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ANTI-TARIFF MEETING.

ABBEVILLE DISTRICT, S. C.

According to previous notice, indiscriminately given and extensively circulated, a large meeting of the citizens of Abbeville District was held in the Court-House, on Monday, 6th August—Gen. Edmund Ware was called to the Chair, and Wyatt W. Stark appointed Secretary. Joseph Black, Esq. called the attention of the Meeting to the Woollens Bill, and urged the necessity of memorializing Congress in opposition to it. D. L. Wardlaw, Esq. moved that a Committee of nine should be appointed to prepare a Memorial and Resolutions on this subject, to be reported the first Monday in next month. After Addresses from Mr. Wardlaw, Mr. Black, Col. Bowie, Col. Noble, and Major Bull, the motion was adopted; and the Chairman nominated for the Committee, D. L. Wardlaw, Joseph Black, Patrick Noble, A. Bowie, W. A. Bull, James Calhoun, W. S. Campbell, W. W. Stark, and Edmund Ware—the last upon special motion. The meeting was adjourned until the first Monday of September.

On Monday, 3d Sept. 1827, the assemblage of citizens was one of the largest ever seen at this place. The Court Room, which is very large, was crowded to oppression; and many who could not find room to stand within, thronged around the doors and windows. Mr. Wardlaw, from the Committee, appointed at the last meeting, after some prefatory remarks, introduced the following Memorial and Resolutions. These were sustained by Mr. Campbell, Col. Noble, Major Bull, Mr. Stark, Mr. Black, John S. Pressly, Esq. and Col. Bowie, and were unanimously adopted. On motion of Col. Noble, it, was ordered, nem. con. that they should be entered as the unanimous act of the citizens assembled.

W. W. STARKE, Secretary.
MEMORIAL.

To the Honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled;

We, the citizens of Abbeville District, respectfully approach your honorable body as memorialists, to remonstrate against the passage of the Woollens Bill, or any other bill for imposing Protecting Duties, and to pray the repeal of all laws now in force of this character, and an abandonment of the principle.

We will not occupy your time by repeating arguments to show that the whole protecting system is contrary to the well established doctrines of political economy, everywhere applicable: and that in this country especially, it is expedient, as it leads necessarily to entire prohibition, and even now subtracts from the whole sum of national wealth; diminishes the demand and value of our exports; seriously affects our trade; is injurious to the only revenue system the country can well abide; and is well calculated to destroy our foreign commerce, shipping interest, commercial marine, and navy:—to arrest the settlement of our public lands; to render the yeomanry of the country subservient to dangerous accumulations of capital, and to thwart all the correct policy of the country;—nor will we attempt to expose the peculiarly offensive provisions of the Woollens Bill, and the inapplicability of the reasons urged in its support: but we will proceed to the representation of grievances felt by us, immediately connected with the principle of this system.

When the oppressive Tariff Bill of 1824 was before your honorable body, its passage was in a great degree affected by its friends representing it as a final adjustment of the subject: and although we then believed, and now believe, that it was an adjustment wholly at the sacrifice of the great interests engaged in cultivating the principal staples for exportation, and in carrying on the foreign commerce of the country; yet such was our attachment to the union, peace and harmony of the country, that we felt disposed to acquiesce in the unequal terms of compromise. The consequence was such as experience ought to have taught would follow. Avarice is never satiated. Two years had not elapsed before the great monopolists of the Eastern States, to whose advantage the Tariff of 1824 almost exclusively operated, began to demand additional bounties by urging the passage of the Woollens Bill; and we now behold them resorting to new and dangerous measures to effect their schemes at the next session. To concentrate their force, a meeting has been held in the imposing form of a Convention of
thirteen States. The prejudices, interests, and feelings of various sections have been artfully invoked; and exchanges of monopolies arranged. Iron, hemp, whiskey, cotton goods, wool, and copper, offer the hopes of gain to those who have no share in the woolens: to others interested in none of these, the profits of Internal Improvements and bounties of public lands promise rich rewards. Combining the whole under the misapplied name of the "American System," bold speculators in politics and manufactures hope, through the Congress of the United States, to achieve their purposes of self-aggrandizement, at the expense of the great mass of the people, who have taken no share in their intrigues, or are deluded by party feelings, and the vain expectation of advantage. No doubt now exists, that total prohibition of all foreign fabrics, which by the most extravagant encouragement can be produced in this country, is contemplated. It may not be effected or proposed at once: but if not at once arrested by the intelligence and justice of Congress, the scheme will be persevered in, while ever the other sections of the Union will bear burdens sufficient to compensate the increased burdens which the favors granted to obtain friends will impose upon the various classes of manufacturers in common with others. If once fairly established, the system will grow without the adventitious aids now called to its assistance, and will create in its progress, interests and influences strong enough to support it, long after general consent shall have pronounced it ruinous and intolerable. These things have brought the sense of past injuries forcibly to our minds, and caused us to look with apprehension to the future. We have borne too long—our only hope is to revert to first principles, to redress our past wrongs, and resist all future impositions! We see that our burdens are to be increased, while a cent is left which may be wrung from us by an odious monopoly: and we feel justified, whatever may have been our disposition to acquiesce in the Tariff of 1824, to remonstrate against the entire system, as we now solemnly do, under the most sincere conviction that, if not arrested, it will lead to the poverty and misery of ourselves and our posterity, and finally to the extinction of the liberty of our country.

To be subject to no restraint which does not produce general good more than sufficient to counterbalance the individual hardships, is our notion of civil liberty; and we deem all interferences of Government, which are not plainly useful to the community, as pernicious—if wilfully persevered in, tyrannical. Our Constitution may be abused no less in its exercise, than in its violation. The powers essential to the public good may all, without transgressing the limits assigned, be perverted to inexpedient, dangerous, unjust and tyrannical use: under the color of the terms in which several of them are granted, may be performed acts wholly beyond the intention with which they were conferred. Much necessarily was left to the sound discretion of the agents, conscientiously to be exercised. Each branch of Government is bound to presume the purity of its co-ordinate members, and to attribute every act to such motive as is essential to its validity. The sovereign power of the people, enforcing the responsibility of the rulers, is ne-
necessarily the only check to most inexpedient exercises and dangerous perversions of the powers granted in the Constitution. From these premises we infer, that many acts which the Supreme Court would rightfully pronounce constitutional, the people, free from all the trammels of presumptions which the Court must make, may well pronounce to be unconstitutional: that many acts which are constitutional, the people may well resist as tyrannical and unjust; and that against a determined majority, the oppressed are often without remedy in the constitutional checks of power. We are not bound to presume a measure totally uncalled for by the state of our foreign relations, which is avowedly intended and plainly tends to the destruction of commerce, to be a regulation of commerce: we are not bound to presume a measure which will diminish, if not destroy the revenue from imports, and which, throughout its discussion, and every where but on its face, appears to be a measure for the protection of one branch of industry to the prostration of others, to be a measure for increasing the revenue from imports. As part of the people who made the Constitution, and whose consent maintains it, who know its objects and can inquire into the motives of those who act under it, we refer ourselves and others to a higher standard of construction than the technical and necessarily constrained decisions of a judicial tribunal. We claim the benefit of the Constitution in its spirit and good sense, and not according to its terms, extended to the farthest limit which the conscientious exercise of one branch of Government might go, without coming within the reach of a co-ordinate branch. We have searched in vain for the power given to Congress to lay duties for the protection of domestic manufactures. But on this subject we disdain to cavil about terms. As Americans, we know that equality of rights is the pervading principle of our Constitution, and we feel that no law by which one class of citizens is oppressed for the benefit of another, can be reconciled with the rights of man, as they have been established by reason, as they were maintained in our revolution, or as they are secured in the great charter of our liberties.

Without entering further into the consideration of the great political questions connected with this subject, we propose to consider it simply as it really is, and as it is stated by the manufacturers themselves. The tariff of protection is intended to relieve them from existing difficulties, so as to enable them to carry on profitably, what they represent to be without it, a losing business.

Every tariff for protecting any branch of industry, is neither more nor less than a tax on the imported article, laid with the view of raising its price in order to give the home manufacturer a better market. Its very essence is a bounty founded on monopoly, in favor of the producer, and against those who simply consume. The measure of the bounty to the former, is the increased price of the article and the quantity consumed: and the measure of the tax on the latter is the same—so that the gain and loss to the parties are strictly reciprocal.

In representing the tariff as a tax intended to increase the price of the article for the benefit of the manufacturer, we do not intend to
assert that the advantage of the increased price accrues solely to him. Others, such as the laborers in the factories, the artisans employed in making the machinery, and the farmers employed in raising supplies, more or less participate. If, however, the operations of the monopoly secured by the tariff, could be limited to the manufacturer himself, and those participating in its profits with him, it is manifest they would stand in the double character of producers and consumers—and would lose in the one character, what they gained in the other: which result could not fail, by proving the monopoly useless or pernicious, to render it odious. Very different is the case when the monopoly extends to others who are mere consumers of the articles, without participating directly or indirectly in the advantages of the increased price—to them it is a pure loss, and that loss being added to the profit side of the manufacturer, and those participating with him, constitutes their real gains; and it is clear, that as their profit will increase with the increase in number of the consumers on whom the monopoly may operate, if this number be large, the gains may be so great as to create a powerful interest in favor of preserving and increasing the monopoly. The result in this case must be, that opposite interests will be created in the community: the one demanding incessantly additional monopoly by additional tariffs, and the other resisting the injustice and oppression; and, if it should happen that the country be extensive, and the manufacturers occupy one portion and the consumers the other, these opposing interests will assume a geographical character. Such your memorialists conceive to be the case in our country. The United States consist of more than 12,000,000 of people—spread over nearly 2,500,000 square miles, with great diversity of situation and pursuit: some portions of this immense country being fully ripe for manufacturing, while others cannot be for generations to come. Over this greatly extended and diversified country the tariff acts uniformly in raising the price of the articles on which it may be imposed, while its benefit is limited to that portion of the country, ripe for manufacturing establishments, which alone can take advantage of the monopoly thus secured: and on the rest of the community it acts simply as a tax on consumption. These two portions of the community are, for the most part, separated by well-marked geographical lines; which, however, we will not undertake the invidious task of drawing—sufficient it is to say, that there are upwards of five millions of people grouped together, on whom every tariff must act as a tax on consumption; and, consequently, from the nature of things, it must give to those residing in another section a monopoly to the extent of the tax. When to the number of the former are added the fertility of their soil, the favorable nature of their climate to produce the great staples of the country, and above all, the extent of the existing tariff, it will be seen that a more profitable monopoly never existed than the latter now enjoy: nor is it in the least surprising that its mighty profits, diffused directly or indirectly over nearly the whole of their section of the country, should create there, as we now behold, an almost universal interest to maintain and increase it. In their zeal for the tariff, it is clear that the
manufacturers and those participating with them, do not aim merely at securing themselves against foreign competition, or at the benefit of what may be truly called the home market—that of their own States; but their aim is, the great and profitable market of the consuming States, where the gains are pure gains to them, unaccompanied by burden or loss. For it is as much in the power of the Legislatures of the manufacturing States to secure their own home markets to their manufacturers, and thereby effectually protect them against foreign competition within their limits, as it is in the power of Congress to secure to them the market of the Union; and by the same means, under a different name. The difference between a tariff which may be laid by your honorable body in favor of the manufacturer, and a bounty paid to him out of the Treasury, is merely nominal. Both must be paid by a tax on the community; with this simple difference—that in the one case it is paid directly to the manufacturer by the consumer, in the shape of increased price; and in the other, it is first paid into the Treasury before it passes to him. A tax in his favor, in the latter shape, is in the power of State legislation; and to the extent of the State, may be made effectual to exclude all competition. How happens it, then, that the manufacturers do not apply to their State Legislatures for protection, and that none of the manufacturing States have adopted the protecting policy by granting bounties? The answer is clear: a bounty thus granted would be a monopoly on the monopolists themselves; the profit and loss would fall together, and would neutralize each other. It is not then simple protection against foreign competition—which can be effectually granted by the States, through bounties, that the manufacturer desires, as he pretends—but a monopoly against the five millions of consumers inhabiting the section of country engaged in raising the great agricultural staples of the country. Such a monopoly can be created only through your honorable body, by a tariff imposed for the purpose: which your memorialists do solemnly believe cannot be done, without extending your power beyond the assigned limits of the Constitution; without interfering with the rights sacredly reserved to the States; and without the grossest injustice and oppression.

The reason why application for protection is made to your honorable body, instead of the State legislatures, fully explains why the system of protection by Congress is so popular in the manufacturing portions of the country. Not that we would be understood as insinuating that our fellow-citizens in these States urge the system with a view of profiting at our expense. If such was the fact, it would prove that all political ties and sympathies had terminated, and would not constitute a case for remonstrance. On the contrary, we believe that the great body of the people in these States, (always excepting the designing politician, and the aristocratical monopolist,) are sincerely in favor of the system, on what they esteem honest grounds. They see and feel the benefits as to themselves and their portion of country. They see villages, towns, and cities springing up as by magic, improvement extending, and capital growing with unexampled rapidity; and they truly
trace these wonderful effects to the tariff; but without suspecting that all their great profit and boundless prosperity are wrung through its agency from a large class of their fellow-citizens, with whom it is accompanied by poverty and misery, equalizing their own gains and prosperity. It is not unnatural to judge by what is seen and felt; and if it is expected that we should give implicit faith to the testimony of those in favor of the system who profit by it, surely it is not asking too much, that we, who on the contrary are ground to dust by it, should claim equal faith in our adverse testimony. We see and feel embarrassment, distress, and decay, which we no less trace truly to the tariff. Great as may be the unanimity in favor of the system of monopoly throughout the manufacturing section, no less great against it is the unanimity among the millions who inhabit the other section. There can then be no rational doubt, that the effects of the system are directly opposite in the two portions of the country; so much so, that the prosperity of the one may be measured by the adversity of the other, so far as its operation is concerned. If such be the fact, as cannot be questioned, it is manifest that the only point which can be presented for the consideration of your honorable body on the passage of a tariff bill of protection is, whether, representing, as you do, these United States, confederated for mutual protection and benefit, you can justly and constitutionally promote the happiness of one part, by sacrificing that of another, not much less numerous, and equally intelligent and patriotic.

That the interests of a country of great extent may on a particular point become thus opposed, and that the major interest, through perversion of the powers conferred on Congress, may exercise a despotic control over the minor, we have the authority of one of the ablest men the country has produced. "It is," he says, "of great importance in a republic, not only to guard society against the oppression of the rulers, but to guard one part of society against the oppression of the other part. If a majority be united by common interest, the rights of the minority will be insecure." Again: "In a society under which the stronger factions can readily unite, and oppress the weaker, anarchy may as truly be said to reign as in a state of nature, where the weaker individual is not secured against the violence of the stronger." Such is the opinion of Alexander Hamilton; and those who respect his memory ought seriously to reflect whether there be any case where adverse interests are more likely to spring up than the one under consideration, and what are the consequences which may follow from their urging on the dangerous state which he so forcibly depicts?

It is sacrificing substance to form to say that laws are equal because their terms are general, when circumstances, beyond the reach of the laws, control their operation. Every proposition to protect any branch of manufactures in this country, from the nature of things, we have shown, must be sectional; in this character it is discussed, and from this those who pray its passage promise to themselves their gain. Would the woollen manufacturers desire the passage of the woollens' bill, if the whole Union was equally prepared to seize its advantages,
and domestic manufacture sufficient to supply the demand, were likely
to arise in every county, or even in every State? No; it would then
be a common benefit or common burden. At present, the benefit is to
be enjoyed by others—the burden alone is extended to us. What
would our northern brethren think of an act of Congress granting a
bounty to every grower in the United States, of cotton, rice, or other
product peculiar to the climate of the south? Such a measure would
be general in its terms; the mode of encouragement would be no less le­
gitimate than by duties on imports; and the natural obstacles to their
profiting by it, would be no more insurmountable than the obstacles
which preclude us from taking benefit of the monopoly created for the
protection of manufactures. Yet, if it were sufficiently strong to com­
penstate us by one-half for the taxes we pay to their manufacturers,
such a measure would produce amongst them a sensation very different
from the complacency with which they now regard the duty upon the
importation of raw cotton into this country, which was imposed unne­
cessarily in the beginning, where there was no danger of foreign com­
petition, and has never yielded either revenue or protection; from
which the cotton growing country has never derived the least benefit;
which is but the name of consideration for the grievous exactions taken
in exchange, and which we pray may be first included in the repeal of
all tariffs of protection, that we no longer may be taunted with the
pretence of favor to us.

To the suggestion that, in time, all the sections of the Union will be
in a situation to engage in manufactures each of the articles most suit­
able to its situation, and that the benefits and burdens of restriction
will then be equal, we reply, that justice forbids, that, after others
have enjoyed tribute from us for fifty years, we should then only be
admitted into equal rights with them, and be obliged, upon equal terms,
to contend with their superiority over us, greater than the superiority
of foreign manufactures over them, of which they now complain.
When any section is ripe for manufactures, no encouragement is neces­
sary; before then, it is inexpedient, and given through Congress, is
unjust and unconstitutional.

We are aware that the monopolists endeavor to reconcile the con­
sumer to their profits, by attempting to prove that protection does not
enhance the price; but can there be an absurdity greater than to sup­
pose that the home manufacturer, who now cannot persist in his trade,
as he says, with an existing duty of about 50 per cent. on woollens,
would be enabled to manufacture as cheap as the foreign manufacturer,
provided all competition from abroad were inhibited, which would be
substantially the fact if the woollens’ bill were passed? It is enough
to oppress us, but to urge such arguments is to add insult to injury.

Nor can the instance of coarse cottons support the sophistry of the
monopolist. It is known that our country has now an advantage
in the raw material of cotton over all others; notwithstanding which,
we learn, from good authority, that coarse cotton goods are now so
much cheaper in Manchester than in this country, that, were it not
for the high duty on them, they would still be imported. It is not
enough to prove that coarse cotton goods are cheaper now than when the tariff of 1816 was laid. The price of the raw material and labor have greatly fallen since, while the machinery has greatly improved. If the article be cheaper still abroad, as we believe, the difference of price is the bounty continued to be paid to the monopolist.

It is a great mistake to conclude that there is no loss if an article does not rise on the imposition of a protecting tariff. Suppose there be neither rise nor fall in price, the country at least loses the old duty, which goes into the pocket of the monopolist as a bounty, instead of going into the public Treasury in the shape of duty. To indemnify the country, the price not only ought not to rise, but ought to fall, the whole duty laid by the tariff; that is, if the woollens bill, which would almost entirely prohibit the foreign article, should pass, the price of woollens ought to fall about 50 per cent. which is about the present duty under which they are imported; and surely he must be a madman who could expect such a reduction in price, or who believed that, if the manufacturers themselves expected it, they would urge the bill.

Every measure which diminishes importation, also necessarily lessens the demand and price of our staples of exportation in the foreign market, as well by the natural operation of trade, as by retaliatory duties likely to be incurred; and although a new market is afforded at home, yet it purchases only what else would have been better sold abroad; and not only are we burdened in it by the monopoly price of articles we take in exchange, but the quantity it purchases is necessarily limited to the supply of this country, within which only the manufactures sustained by our bounty can avoid foreign competition; so that a new loss to us, and a new gain to the manufacturer, accrues in the superabundance and diminished price of our raw materials.

Are our profits sufficient to enable us, with economy, to bear the burden imposed upon us? They are derived from our honest industry, unaided by restrictions or monopolies. If nature has given us advantages, government has no right to take them away. We acknowledge not the principle of the Agrarian law. Cheerfully, as we have ever afforded, and hope ever to afford our assistance when required by our country, we maintain that no set of men have a right, without our consent, to take a portion of our private property, and, without compensation to us, convert it to their own use. The injustice of such a proceeding becomes to us more galling, when we reflect that the very manufacturers who are now most clamorous for higher gains at our expense, receive a profit from their capital, (as their acts, independent of their statements, show) greater than our most thriving farms afford. But, prosperous or adverse, our principles are the same. We insist upon a right to the profits of our own labor, except what the exigencies of our country require; and we claim liberty, restrained only for the general good, and equality of public burdens and public benefits. If our manufacturing brethren will sell to us as cheap as we can purchase abroad, we will give them the preference—further we would not ask them to do towards us.
But we would present to your honorable body a feeble picture of our grievances, if we were to limit our representation to the evils, great as they are, growing out of the measures adopted professedly to protect one branch of industry at the expense of another. It is with pain that a sense of duty compels us to probe the ulcer to the bottom; but, be the consequence on those who, by tampering, have aggravated the disease to its present alarming state.

A great change has taken place since the commencement of our government, which has rendered the whole of our fiscal system unequal and oppressive to the great interest in behalf of which we have attempted to raise our voice. Under the existing state of things, the burdens and benefits of the system are unequal as can be imagined. The great interest to which we have so often referred, while it almost exclusively bears the burden of supporting the government, participates but slightly in its advantages.

Our revenue, with the exception in reality of not more than about half a million, (principally from the sales of public lands) is derived from a tax on imports, amounting to about $20,000,000 annually. Of this immense sum the greater part is derived from duties on articles, of which the manufacturing section is perpetually demanding an increase of the impost, to prevent competition in the home market: of course it must be clear that they do not consider the duties as a tax on them. We do not wish to be understood to say, that none of the imported articles to which we refer are consumed in the manufacturing section, and consequently none of the duties levied on its inhabitants: but we do boldly assert, that they are more than indemnified for whatever may thus be paid by them into the Treasury, by the monopoly in the home market of the consuming States which these very duties secure: and surely higher proof cannot be given of the truth of this assertion, than the zealous support which they give to every proposition to increase the duties. Such being the fact, it cannot be doubted, that the whole burden of the government, almost to the full extent of the revenue, falls substantially on the very States which also bear the burden of the tariff for the protection of manufacturing monopolists.

Very different was the fact when our revenue system was first adopted, and for a long time afterwards. No part of the country was then manufacturing; and, with the exception of food, almost every article consumed in the country was imported. In that state of things the system fell with nearly equal pressure on all the parts; but the great change which has since taken place in the industry of many of the States from the introduction of manufactures, has substantially relieved the wealthy and flourishing part of the country from the burden of contributing to the public Treasury, and thrown its weight upon the poor and much exhausted section.

We present these facts, not with the hope of alleviating the great and unequal burden, by a change in the system of revenue. We know full well the almost insuperable objections to a change, and we must make up our minds to bear the load: but, certainly, these considerations offer a most powerful reason why burdens already so unequal,
should not be made still more so, by the odious addition of tariffs, to take from the light and put to the heavy.

But unequal as the burden of taxation may fall, no less unequal are the disbursements from the Treasury. It is well known that equality of disbursements is not much less important than equality of taxation, which the framers of the Constitution were so solicitous to secure. A portion of a country may be rendered rich by an overflowing disbursement, or be impoverished by an incessant payment of taxes, without a correspondent return through disbursements. The inequality of disbursements, of itself so oppressive, exists to a remarkable degree; and to render its operation infinitely more distressing, the grievance falls continually on the same section, and that the very section from which, in reality, the contributions to the Treasury are mainly drawn—thus producing an inequality, heretofore unknown in any free country; which cannot be increased, nor even continued, without exposing the country to the most dangerous consequences. For it is not possible, that men, knowing their rights, and feeling conscious that they are entitled to participate equally in the benefits of government, can long sustain so unequal a load, imposed against the united remonstrance of themselves and their representatives, without a fearful diminution in their attachment to the institutions under which they live. But, admitting that the oppressed have not sufficient intelligence to see their wrongs, or to trace them to their true cause, or seeing them have not sufficient spirit or union to resist with effect—still, to every patriotic and intelligent mind, the danger must appear great and alarming.

To the wily and corrupt politician, it is the most favorable state that can be conceived. If it be permitted by the magic of legislation to enrich one section at the expense of another, who can doubt that the influential and corrupt, in order to gain or retain power, will seize on so potent an engine of bribery? And if it be permitted to be used as the means of bribery, who, in the least conversant with history, but must see that it will end in the destruction of free institutions, however skilfully constructed, by concentrating the whole influence and power in the hands of a crafty despot, or of an odious oligarchy? But, supposing it to be our good fortune to escape so great a calamity, how clear it is, that the system must engender the most thoughtless prodigality! For what possible inducement can the majority have for economy in the public disbursements? To them, the greater the impost the greater the monopoly: and the greater the revenue, the greater the disbursements: and the greater the disbursements, the greater the gains. The revenue is to them like a tribute from a conquered province, and we might as rationally expect that an imperial government would cease to devise ways and means to augment the tribute from its provinces, as that the majority, under existing circumstances, will regard economy with a favorable eye. Even a public debt will soon be regarded as a public blessing;—as one of the most effectual means of keeping up a system of tariffs and imposts; and we may accordingly expect to find new devices to increase it, just as the sinking fund may diminish its amount. Already we witness alarming indications of a dis-
position this way; and among others, we behold an artfully got up scheme to assume an old claim of twenty-five years' standing on account of French spoliations: which will, in all probability, add an amount nearly equal to one half of the existing debt, and which must not only, under the present revenue system, be paid almost wholly by funds drawn from the section of country already so grievously oppressed, but go almost exclusively to add to the capital of the already highly favored section: thereby producing, in a single operation, the double effect of greatly increasing the debt, as the means to perpetuate the present system, and of transferring not less, in all probability, than twenty-five millions of dollars from one section to another.

In the exercise of our constitutional right we have thus decorously, but freely stated some of the grievances, under which we, in common with nearly one half of the Union, labor: firmly believing that nothing short of the united and strong voice of remonstrance from the oppressed, can arrest the great and growing evil, and thereby preserve our union and liberty. To both we are deeply and strongly attached, and we are prepared, in order to preserve them, to make whatever sacrifice freemen ought to make. Against the growth of our manufactures we have not the slightest prejudice. On the contrary, we have always rejoiced to see their prosperity, when effected by the ingenuity and industry of our fellow-citizens: but our objection is insuperable to the employment of the unconstitutional and unjust means of protecting them, at the expense of the consuming States.

In the hands of your honorable body, the destiny of the country, under Providence, is in a great measure placed. To eradicate a disease so deep seated, we know will require time and patience: but in the mean time we reasonably expect that it will not be aggravated by adding to the burthens of the oppressed; that means will be adopted to enforce the most rigid economy, the greatest practicable equality in the disbursements, and the speedy payment of the public debt, by which means the public expenditure may be reduced, and the burden that cannot at once be equalized, at least be lightened.

By adopting this course, your honorable body will preserve the peace and liberty of the country, and be entitled to the lasting gratitude of posterity: but should (which Heaven avert) the contrary course be pursued, should monopoly be added to monopoly, and oppression be heaped upon oppression, on them be the responsibility, whose insatiate avarice, or whose profligate ambition, may impel the country to so fearful an extremity. Firm in the justice of our cause, we will have, even in the worst event, at least one consolation, though a poor one: that when the catastrophe comes, if come it must, those who are now pampered by the oppression of others, will not have the least to lose.

EDM. WARE, Chairman.

W. W. Stark, Secretary.

Abbeville Court-House, Sept. 3d, 1827.
RESOLUTIONS.

Resolved, That we desire the repeal of the whole system of protecting duties, and the abandonment of the principle.

Resolved further, That this system, which we believe inexpedient, upon sound principles of economy, applicable to any country, is considered as a mere question of policy, particularly inexpedient in this country; as it necessarily leads to prohibition, and is even now injurious to the only revenue system which the country can abide; injurious to the great agricultural and commercial interests of the country; and calculated to lessen the whole sum of national wealth, to destroy our commerce, shipping interest, commercial marine, and navy; to arrest the settlement of our public lands; to render the yeomanry of the country subservient to dangerous accumulations of capital, and thwart all the correct policy of the country.

Resolved further, That, considering how extensive and diversified our country is, the system appears doubly pernicious, as being necessarily sectional and unjust, arraying against each other hostile interests, geographically divided, of which the protection of one is the oppression of the other.

Resolved further, That the system is unconstitutional, for that the power thus to protect domestic manufactures is not given to Congress by the Constitution:—which appears, not only from the silence of that instrument as to such power, but from such power's being a virtual exercise of powers either expressly forbidden to Congress or in general terms reserved to the States, and from its necessarily impugning the principle of political equality in the States and among the citizens, upon which our government is founded.

Resolved further, That the exercise of this power by Congress, is at best a sacrifice of the spirit of the Constitution, to extended construction of its terms; a perversion of rightful power beyond the intention of the framers of the Constitution, to dangerous and tyrannical use; and a gross act of oppression upon a large minority, by “a majority united by common interest.”

Resolved further, That to us, in common with the great consuming and exporting section of the United States, the present tariff of protection is a tax upon consumption; which, whilst it operates upon the manufacturing section like a bounty from a foreign treasury, burdens us grievously, as well by the increased price of our consumptions as by the reduced price and lessened demand of our staples of exportation.
Resolved further, That by the operation of the present tariff, revenue system, and system of disbursements, pursued by the government, the immense bounty which we pay to the manufacturer, and the disproportionately great contributions which we make to the revenue, are pure unrequited loss to our section of the country, and pure gain to the manufacturing section, to which both are regularly transferred: while that section is indemnified against any loss of this great gain either from the tariff or revenue, its tax, under the former being required by the diffused benefits of the manufactures supported by our bounty; and its contributions to the latter being returned, along with our contributions, in the disbursements of the government.

Resolved further, That this state of things, if continued, will lead to our poverty and misery; and not less certainly to the extinction of liberty in the country, by the barters of legislative favors, the bribery, corruption, profanities, and utter destruction of fraternal sympathies, which it will produce.

Resolved further, That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, be all earnestly requested, and that our immediate representatives be solemnly enjoined, to oppose all further imposition of tariffs for protection, as utterly intolerable; and to urge, in the most speedy mode practicable, a repeal of the whole system of protection, and an abandonment of the principle; in the mean time taking care to provide for the enforcement of the most rigid economy, the equal disbursement of the revenue, as far as practicable, and the speedy payment of the public debt.

Resolved further, That the legislature of our State be requested to take this subject into their most serious consideration, and guard the rights of the State, and of its citizens.

Resolved further, That the memorial to Congress, reported by our committee, be adopted, and copies furnished to our Representatives and Senators, to be laid before Congress; that copies of it, and of these resolutions, be also furnished to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, and to the members of our State legislature; and that the committee appointed at the last meeting, be continued as a committee of correspondence and vigilance on this subject.

EDM. WARE, Chairman.

W. W. Starke, Secretary.

Abbeville Court-House, Sept. 3, 1827.
April 19, 1948

Dear Mr. Salley:


The Lower Main Street Bank
Columbia, S.C.

Pay to the order of Tyson's Book Shop $2.50

Two and 50/100 Dollars

Signed

Salley
Dear Mr. Salley:

April 19, 1948

Thank you for your order and check of the 16th.

Item #366 my list #122 has been mailed to you today via insured parcel post.

Haven't had a single new Simms item come in but will let you know of any arrivals.

Very truly yours

TYSON'S BOOK SHOP
61 Empire St. Rm. 319
Providence 3, R.I.