

COLUMBIA TRIANGLE SCOPY.

AND SOUTH-CAROLINA STATE JOURNAL.

COLUMBIA, (S. C.) FRIDAY EVENING, JULY 6, 1827.

NO. 7.

Columbia Eclogues;

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY EVENING.

BY SWEET'S SING.

Printed at the House of Representatives of South Carolina.

TERMS.—Three Dollars per annum, payable in advance, or Four Dollars payable at the end of the year. ADVERTISEMENTS, are inserted at the rate of twenty-five cents for every twenty lines, or a less number, for the first insertion, and forty cents for each continuation. Those from non-subscribers must be accompanied by the cash, or a responsible reference, or they will receive no attention.

From the Monthly Magazine.

Oh ask not, hope thou not too much
Of sympathy below;
Few are the hearts when once some touch
Bid the sweet mountain flow;
Few—and by still conflicting powers
Forbidden here to meet—
Such ties would make this life of ours
Too fair for aught to fleet.

It may be that thy brother's eye,
Sees not as thine, which turns
In such deep reverence to the sky,
Where the rich sunset burns;
It may be that the break of spring,
Born amidst violets lone,
A picture of thy soul can bring—
A dream to his unknown:

The tone that speaks of other times—
A sorrowful delight!
The melody of distant climes,
The sound of waves by night;
The wind that with so many a tone,
Some chord within can thrill—
These may have language all thine own,
To him a mystery still.

Yet scarce thou not for this, the true
And steadfast love of years;
The kindly, that from childhood grew,
The faithful to thy tears!
If there be one that o'er the dead
Meth in thy grief born part,
And watched through sickness by thy bed—
Call him a kindred heart!

But for those bonds all perfect made,
Wherein bright spirits blend,
Like sister flowers of one sweet shade,
With the same breeze that bend,
For that fall-bloss of thought allied,
Never to mortals given—
Oh! lift the lovely dream aside,
Oh! lift them unto heaven.

F. H.

TARIFF MEETING.

Charleston, June 12, 1827.

DEAR SIR—At a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, held last evening, an extensive view of the consequences expected to result from the adoption of the proposed increase on the duty of woollens was taken, and the sentiments of the chamber have been embodied in a memorial to Congress, upon the subject—but, as this is a matter which concerns the planter, as well as the merchant, and indeed in some degree or other, every other description of persons in the community, the chamber have directed me to suggest to you the propriety of calling a general meeting of the citizens upon the occasion, at some early day; that, thereby, an expression of the sentiments of the citizens of Charleston, generally, may be obtained. Attentive as all chambers of commerce are bound to be, to the interests of trade, it must not be understood, because the chamber of commerce have taken the lead in this business, that they by any means, wish to dictate either to yourself or their fellow-citizens, what is proper to be done in opposition to the measure in question; they, however conceive, that a general expression of the opinion of the citizens of Charleston at large, will have more weight throughout the state, in inducing the country towns and districts to take up the subject, than if it was confined to any particular association or public bodies of the city.

Under this conviction, and for the purpose of saying both time and trouble, I am further instructed to say, that should the citizens meet, and think proper to adopt the memorial which has been agreed to by the chamber, even with modifications or amendments, the members of the chamber will cheerfully unite with them by adding their signatures to it; but, if this proposition should not be acquiesced in by the meeting, they will then consider themselves at liberty, as a chamber of commerce, to transmit the memorial to Congress themselves, as the act of the chamber alone.

In behalf of the Charleston chamber of commerce, I have the honor to be, with great respect, dear sir, your most obedient servant,
DAVID ALEXANDER,
President.

To the Hon. Joseph Johnson,
Intendant of the city of Charleston.

MEMORIAL TO CONGRESS.

Your memorialists, members of the chamber of commerce of Charleston, united with their citizens generally, approach your honorable body to offer their solemn remonstrance on a subject in which they cannot but take the deepest interest and feel the deepest solicitude. Your memorialists allude to the late bill for an increase of the duty on woollens, and which they have reason to believe will be again brought to the view of Congress at the approaching session. It is against the provisions, not less than the principle of that bill, that your memorialists would most earnestly remonstrate, and implore your honorable body to pause before the doctrine of commercial restrictions is so incorporated in our legislation as to constitute a part of our permanent policy. The danger of all legal restraints on foreign commercial intercourse, existing in their commencement—the difficulty in their removal. The general views on this subject do not admit of further illustration, and argument, nor can they

be strengthened by any additional appeal to experience. If the lesson of history fail to enlighten and forward on this subject, the struggle now in progress on the other side of the Atlantic between rival interests established by law, afford a solemn admonition to states who have not yet encumbered their onward course with restrictive regulations.

Your memorialists do not rest their opposition to the contemplated act, on any exclusively sectional considerations or local views. They apprehend that the people of this country have a common interest in preserving their commercial code from the complexity and contradictions which attend those of Europe, and from the introduction into that code of any principle, that in its results, would place them in a hostile position to each other—that would arm the agriculturist of one section of the country against the manufacturer of a different section. If these interests will not harmonize by the slow and natural operation of circumstances, they can never be forced into an alliance by law.

There are two leading aspects in which the subject presents itself to your memorialists:

1. As the duties contemplated in the bill must constitute an aggravation of an already unequal and burthensome tax on the consumption of the southern states; and

2. As they must have an increasing tendency to limit the foreign market for their staples.

On the first of these points the allegation of your memorialists is susceptible of the readiest proof—the evidence is accessible to all who will seek it in the spirit of impartiality. The duty on that class of woollens consumed by the slave, constitutes an impost on capital, under the guise of a tax on the consumption of the slave—it is one that cannot be got rid of, even under the most romantic state of things; nor does the burthen admit of diminution, as in other taxes on consumption, by a reduction of expenditure; the expense of clothing the slave is brought within the narrow limits of an economy that is consistent with humanity. All duties, therefore, will enhance the cost of clothing the slave and will fall with unmitigated pressure on his owner. In this view of their effects, they partake of the essential features of a direct assessment, and the distinction between an impost in this form and a capitation tax on the slave, is one more in name than in substance. The slaves of the southern cultivator constitute the greater portion of his capital—his land forms but a small part of his productive means. The entire southern region, which affords, in the produce of its soil, the means of maintenance to thousands, north as well as south, would become a barren waste without that species of labor by which it is now rendered productive. To assess the cultivator in the only means at his command, to effect the most profitable results from cultivation, from the unfettered use of his whole capital, is to impose a penalty in the form of a duty on southern improvements.

Your memorialists are persuaded that the burthen in this form borne by the southern states, since the tariff of 1826, would, in its aggregate, constitute a great deduction from their productive means, and, in its annual amount, a heavy per centage on individual capital. They believe that accurate calculation would show that on that portion invested and held in slaves, the present duty on woollens is equal to an assessment of three sixteenths per cent on such capital, and that South Carolina, assuming that one half only of her slave population are clothed in foreign woollens, now pays and has since 1816, an annual tax between 60 and 70 thousand dollars, on that portion only of her consumption of her article of woollens which is limited to her slaves.

It will be obvious on the least consideration that this is a duty distinct in its effects from that paid by the free portion of the population in general. The latter is a part of that contingent to the general fund which the southern planter contributes in common with all other classes of American society—the duty on the coarser description of woollens is an additional burthen on him, in the ratio of the number of slaves he employs in cultivation. In cases of hired services the burthen of taxes on consumption is borne in part by the employer, when labor is high—but that burthen is sustained exclusively by the laborer, in the diminution of his comforts, when such labor is low; but the price of maintenance, however high, for involuntary services, being paid without the possibility of relief or mitigation—as the burthen admits of being neither shifted or divided, it constitutes in the opinion of your memorialists, an unanswerable argument against the policy (not to say any thing of the justice) of aggravating by law this already very unequal pressure. It will be recollected that this reasoning applies to the very coarsest description, of woollens which forms scarcely any part of the consumption of the laboring and poorer classes of the other states, and as relates to the existing duty.

Nor would your memorialists omit to urge such views (if they had not been already stated with great force and truth) which go to show that the proposed increase of duties must bear with a very unequal pressure on the different classes of American society—as burthening the poor in proportion to their poverty, and exempting the wealthy in the ratio of their riches. Such duties are widely various: from the most intended general scope of our institutions, which look to the equal distribution of public burthens as the cardinal rule of legislation, whether as relates to the imposition of duties or the appointment of taxes, your memorialists are willing to admit that the home has to a great extent supplanted the foreign manufacturer, but the policy of building up an interest on such a basis as high duties, which heavily amounts to exclusion of the foreign article,

becomes here again the interesting problem, which the national legislature, having a paternal regard to all the interests involved in the issue, is called upon to solve. It may be alleged that the domestic fabric has, by the process of high duties, been greatly reduced in price, as well as improved in quality; but the true question for the consumer, in the apprehension of your memorialists, is the comparative price of the home and foreign article at the present and not at any antecedent period.

On the other branch of the subject alluded to by your memorialists, is the tendency of additional duties to limit the foreign market for the southern staples, they could open no views that are not familiar to the intelligence of the legislature of the union. There is no principle better established in commercial intercourse, than that if nations will not buy, they cannot sell. The effect of our legislation is to deprive us gradually of our steadiest and wealthiest customers. There is no magic nor mystery in the pursuits of trade—its laws are as simple as its ends are beneficent. The exchanges which mutually enrich nations are those of barter, and the great dictate of nature, with the law of human wants and human necessities, teach this truth, that legislators cannot create the elements of individual wealth and public prosperity, but they may prevent their full development and healthy action by artificial combinations and unnatural arrangements. It is impossible to foretell to what precise extent we may be deprived of the foreign demand for our staples, by our persistence in the fatal policy of high duties. The depression from a contracted market is reached by successive steps in this artificial career. The connexions of business are not suddenly dissolved—the arrangements of commerce are not without some difficulty broken up; but nations will not, any more than individuals, continue to trade on unequal terms. We may profit for the moment by our prohibitory policy—we may sell without purchasing, until fresh markets are sought and opened; but the law is not more certain that brings fluids to their level, than that nations cannot permanently and profitably trade together, unless it is by the reciprocal interchange of their respective productions.

Your memorialists are of opinion, that if the principal of legislation lately set up, as the rule of conduct on this subject for Congress, is to be acted on and carried out in practice to its full extent, a general depression and deterioration of property in the cotton growing states, may be predicted as the positive results. That principle is, that Congress possesses the power of effecting a new distribution of the national capital, and by forcing it into channels different from those into which it would naturally flow, to produce a corresponding change in the industrious pursuits of the citizen. Against such an exercise of power your memorialists solemnly protest. Commercial retaliation has been limited in the previous practice of the national government, to the vindication of the dignity or honor of the country, or with the view to produce the relaxation of foreign edicts or statutes that did violence to some principle of commercial reciprocity. But the exercise of the right to retaliate, as relates to countries which may choose to close their markets against a certain description of our produce, would involve the power to reduce to a common level of poverty or misfortune those who still preserve the foreign market for their productions, and those who by the revolutions of trade, originating in the accidents of politics or the changes of foreign legislation, have unfortunately lost that market. It would be to make a portion of the people of this union bear the burthen, to a certain extent, of the British corn laws—to visit, in short, on a large division of our population, the pains and penalties of British legislation. If such a sacrifice were necessary to assert or vindicate the national honor, or to sustain any interest intimately connected with national defence, it would be submitted to by your memorialists, with the rest of their fellow-citizens as a common burthen for a common benefit. They cannot, therefore, conceive the propriety or justice of the plea which will lead to the depression of one interest for the relief of another. The southern agriculturist had no agency in producing that state of law or circumstance abroad which, changing the channels of trade, left the western and northern cultivator to struggle with contracted markets and reduced prices. But it is a fact which does not admit of denial, that when the farmer of the middle and western states was in the enjoyment of open markets and profitable prices, the planter of the south had almost reached the last ebb of his fortunes, from the closing of the ordinary vents for his produce. He claimed no protection when he saw himself at the brink of ruin—his estates mortgaged and the produce of his plantations perishing on his hands, from the severe visitation of the accidents of war as felt in those changes of the channels of trade which invariably follow in their train.

Your memorialists would beg leave to suggest, whether it would not be within the proper province, and legitimate purposes of state legislation, to effect that more equal division of capital and employment, between agriculture and manufactures in those states which are desirous of producing such a result. This might be effected by a bounty or premium on manufactured produce, within the local jurisdiction—and the subsisting arrangements in the other states would not be exposed to disturbance. These arrangements, having their origin in that master principle of improvement—the agency of self-interest, in describing the true path to riches—claim for the future, as for the past, to be left to the voluntary and unfettered action of the same principle.

Your memorialists would also interst your honorable body to pause, having already entered on a war of commercial restriction, before war too deeply committed in that false and fatal policy. They feel convinced that the British want only a colorable pretext of retaliation to impose countervailing duties which will alike reach the eastern ship owners, and the southern agriculturist. The bill against which your memorialists protest, will most aptly afford this pretext. The commercial convention of 1816, between this country and Great Britain, expires, by its own limitation in October 1828. Is it not to be apprehended, if we pass that bill and it becomes a law, that the British government will refuse to renew that convention. The leading principle of that treaty, your honorable body knows, is the mutual abolition of discriminating duties, as regards the intercourse with British ports in Europe, on the ships and commodities of the parties respectively to that compact. We, however, possess the largest share of advantages from that arrangement. The carrying trade between the ports of Great Britain and those of the United States, is enjoyed principally by American shipping. A higher duty on American cotton imported into British ports in American than in British ships, will be in effect a discriminating duty in favor of British navigation, under the justifiable plea of retaliation, which would leave us without the power of inflicting a corresponding injury. Such a discrimination could not place the British ship owner in a worse position than he now occupies as regards his share of the carrying trade between the two countries—it might improve that position. It would preserve a resemblance in the form merely of duties, which profess to counter-vail by inflicting an equivalent evil, but in substance and effect it would operate a double injury to us. It would, in the face of an abundant growth among ourselves and the increasing competition of other countries, depress the price of our cotton in proportion to the British duty imposed on it, whilst by lessening the employment for our shipping, it would contract our mercantile marine, and thus weaken our principal arm of national defence. Holding out a boon to the shipping interest of Great Britain, it would be deemed some compensation for the supposed pressure on that interest of Mr. Huskisson's free trade acts. That to this result our restrictive and prohibitory policy is likely to lead, your memorialists feel assured from an attentive observation of recent events, and the state of public opinion in that country. Your memorialists feel the strongest assurance, therefore, that the persistence in our burthensome duties, must lead, through countervailing and retaliatory acts, to the depreciation of the produce and property of the southern states, in a far greater degree than it will benefit any considerable class or portion of the people of the United States.

Your memorialists have not adverted to the effect of excessive duties on the imports, in the future diminution of the national revenue. But it requires no argument to convince the national legislature, that the experiment of direct taxes cannot be hazarded but in support of a popular war. The inability of the southern states to pay its contingent to a general contribution in this form, will increase with the augmentation of the foreign duties; the power will, under such circumstances, be in the inverse ratio of the demands of government. Nothing short of an armed power could collect a direct impost in such a state of things. It remains for the national legislature to say whether the revenue laws of the country shall be enforced, with resort to so dreadful an alternative, and in the face of so imminent a peril to the republic.

Your memorialists also feel it their duty to express their dissent to the assertion of the constitutional power of Congress to impose duties ostensibly for revenue, but virtually for protection. They feel confident that such is not the correct interpretation of this part of our national charter. Constructing that instrument in conformity with its obvious purposes, and in the spirit which pervades the whole compact, your memorialists feel impressed with the truth, that the power to impose duties for revenue would have been expressly limited to this single object, if the framers of the instrument could have anticipated the course of our national policy. The right to raise a revenue by imposts, is unqualified—because your memorialists conceive, that being a branch of the taxing power, it would have been unwise to have limited it—like the other branches of the same power, it was judiciously left in the sound discretion of responsible agents. They, therefore, protest, in the absence of any express limitation, and in the general silence of the instrument on the subject, against the assumption, that the power can be taken in any other and larger fact of the commission of any right of employing other legislative measures for purposes of protection? It is not familiar to the knowledge of your enlightened body, that there is a choice of expedients for this object; and that the favorers of domestic industry throughout Europe, in former days, employed bounties on exportation, in addition to the duties on importation, to afford a similar protection to that claimed for the domestic industry of our own day and country? Why is the federal charter silent also as to bounties on production, which are more directly sense than as a means to a single end—and that end revenue. Is not this construction strengthened by the promotive of the same end? But we find a positive prohibition in that instrument, both on congress and the states, to impose duties on exportation, for fear, evidently, that the power might be used to trammel commerce in too great a degree, from excessive taxation, whilst such prohibition forms the only restriction on the taxing power to be found in the whole instrument. The framers of our national charter conceived that it was sufficient

to confer the power to raise supplies, in the mode by which revenue is most easily collected, but as they wisely thought there could not be importation without exportation, they would not give the power of taxing the exports. If the right to protect certain branches of industry is to be impliedly taken from the power to impose duties, your memorialists cannot conceive what can invalidate the plea for protection of all the other branches, by claiming a premium or bounty either on exportation or on production, for any article which may be grown or manufactured in our widely extended country.

There remains but one other view of the subject to which your memorialists would ask leave to call the earnest attention of the national legislature, and which if they did not press on the deep consideration of your body, they would conceive their duty but imperfectly executed. Your memorialists allude to the effect of high duties in placing the self interest of the citizen in opposition to his social obligations. To respect the laws is one of the highest of our moral engagements, but there are limits to legal obedience, as well as political attachment, which daily experience admonishes statesmen is but too easily passed. The attachment, in fact, which constitutes patriotism, is not a blind devotion, but an enlightened moral sentiment. It does not consist in a contracted and bigotted love for the soil on which our lot is cast, but in an intelligent and cultivated affection for the institutions which afford impartial protection to property as well as person, and for the laws which look to the rule of equality in the distribution of the burthens (pecuniary and personal) of the state. If in the delicate relation in which the citizen stands to his government, is found the source of his highest virtues and most disinterested exertions, so also in that relation will be discovered the origin of some of the greatest mistakes ever committed by statesmen—and none have been more conspicuous and remarkable than presuming to too great an extent on the undiminished strength of that affection which the citizen yields to his government, in the unbought homage of his voluntary respect and liberal confidence.

All history proves that the spirit of opposition to laws which have their origin in partial and narrow considerations—which depress one class of citizens whilst they elevate another, first begins in expressions of discontent and disapprobation merely, but the frequent repetition of the wrong produces at last the sense of alighted interests, and the allegiance of the citizen is from that moment held by a very frail and insecure tie. Obedience to law is then no longer voluntary, and veneration for compacts ceases to be a cherished and hallowed feeling. The general sense of injury gathers force in the progress of that legislation which is partial and deaf to the voice of remonstrance and entreaty. Laws incur the hazard, in such circumstances, of remaining a dead letter, from the odium attached to their execution; those who are appointed to the trusts of administration, may find it a harsh as well as painful duty to discharge under the popular exasperation. These topics not adverted to by your memorialists, and thus pressed on the attention of Congress, to inflame, to menace or to alarm. The cautions they furnish are among the striking lessons of history, and the familiar truths of daily experience. Your memorialists look with some apprehension to the growth of a spirit of disaffection that may come to regard the federal charter with alienated feelings, and in any, even the most remote sense, as the source of unequal burthens. They hope it may be long among the boasts of the parties to that compact, that affection for the instrument itself is so bound up in the sentiment of patriotism as to be inseparable from it. But your memorialists would be wanting in one of the highest of the obligations which their present office imposes on them, if they did not forward the legislature of the union against a too confident dependence on the unimpaired strength of that affection, whilst there continues to be neither pause nor rest to the spirit which has dictated our prohibitory and exclusive policy.

Biting Comparison.—Sir, said a coarse sailor looking man in a corner, "the musketoes we have in this country are not to be compared to those in the south. Damme, sir, they'll eat up a Yankee, as you would a radish without salt in Georgia. Talk about these little, sickly, calico-winged things—Why, sir, what would you think of a New-Orleans musquetoe? They fly about the room as large as a goose, and carry a brick-bat under their wings to sharpen their bill on damme!"

A celebrated wit made one of his happiest jokes when he heard that Bishop, who had been sent to Portsmouth, preparatory to transportation for life, had escaped—"Gad sir," said he, "he must have been an Arch-Bishop to do that, and yet his dislike to the Sec is quite unaccountable."

The facetious wag Talbot, meeting his friend Capt. Garth, soon after a second verdict of one shilling damages, in a *Crim. Con.* case in the common pleas, exclaimed, "What a lucky fellow you are Garth, to obtain a life interest in the best box of *Antley's Amphitheatre* on payment of one shilling only."

Irish Traveller.—The Germans sleep between two beds; and it is related, that an Irish traveller, upon finding a feather bed thus laid over him, took it into his head that the people slept in strata, one upon the other, and said to the attendant, "Will you be good enough to tell the gentleman or lady that is to lay over me to make haste, as I want to go to sleep."