

found their way into Russia from all parts of the civilized world, and more especially from England and Germany. Nothing more was heard there of commercial crises, caused by overtrading; the nation has grown prosperous and the manufactures are flourishing.”

The New York Tribune, a daily paper of immense circulation.

To Horace Greeley, Esq.—In the *Tribune* of this morning, you state that “at this moment, half the manufactories in the country are running at a loss; many have stopped, and more must stop, if some decided change is not effected.” That “our iron works are closing up, while British rails fill our ports, and are spreading over the country.”

Presuming the information on which you found your assertion to be correct, still, I do not admit the propriety or justice of farther protection to manufactures of the articles in question. The people require these articles for their consumption—they already submit to a duty of 30 per cent., and if manufactures cannot produce profitably with that protection, it appears to me that they had better employ their capital elsewhere. The consumers of the country constitute the great majority, and their interests should be first considered. They require railroads, and if British rails are cheapest, they should be permitted to use them, rather than be taxed for the benefit of the few manufacturers. Railroads are for the benefit of the *people*—they place the producer and consumer side by side, and should not be cramped by partial legislation. I am a Whig—but with reference to party, support those measures only which are conducive to the welfare of our

COMMON COUNTRY.

NEW YORK, July 31, 1850.

The Editor's remarks on the above.

The difficulty in bringing this Tariff controversy to a conclusion grows out of the fact that *one party pays no attention whatever to the other's arguments*. We, who stand for protection, read the writing of our opponents, and discuss the question with direct reference to their arguments: but our adversaries coolly assume at the outset that all we have to say is nonsense, and absurdity, dictated by selfishness or bigotry, and never take the trouble of listening to us for the first minute. Thus, after we have patiently met their arguments, point after point, and as we think refuted them, they simply repeat their previous assertions, paying no attention to our replies, and deeming themselves unanswered because they have not looked at the answer.* Our correspondent is a fair sample of the breed, calling himself a “Whig,” (*why* a Whig?) he coolly assumes that the first article in the Whig creed is a fallacy, and gives us a rehash of the most ordinary sophisms of free trade, with a seeming unconsciousness that they had ever before been uttered—much less answered. Yet there is not a suggestion in his letter that has not been at least ten times fully considered—and we think refuted in the *Tribune* alone. That 30, 25 and even 20 per cent. is sufficient protection for many branches of manufactures, we have freely and often stated. There are other branches which need more, and for these among other reasons: 1 They (not all manufactures, but these branches) are yet in their infancy, and are necessarily prosecuted at great dis-

* If in the above extract we substitute “Canada” for “Russia,” [the description of our present condition will be found to the letter.—Ed. C. M. M.]