have a great public place for the recreation and health of the masses of its residents; and in compliance with this feeling the act for the laying out of the Park was passed by the Legislature. Some of the most eminent gentlemen of the community, men like Mr. Kent and Mr. Bradish, were appointed to make the necessary assessments; and how equitable and satisfactory was their general appointment may be judged from the fact that when the work was completed, the press of the city, without an exception, including journals of the most antagonistic views on almost every other subject, were unanimous in commending the action of these Commissioners, and in congratulating the public on the cheering prospect that this magnificent public ground would now at last be added to the blessings and attractions of the city. It would seem, however, that they reckoned without the judges of the Supreme Court.

According to the Act establishing the Park, the assessment rolls of the Commissioners must be confirmed by a Judge of the Supreme Court, and to that Court they were accordingly carried. The hearing was first appointed for the 15th ult., but when that day arrived, it was postponed to the 22d, then to the 24th, then to the 26th, then to the 28th, and so on. One day none of the Judges were present, the next day some other excuse was found, at the same time that mysterious givings-out from parties hostile to the Park, to the effect that it would be squelched by the Judges, came to the ears of its friends. At last, all other members of the Supreme bench being out of the way, Judge Roosevelt was found not only ready but willing to hear the matter. But as he had an indirect, if not a direct, pecuniary interest in the case, Mr. Dillon, who, as Counsel for the Corporation, was charged with the duty of conducting the affair, felt himself bound to protest against that judge having anything to do with its decision. In ordinary cases, the simple suggestion of such an obstacle, is enough; the natural delicacy of a judge dictating that he should never adjudicate a question in respect of which the suspicion of personal interest on his part is possible. Such a feeling, however, does not appear to be one of the virtues of Judge Roosevelt. Instead of promptly declining to act in the case, he heard Mr. Dillon's protest, and then took the matter under advisement. This made another adjournment, but strange to say, when his decision came, it did not even allude to the point raised by Mr. Dillon, and neither denied nor admitted that he was pecuniarily interested. Instead of this, the Judge discovered a new point, which was that the matter might be heard before a special term of the full bench, including himself with all the other Justices of the Court.

This special term came up on Monday last, the 7th inst., and then again Mr. Dillon protested against Judge Roosevelt's sitting in the case, on the same ground of personal interest. Once more that Judge exhibited the same peculiar feeling—whether of delicacy, or obstinate determination to have a hand in the decision, we do not undertake to say—which he had previously manifested; and instead of his at once withdrawing, the question was again taken under advisement, and put over to another day. That day was yesterday, and when Mr. Dillon appeared, he found Judge Cowles alone present, who informed him that the Court desired to hear an argument on the question of Judge Roosevelt's interest, and that it must go over again.

That argument is appointed for the 21st instant, when it will perhaps be disposed of. But we think it will strike everybody as not a very admirable proceeding that argument should be thought necessary, or even proper, on such a question. Even if Judge Roosevelt cannot be proved to be directly interested in the laying out of the Park, it is well known that he is a large property owner in that part of the city, and this alone, we think, should satisfy him, as it will satisfy the public that he ought to keep aloof from this adjudication. In fact, of all the Judges now on that bench, there is only one against whom the suspicion of interest or prejudice cannot, to some extent, be entertained. We refer, of course, to Judge Cowles, who, as neither a long-standing resident nor a property-holder in the city, would doubtless approach the case with perfect impartiality. He is evidently the most proper man to dispose of the matter; or if he cannot undertake it, some Supreme Judge from the country should be specially appointed for the purpose. All that we ask is that the case should be fairly and impartially settled; and so much the public certainly have a perfect right to demand.

POSTS VERSUS PROGRESS.

What is that institution which we call a Post? According to Noah Webster it is "a messenger or a carrier of letters and papers; one that goes at stated times to convey the mail or dispatches." The same eminent authority adds that "this sense also denotes fixedness." But this is not all, for there is still another definition—"post, a Latin preposition, signifying after." Such are the authentic meanings of the word, and it must be gratifying to the curious student of philological precision to know that the institution, as it exists in these United States, perfectly embodies and exemplifies them all. So much, at least, is clear from the recent Annual Report of our Master-General of the Post. In that luminous document we see that the establishment, over which he presides, is "a carrier of letters and papers;" a type of "fixedness," showing no signs of progress; and certainly a great way "after" or behind the times.

We have already commented upon some of the positive faults of this Report. Its sins of omission are, however, equally glaring and far more blameworthy, and those we now propose to notice. In the first place, it advises no amelioration whatsoever in our wretched postal system. In fact, during the whole period of Judge Campbell's term of office—nearly three years—he has neither recommended to Congress, nor carried out in his official capacity one single improvement of any consequence. He has, however, by way of compensation, procured the passage of several laws seriously detrimental both to the business of the country and to an efficient postal service. He claims, indeed, to have done something toward bringing about a better distribution scheme at distributing offices. We will give him his due, and acknowledge that he has made the plan of distribution more complete and a little more systematic, but it is merely an extension of an old plan. It cannot claim originality. He has also procured the passage of a law detaining, opening and destroying all letters that happen to be mailed without payment of postage, by which means one million two hundred thousand letters annually are prevented from reaching their proper destinations. This same law, moreover, will frequently entirely stop the mails in consequence of the offices getting out of stamps, and thus throw the business of the nation into the hands of express companies. It will also operate with great hardship on the settlers of our frontiers. Moreover, this law takes away from the Post-Office at least five hundred thousand dollars of its annual income, and that, too, at the very time when the Department is greatly in need of funds. We hazard nothing in predicting that just as certain as the financial year rolls round to July, 1856, the annual Postal revenue will be half a million dollars less than it would have been but for this law, notwithstanding the increase of postage rates to and from California. This prediction may in due time be verified or falsified, as the case may be, by comparing the actual income with what it would have been, according to the ordinary increase of past years.

The Postmaster-General also procured the passage of a law raising postage from six to ten cents on all letters going over three thousand miles. This is both unjust to the citizens of our Pacific coast, and is a measure of bad policy, as it perpetuates and increases the irregularities in our postal rates, and creates an actual extra expense of a million of dollars a year that would not have been incurred with uniform postage. He has furthermore procured the passage of the law for registering letters—a complete farce, pretending to carry on its face a guaranty of safety, while it is no guaranty at all, but a direct swindle. Having thus shown what the Postmaster-General has actually performed, let us now see what he has not done.

He has not advised the abolition of franking, a system the iniquity of which is acknowledged everywhere. It saddens an expense of millions on the Post-Office, keeps the Department on the verge of bankruptcy, and by its enormous burden furnishes a pretext for preventing extensions of mail service to all parts of the Union. He has not advised a uniform rate of postage, a measure that by its mere economy and convenience would effect an annual saving of nearly a million of dollars, and which with the abolition of franking, would allow of a uniform rate of postage of two cents, and would entirely support the Department. He has not advised Congress to establish letter-carriers and receiving houses in cities and towns, a measure in operation in nearly every nation in Europe, and which, as is well known, completely supports itself without any extra charge, and is a great convenience to the people, while it also pays a large profit to the Post-Office. He has not advised Congress to pass a law establishing a money-order system for safety in remitting money—a system that has long been practiced with entire success in France, Spain, Prussia, the German States and Great Britain, and is greatly needed in this country, where there are mailed annually over ninety millions of dollars. He has not proposed a law requiring all dead letters to be returned to their writers. He has not proposed a simplification and reduction of rates of postage on printed matter, while the expense of mail carriage is now four times the price charged by express. He has on the contrary advised a raising of the rates on the poor man's newspaper, a measure that could not possibly add half a million to the postal income, while four times this amount is added to its expense by the franking iniquity.

There is after all nothing so very strange in this state of our Postal System. Indeed, it is worth noting that there is a complete uniformity in one particular in the whole history of postal affairs, since the time when carrier pigeons were used to convey messages to the relief of the garrison at the siege of Tyre. This uniformity is a single improvement of note in any postal system in the world that owed its origin or support to the Government or head of the Post-Office. It would seem to be a fatality that official position begets official stupidity. William Doekkers, an enterprising citizen of London, was the original inventor of letter-carrying. King James ousted him as soon as he could profitably do so, considering that he owned the Post-Office, and, therefore, its profits should rightfully accrue to himself alone. John Palmer, a theater-manager, started the system of mail coaches in the place of horse and foot posts. His improvements were met with every kind of official obloquy and abuse until long after his plan was proved successful, and he himself was beggared; and it was not until his country's treasury had reaped millions by his system that he received any reward. The opposition to Rowland Hill and his plan of uniform penny postage is known to every one. The obstacles thrown in his way by two General Postmasters, the false report and consequent disgrace and discomfiture of the Secretary, are mere ordinary official incidents—the normal obstacles strewn in the path of a volunteer reformer.

We would not, however, be supposed to condemn everything in the Postmaster-General's Report. Far from it. It has one particularly eloquent, we had almost said touching passage. "For 'irregularities,'" exclaims the Postmaster-General, "as well as for real delinquencies, the Department is constantly made the subject of reproach. 'Where there is good ground of complaint this is expected; but it is apparent that there is a too ready disposition on every occasion of actual or presumed slight derangement in the machinery of the mails, to reflect upon the Department; thereby, in a greater or less extent, impairing its efficiency. The postal establishment is one in which every citizen is most deeply interested, and all should aid in rendering it as perfect as possible. Instead of denunciations in the event of mistake, carelessness or neglect, as a general rule, certainly the wiser course would be to advise the department of the wrong committed, and leave it to apply the remedy."

To this burst of official sensibility we know of no better reply, nor one from a more appropriate source than may be found in some suggestions to the public, put forth a few months since by Rowland Hill. "The sharp and watchful criticism of 'the public eye,'" says this enlightened reformer, "even though it be sometimes founded in a mistaken view, is far from being an evil to any Department of Government; none can expect immunity from it. And probably the Post-Office, the good administration of which concerns every class of the people, and depends greatly upon a care of minute details, is more likely to receive benefit from it than any other."

Remove this impediment to her career, and the superiority of her soil, her great facilities for internal communication and the advantage she would take of what Western Europe has already done, would enable her to move forward at a most rapid rate. And while Russia would thus rapidly gain on her rivals in these two great matters of intelligence and wealth, she would gain another victory of still greater importance, because it would be a moral victory over the prejudice, the antipathy, the hostile feelings of her neighbors. What is it that makes Russia at this moment the dread and fear of the nations about her? A dread and fear that has precipitated even the cautious, money-making, tax-hating English shop-keepers into the present war. Clearly, it is the immense standing army of Russia, and the facilities which the system of serfdom affords for recruiting that army to an unlimited extent. It is this immense Russian army, striking terror into all her neighbors, frightening them with the idea of another barbaric invasion from the North and East, another Cossack occupation of Paris, that makes Russia the bugbear that she is, and which, in making her neighbors hate her,—even those like Austria, whom she has lately helped out of the quagmire of revolution,—more than counterbalances all the strength which she derives from her armies. Remove this terror out of the way—abolish that serfdom which forms the basis of the existing military system of Russia, and in ceasing to be the dread of her neighbors she would cease also to be the object of their hostility.

Nor would the benefits of this great measure be limited to Russia alone; nor would they display themselves merely in the sphere of the balance of power and of general advancement—Russia and Western Europe reacting on each other in wealth, intelligence and civilization. It seems impossible to substitute for the one-man power—by which under one modification or another all the great and most of the small States of Continental Europe are governed—anything approaching to our Republican system or to the Republican system of Great Britain, until the immense standing armies of those countries are got rid of. So long as Russia hangs like a black cloud on the eastern horizon of Europe with a million of men under daily drill, all the other Continental States will be able to set up the plausible plea of self-defense as also keeping up their standing armies to the utmost limit. A change in this respect must begin with Russia; and the first step to such a change is the abolition of serfdom.

SOUTHERN PROPHECIES.

For the last thirty years the South has been engaged in holding Conventions for the purpose of establishing direct trade with the world, and freeing itself from dependence upon this city, Liverpool and London for the sale of its cotton, and upon Manchester and Lowell for the purchase of its cloth—and yet the dependence becomes more complete from day to day. In all this time we have had an abundance of words, but no action—abundance of self-glorification and promises of what the South could and would do, and yet the South declines in influence from year to year—and does so because her policy is in direct hostility with her words—the former looking to increasing her dependence, as she ever is doing, and the latter looking to diminishing it, all by help of measures counseled by the men of Manchester, who desire that cotton may be cheap, and that cloth may be dear.

Among the active and influential men of the South is Mr. Barnwell Rhett, and among the most remarkable prophecies of Southern men is one that we find referred to in the recent interesting "Life and Correspondence of Amos Lawrence," in the following words:— "I do earnestly desire your State to carry out your prophecy, that in ten years you will spin all your crop of cotton; for we of Massachusetts will gladly surrender to you the manufacture of coarse fabrics, and turn our industry to making finer articles. In short, we will give up the manufacture of coarse fabrics, and turn one half of our machinery into spinning and weaving cotton hose; and nothing will spin us all so much as specific duties. The whole kingdom of Saxony is employed at this moment in making cotton hose for the United States from yarn purchased in England, and made of your cotton. How would it be better for you and for us to save these treble profits and transport, by making up the cotton at home? Think of these matters, and look at them without the prejudice that prevails so extensively in your State. A few years ago, I asked our kinsman, Gen. — of your State, how the forty bale theory was esteemed at that time, and he said to you that year, 'I do not think it true that it was started, and it had its effect, but nobody is of that mind now.' Still, I believe that when an error gets strong hold of the popular mind, it is much more difficult to eradicate it than to supply truth in its place. If I know myself I could not mete out to you any different excuse from what I state and believe to be true. Give up to us your yarn, which will be as placed to them in a few years as the sun at noon-day."

This letter is now just six years old, being dated December 12, 1849, and it refers, as we see, to a prophecy of Mr. Rhett that his State was, before 1850, to convert all its cotton into yarn or cloth, having done which it could have direct trade with the Saxons, who needed yarn, and the Brazilians, who required cloth. Under what circumstances was it that Mr. Rhett made this prophecy? They were these: The tariff of 1842 had started manufactures in the South and South-west, and they were advancing with such rapidity that already, in 1848, the domestic demand was absorbing nearly two hundred thousand bales, with a certainty that before many years it would reach half a million; and the Yankees had been everywhere looking forward to what is here suggested—the abandonment of coarse manufactures, and the substitution of fine ones. In that year, however, the operation of the tariff of 1846 began to be felt, and in the following year the Southern manufacturers found themselves obliged to make an effort to induce the Northerners to make finer goods, and thus keep up the prices; but the answer of the North was to this effect: "We were about to turn our attention to fine goods, but Mr. Walker's tariff has closed our print-works and bankrupted their owners, and we have nothing now to do but hold on to the coarse articles. Those we can manufacture, and we have direct trade with our customers, whereas you have not. When you make up your goods in Georgia and Carolina, you find yourselves forced to send them to New-York, there to be purchased by your very neighbors, and therefore with all your advantages in the price of the raw material, you cannot compete with us under the system known as Free Trade. With us the rate of interest is low, and with you it is high, and now that the time has come when business is to be done for little or no profit, we must carry the day. We can exist under your system, but you cannot. And the weaker must go to the wall."

What has been the result? The answer to this question has been given to the world in several papers published by The Journal of Commerce, from which we learn that the manufacturers of Georgia have in a great degree died out, and those concerned in them been ruined—and so has east-