

Edgefield Advertiser.

"We will cling to the Pillars of the Temple of our Liberties, and if it must fall, we will Perish amidst the Ruins."

VOLUME IX.

Edgefield Court House, S. C., February 7, 1844.

NO. 2.

EDGEFIELD ADVERTISER

W. F. DURISOE, PROPRIETOR.

NEW TERMS.

Two Dollars and Fifty Cents, per annum, if paid in advance—Three Dollars if not paid before the expiration of Six Months from the date of Subscription—and Four Dollars if not paid within twelve Months. Subscribers out of the State are required to pay in advance.

No subscription received for less than one year; and no paper discontinued until all arrears are paid, except at the option of the Publisher.

All subscriptions will be continued unless otherwise ordered before the expiration of the year.

Any person procuring five Subscribers and becoming responsible for the same, shall receive the sixth copy gratis.

Advertisements conspicuously inserted at 62½ cents per square, (12 lines, or less,) for the first insertion, and 43½ cents, for each continuance. Those published Monthly, or quarterly will be charged \$1 per square for each insertion. Advertisements not having the number of insertions marked on them, will be continued until ordered out, and charged accordingly.

All Job work done for persons living at a distance, must be paid for at the time the work is done, or the payment secured in the village.

All communications addressed to the Editor, post paid, will be promptly and strictly attended to.

Remarks of Mr. McDuffie.

IN SENATE, Jan. 19.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate then took up for consideration the report from the Committee on Finance, as follows:

January 9, 1844.—Mr. Evans from the Committee on Finance, reported the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the bill entitled "A bill to revise the act of the 21 March, 1833, usually called the compromise act, and to modify the existing duties upon foreign imports, in conformity with its provisions," is a bill "for raising revenue," within the meaning of the 7th section of the 1st article of the Constitution, and cannot therefore originate in the Senate; therefore,

Resolved, That it be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. McDuffie said, if one of the illustrious framers of the Constitution could have presented himself before us in the debate of yesterday, with what utter astonishment would he have found us construing a provision, which was made to protect the people of the United States from injustice and oppression, in such a manner as to make it a barrier against any effort to free the people from the most unjust and oppressive system that was ever imposed on them. The illustrious patriots who framed this instrument had seen so much of the abuse of the taxing power, that they endeavored to rescue their posterity from the evil. They therefore provided that all bills raising revenue should originate in the House, more directly representing the people of the United States. The people could not suppose that the framers of the Constitution would deal in mere idle words, and that they would insert a clause with no particular meaning. What rational construction could be given to the clause except that it was intended to prevent unjust and unnecessary taxation? It did not prevent the Senate from putting money into the Treasury, but from taking it out of the pockets of the people. Raising money was nothing; but the design was to prevent us from raising in such a manner as to take it from the pockets of the people. One of the gentlemen who had taken part in the debate had let out what was the true view of the question. The Senator from New Hampshire had shown beyond dispute that the Senate had passed bills affecting the revenue, and the Senator from Connecticut had said truly that they did not raise revenue by imposing taxes. Suppose we had some mode of raising revenue without a resort to impost; suppose we had some magic power of raising it—by stamping on the earth—we could raise in that or any way, except by imposing burdens on the people. In any other light the provision would appear frivolous and unmeaning, consisting merely in words. But let us look at the bill. Is that, in any form or shape, a bill to raise revenue? Is that its object or effect? It was absolutely and essentially a bill repealing duties, and nothing else; and yet a construction had been assumed here for the purpose of scouting it out of the Senate, and the people were to be told that we had no power to mitigate their burdens.

It was contended by the Senator from Maine, that duties must be collected under the bill if it passed into a law. If this was true, in any just sense, he would give up the question. How can it be said that a bill reducing duties from fifty to thirty per cent imposes duties? The gentleman says if you repeal the other twenty per cent you would impose duties; that is to say, if the bill fails to repeal a part of the duties, it imposes the whole. He could not comprehend this reasoning. Why, sir, an act repealing duties, because it does not repeal the whole, is an act imposing duties! He had never seen any thing like this, except the case of the sportsman, who, having lost twenty dollars on a horse-race, said: "he had lost forty dollars; for his own twenty was gone, and the twenty he expected to win. He did not

intend to go fully into this question, but he wished to vindicate the Constitution from this construction.

The Senator from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Buchanan,) had asked what effect a proposition would have to amend the bill by increasing taxes? Would it not, the Senator asked, render the bill one of such a character that the Senate could not originate it? The answer was plain. No amendment could become incorporated in the bill which would throw it out of the jurisdiction of the Senate. We could not add any thing to it that would have the effect to impose taxes and increase duties. He admitted that the amendment would be inconsistent with the powers of this body, and the Senate, he supposed, would therefore exclude it or vote it down. The other question, proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, (Mr. Huntington,) was not for him to answer. The puzzle is how the President would act when he had occasion to return such a bill to the House where it originated. The President had so many difficulties to contend with that he might be prepared to meet this. He must answer the question when the case occurs. But if we send to the other House a bill, and they amend it so as to alter its character, it does not receive its character of a tax bill here, though it originated here, but in the House that has the right to give it that character. The whole purport of this clause was to prevent the Senate from originating money bills—from imposing burdens on the people.

Mr. McDuffie here referred to the compromise act, which was offered in the Senate, and the decision upon which he regarded as the most solemn one ever made in this country—one which gave peace to the Union. Never was there a more heroic action than that of Mr. Clay on that occasion, and it was done, too, while the agents of the manufacturers were here denouncing him as a traitor. He had greatly regretted that that distinguished statesman had not been here again to interpose his great influence, and extend the olive branch of peace over the country, when this compromise was broken. He regretted that he was not here to vindicate it from the foul and faithless innovation that it received from the tariff of 1842. He was not here, and I regret (said Mr. McD.) to say that I have lately seen a letter from him in the newspapers, in which, after giving some general views which are in accordance with my own, he concludes by saying that this monster of 1842 was a very good measure in many respects; that it no doubt needed some amendment, but in what particulars he was not prepared to say, not having examined it with scrupulous exactness. Now, sir, I like the text of the letter, but not the commentary. I had hoped, sir, that this eminent and influential statesman would have used the power that he possesses to do justice to the South, and which every consideration of justice and good faith required that he should have done.

But there seems to be a desire, sir, on the part of the Senator from Maine, to strike from the statute book every vestige of that compromise. The tariff of 1842 was no doubt before the committee over which he, with so much distinction, presides, and he probably had an important and influential agency in passing it. That act, therefore, no doubt, occupied a distinguished place in the regard of the gentleman. He occupied towards it a parental relation, which always excited the strongest sympathies of the human heart. This accounts for his partiality to it, and he could not expect him to give up the bawling; for the intensity of parental affection was often increased by the very deformities which excited the horror of every one else. He would take off the veil and expose its defects. What was this bill of 1842? It was a mongrel—one of those monsters, fabled by the genius of antiquity, with the head and body of man, and the tail of a fish. It was called a bill to provide revenue. Falsehood and deception were thus stamped upon its brow. A bill wholly prohibiting the importation of many classes of goods was called a bill to provide revenue. He had before him documents from well informed practical merchants and others, showing that the duties, in many instances, were one hundred and fifty per cent. On some descriptions of iron it was from seventy-five to one hundred and fifty per cent, and even two hundred per cent; totally prohibiting it. This was the duty imposed for revenue on an article of universal consumption.—Salt was another article used in equal quantities by the rich and the poor, and of the first necessity for all—what was the duty on this article? For every bushel, costing in Liverpool five or six cents, we pay a duty of eight cents. [Mr. Benton here said it was now ten cents.] And this, sir, is a revenue law—a duty of two hundred per cent on salt. These are revenue duties—duties imposed for the purpose of raising a revenue for the General Government.

Having adverted to the prominent features of the bill, it was proper that he should submit some considerations in regard to the extent and character of its principles. A question of its constitutionality, as well as of its expediency, addressed itself to every mind. What power have you to pass such a law? We profess to act under that clause of the Constitution which authorizes Congress to raise revenue for the support of the Government?—He was satisfied it could be drawn so distinctly as to satisfy every mind. He held that the power of Congress was limited by the Constitution, and that our duty was this: when we voted a revenue duty, that

it must be the lowest rate of duty, ad valorem, which would yield the necessary amount of taxation. Every Senator knew that any duty, however small, operated to some extent as a prohibition. Twenty per cent on Cotton Goods would not yield quite as much revenue as any higher rate of duty. If that rate of duty yields four millions, a duty of forty per cent, would yield no more; for it will exclude one half of the amount of goods usually imported, and impose the duty on the other half.

Both rates of duty would yield the same amount of revenue. Many of those articles paid a higher rate of duty than forty per cent. On calicoes, the duty was forty, seventy, eighty, a hundred, and a hundred and twenty, and a hundred and eighty per cent. This shows very clearly the true character of this law; Calico cloths, which were worn by all the poorer classes of the whites, and even by every negro slave—for every planter gave his slaves at least one calico gown to wear on Sundays—paid such an amount of duty as to prohibit them. Calicoes costing four cents a yard, and which could be sold here for five cents, was by a most ingenious device of the manufacturers, taken and deemed to have cost thirty cents, and a duty of thirty per cent, ad valorem, was imposed upon that, making the rate of duty one hundred and eighty per cent. So it was with many other articles. There was a class of prints, good enough to be used in every family, that cost ten cents, and under the rule adopted the rate of duty was ninety per cent. A large class of cotton goods, amounting to ten millions in value, was utterly excluded by this tariff. He also referred to the duties on window glass and other articles.

He came now to the question, was this a revenue tariff? If the Senate was satisfied that a duty of twenty per cent would yield more revenue than a higher rate of duty, then they must admit that this is not a tariff for revenue. It is then a bill framed, not in accordance with the Constitution and the principles of everlasting justice, but for the purpose of taking money out of the pockets of one portion of the people and putting it in the pockets of another portion.

But an idea was gotten up by which the friends of free trade had been, in some cases deceived—that, though duties must be imposed for the purpose of revenue alone, yet, that we could discriminate in favor of domestic manufacturers. This was saying one thing and doing another—looking one way and rowing another. It might be employed for giving the whole law a most unjust character. Every revenue law was considered as if it was created entirely for the benefit of manufacturers. We make, in my opinion, a vast concession to the manufacturing interest when we raise the whole amount of revenue from duties on imports alone. We do what no other country on the face of the globe does, when we raise our revenue entirely from that source. But still, gentlemen, gravely say, you must protect manufactures. Let me tell them what would be the true mode of discrimination. He would admit that discrimination was proper in one sense. There were two proper objects of discrimination. One was to get the proper amount of revenue from the lowest rate of duty; and the other was to avoid, so far as possible, the imposition of duties on articles universally used by the poorer classes. The application of these two rules would alone reverse the whole system. It would take the duty off from calicoes and put it on muslin, and the reverse. That was the true discrimination. Poverty ought, as far as possible, to be exempt from the burden of taxation; He would begin a... lowest rates, under the minimum, and come up, increasing the duties on the more costly articles.

There was one other discrimination that he would make, and it would be in favor of the imported article, and against the article manufactured at home. He would impose the highest rate of duty on the commodities manufactured in the United States. If he imposed a duty of thirty per cent on the foreign article, he would impose a higher rate on the article made at home. A duty of twenty per cent made on cotton fabrics to the amount of ten millions would impose a burden of forty per cent on the people of the United States. If we import twenty millions worth of cotton, on which the duty is four millions, we raise the price of the commodity to the same amount. A duty of twenty per cent would give the same revenue that a duty of forty per cent will give; but it will impose a burden, not of four millions, but of eight millions of the consumers. He went into a variety of illustrations to explain his views on this subject.

The duty paying imports were about forty millions. The amount of goods manufactured here was a hundred and sixty millions, one-half of which came in competition with foreign imports, and excluded them to the amount of eighty millions. The amount imported yielded to the Treasury about sixteen millions. What is the burden which the system imposes on the people, under the pretext of a revenue law, for raising sixteen millions? What is the amount of bounty paid to the manufacturers with a duty, he would not say of forty per cent, but of only twenty per cent, supposing the duties to be brought to the revenue standard? Twenty per cent, on eighty millions would give sixteen millions. The other eighty millions, totally prohibited might be taken at ten per cent, making eight millions more. Thus twenty-four millions would be put in the pockets of the manufacturers. Mr. McD. went minutely into explanations on this subject.

Mr. McD. said he had made out an estimate of the amount of Capital, &c. employed in manufactures. He would show the distressed condition of those manufacturers who came here begging for aid and protection. He would show the amount of the profits put in their pockets every year by this system. The manufacturers of cotton state their annual productions at forty-six millions.

The raw material I suppose to be one fourth of the value of the manufactured articles. I concede half a dollar a day to persons employed, and ten per cent on the wear and tear of machinery; and the interest on the dead capital kept there I put at ten millions. Let me give you a picture of their distress. The manufacturers of Massachusetts are, from the above data, now living on the small profit of thirty four per cent on the capital employed by them, on the average; but I have information that some of them are receiving forty per cent. profit, and laying aside a handsome contingent fund. The average profit on other manufactures does not average but twenty nine per cent. On rolled iron it is thirty-nine per cent on the capital invested. The Senator from Pennsylvania could correct him if wrong. They received at their furnaces two cents a pound.

Mr. McDuffie. That is distressing that they can't live on a profit of thirty-nine per cent on their capital.

The Salt made in Virginia cost to make it \$400,000. A profit of eighty per cent is made on the capital if the salt sells at twenty-five cents a bushel. He made these statements to show into whose pockets these enormous bounties went. The ground on which this system was originally supported was, that it would protect domestic industry from the competition of foreign industry. This was a fallacy. There could be no competition between the manufacturers here and those abroad. The competition was between the different branches of industry at home. What was it to our manufacturers that at Birmingham they made three hundred millions or three hundred thousand millions worth of goods? It was nothing till those goods were brought into the United States for consumption.

Another prominent argument in favor of the protective system was, that it helped us to maintain our national independence. If there was any truth in this argument, then it would strike a blow at once at our foreign commerce, and abolish our navy, which costs us nine millions of dollars a year. National independence! Independent of whom?

It is the language of depots—it is the language of those who could live by plunder—of those who war with the peace and welfare of the human kind. Now, sir, nothing under heaven so illustrates the principles of Christianity as this mutual dependence of nations. It was this general principle of harmony between nations, this bond to keep the peace, that the tariff system would break down. It was the only foundation on which the peace and happiness of the world could rest. He cannot be a Christian who seeks to destroy this bond of fellowship between nations.

These remarks were not speculative, nor were they made for any vain object of display. They referred to a state of things that was actually approaching. The system aimed at the destruction of the commerce which tends to bind us in relations of peace to come into conflict. Yet, while destroying three-fourths of our commerce with England and the rest of Europe, we are rearing up a navy at the expense of nine millions a year. We must build ships to employ workmen. A most pathetic appeal was lately made to us in behalf of workmen at the navy yard for employment; and the administration of the Government was denounced in the public prints because it would not keep persons employed without authority of law. In coming to this city in the cars from Baltimore, he heard this matter spoken of in such a manner as to lead one to suppose that the grievance was beyond endurance, and that the people concerned would come to this Capitol and drive us from our places here. This state of feeling naturally resulted from the spirit and genius of this system.

Why maintain these splendid fleets scouring the Pacific, the coast of Africa, &c. for the sake of a paltry commerce of three millions? If you must destroy foreign commerce, you must also destroy the navy. We must adopt the policy of the Chinese—they defend our shores. You want a navy to defend our commerce. Against whom? Pirates? England! for she is held up as the bugbear whenever you are asked for appropriations. What do you want this navy for? To defend commerce, you say. But the great enemy of commerce is not England, nor pirates, nor foreign nations, but here in this Capitol; and before God, he declared that he would rather undertake to defend commerce from all those enemies than from this Congress.

It was also argued that the system would benefit farmers. How? The circle within which the farmer could deal with the manufacturers beneficially was narrow. He would agree that for a short distance, it was a mutual monopoly. It did not extend far because of distance, and the difficulty of transportation prevented it.

Now, he would tell the gentlemen that the planters of the South have the same relation to Liverpool and Manchester—their natural markets—that the Eastern farmers bear to the manufacturer, in their immediate vicinity. Distance made no difference to the parties. Their natural markets, which God gave them, were in Liverpool and Manchester, and Leeds and Birmingham.

Another idea was, that the system made manufactures cheaper. The manufacturers cannot compete, they say, with the foreign manufacturer, and therefore they demand more than twenty per cent duty. This was conclusive, as far as we could judge from men's actions, not their professions that they could not sell articles cheaper than we can import them. If they could afford to manufacture any thing like as cheap as the foreign manufacturer, they would not need any higher duty than twenty per cent.

But it was said that by this system we would relieve ourselves of the ignominy of paying tribute to foreign nations. Yes, sir, a President of the United States held up this commerce with foreign nations as a degrading tribute. What could we expect when such principles were advocated by high authorities. The foreign manufacturer could sell to us cheaper by twenty per cent than any other. If we buy, we pay tribute, it is said. But the tribute is on the other side. Mr. Clay has said, in a recent letter, that it was good policy to buy as little of foreign nations as possible, and sell as much as possible to them. This is the advice gravely given to the most enlightened people on the face of the earth by one of its most distinguished men. What would a horse-jockey say if you tell him to give his best horse in exchange for the meanest he could get? We must give all our best products for the smallest quantity of foreign goods in exchange. What could we do with all the precious metals in the world if we bought nothing with them? We would be worse off than the Spaniards ever were, with all their gold and silver, exporting nothing. You must send money abroad, because you prohibit buying abroad; and foreign nations cannot buy of you unless you buy of them.

He alluded now to the operation of the system on the exporting States. What was its effect on our staples? Now, we would undertake to maintain that the value of those staples was diminished in the proportion that the duties were increased. The value of exports was the value you could receive in exchange for them. The amount received in exchange was not to be estimated in money alone. Mr. McDuffie went into some statements and calculations to illustrate this view. The consequence of this selling every thing and buying nothing was now severely felt by the people of the South. They found themselves, with a delightful soil, with a valuable staple, with delicate clothes half the world cheaper than they can be in any other way; with as industrious habits as any people on the face of the earth, not excepting those of Europe, they found themselves laboring under embarrassments and sinking into poverty. The importation of specie into the United States degrades its value here, and enhances it in Liverpool and Manchester, and renders our products lower there. Do we not receive a smaller amount for our cotton in this way? Are not our means of enjoying life curtailed by this difficulty of obtaining consumable commodities? The idea of selling every thing for gold and silver was the most gross delusion over heard of in the world.

The amount of imports from France, England, Germany, &c. excluded by this tariff cannot be less than forty millions, and who suffers from it? The planters sustain the special burden arising from this prohibition. What have we seen in Manchester lately? A market has been opened with India. It gave an instantaneous stimulus to the trade. Suppose we open our markets, would it not give instantaneous prosperity to the South? We were approaching a fearful crisis. In the Southern States this was a matter of life and death. This policy has created a hostile feeling against the South—their peace, happiness, and very existence—on the part of Great Britain. It had cut off the trade between this trade and Great Britain to such an extent as to destroy every friendly feeling that springs from commercial reciprocity; and the feeling of England had allied itself with Eastern abolitionism against the South.

He contended that the producing States were in a state of colonial vassalage to the manufacturing States. A large per centage was taken from our pockets and put into those of the manufacturers. Suppose we were colonial dependencies of England, what would be our situation? England might compel us to trade with her alone; but that would be the best market in the world for us, and England could give us our commodities cheaper than any other nation could do. But we were now compelled to trade with our mother, or rather mother country, on the most disadvantageous terms. We were compelled to buy of New England and sell to her—the worst market we could have.

He said that this was the only nation in the world that derived its whole revenue from imports, England had excises, and income tax, &c., and if he remembered rightly the amount she derived from customs was only one-tenth of the whole. Rather than that this policy should continue, he would see every blade of cotton nipped in the bud. Suppose he were to introduce a bill to raise the revenue of the United States by an excise duty of equal amount to the import duty. Two hundred and forty millions of cotton manufactures would be the subject of taxation. It would yield, with a tax of two per cent, a revenue of twenty-four millions of dollars. We have been paying a duty of forty per cent on our imported goods, and they could not complain if we had this excise duty on their products. They say it falls on the consumer only. This would be equal to a duty only of thirty per cent, on an importation of eighty millions.

Suppose we quit making cotton? We cannot make it at these prices. We cannot make it to rot on our hands. What shall we do? Suppose we manufacture? Suppose we, who are only receiving twelve and a half cents a day for the labor of our slaves—and our Northern fellow-citizens having made slaves of us all—suppose we abandon our land, make no cotton, and confer on the manufacturers of the United States the inestimable blessings of having to pay thirty cents a pound for cotton, instead of three cents; suppose we become your rivals in manufacturing? We can have steam, water power, and every advantage. If we can make half a dollar a day on our operatives, and twenty or thirty per cent on their productions, we would be doing well. The Southern negro, acclimated as he is, is much more efficient than the Mexican, and ten times more so than the East Indian. Slave labor, notwithstanding all the European economists tell us, who know nothing about it, is the cheapest labor in the world. Suppose, then, we go to manufacturing and undersell you, making no more goods than we can use—what would be the result? You of the North cannot bear a competition even with the free labor of England, much less of slave labor; and a Senator from Massachusetts had declared here that southern industry should never be brought into competition with the free labor of the North. What would you do? Would you attempt to impose a discriminating duty of forty per cent between the produce of the two species of labor? If that were attempted, would not the South, patient as she had been, rise up against it?

Sir, I can conscientiously say, that during the twenty-four years that I have been connected with this Government, I have contemplated all with painful feelings. I have known it only by its exactions or oppressions. I have since 1829, felt no interest in the Government beyond that of my connexion with the State in which I live.

He never should think of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky without the highest admiration. When the compromise was adopted he was disposed to say, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace."

I then retired, said Mr. McD., in the hope that I could spend my days in peace, disgusted with every thing else I had seen and heard here. And I can tell gentlemen now, that in consenting to come here again, I was influenced by the hope that I might have some agency, however small, in effecting another adjustment of this question. If that hope failed him, he should shake off the dust of his feet, and leave this place forever.

He warned the manufacturing States that it would be for their interest to abandon this fatal policy; for it would be fatal to them. The condition of things would soon change. The great West would combine with the South against this monster of injustice—this god of Eastern idolatry; and it was only necessary to tear off the veil that concealed the monster in order to expose its deformity to the people of the United States. He had attempted to do this. The result he left to God.

Mr. Calhoun's Address.

From the Charleston Mercury.

ROOM OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE, January 3, 1844.

To the Editors of the Charleston Mercury.—We enclose to you for publication a letter to us and an address from the Hon. J. C. Calhoun to his friends and supporters, giving his reasons for withholding his name as a Candidate for the Presidency, from the Convention which is to assemble in Baltimore on the 4th Monday in May next.

In placing this document in your hands for publication, it is proper to state, that although transmitted to this Committee, to be through them submitted to the public, the absence of many of its members prevented the assembling of a Quorum until this day, when its publication was directed in accordance with the wishes of Mr. Calhoun.

FORT HILL, Dec. 21, 1843.

Gentlemen:—I herewith enclose you, as the organ of those who have nominated me for the Presidency in this State, subject to a Convention fairly constituted, an Address to my political friends and supporters, assigning my reasons for not permitting my name to go before the proposed Convention to be held in Baltimore in May next. I transmit it to you, because I deem it respectful and proper to make it known to those to whom it is addressed, through you, and in order to afford you an opportunity to take such measures in relation to it, as you may deem proper, if indeed, you should deem any necessary. All I have to request is, that its publication should not be unnecessarily delayed.

With great respect, I am, &c. &c.

(Signed) J. C. CALHOUN.

Hon. Jacob Bond L'O' and other members of the Committee.

THE ADDRESS OF MR. CALHOUN TO HIS POLITICAL FRIENDS AND SUPPORTERS.

I have left it to you, my friends and supporters, through whose favorable estimate of my qualifications, my name has been presented to the people of the United States for the office of Chief Magistrate, to conduct the canvass on such principles, and in such manner, as you may think best. But, in so doing, I did not waive my right to determine, on my individual responsibility, what course my duty might compel me to pursue ultimately, nor have I been an inattentive observer of the canvass and the course you have taken.

It affords me pleasure to be enabled to say, that on all leading questions, growing out of the canvass, I heartily concurred with you, in the grounds you took, and especially in those relating to the mode in which the Delegates to the proposed Convention to be held in Baltimore, should be appointed, and how they should vote.—You have, in my opinion, conclusively shown, that they should be appointed by Districts and vote per capita; but your reasons, as conclusive as they are, have proved in vain. Already New York and some other States have appointed Delegates, en masse, by State Conventions, and one State (Virginia) has resolved that the votes of her Delegates should be given by the majority, and be counted per capita. Their course would necessarily overrule that which you have so ably supported, should you go into Convention; and would leave you no alternative, but to yield yours and adopt theirs, however much you may be opposed to it on principle; or to meet them on the most unequal terms, with divided against united and concentrated forces.

The question then is, what course, under such circumstances, should be adopted? And that question, you will be compelled speedily to decide. The new approach of the time for meeting of the proposed Convention will not admit of much longer delay. But as your course may depend in some degree on that which I have decided to take, I deem it due to the relation subsisting between us, to make mine known to you without further delay.

I, then, survey the most careful and deliberate survey of the whole ground, have decided, that I cannot permit my name to go before the proposed Convention, constituted as it must now be, consistently with the principles, which have ever guided my public conduct. My objections are insuperable. As it must be constituted, it is repugnant to all the principles, on which, in my opinion, such a Convention should be formed. What those principles are, I shall now proceed briefly to state. I hold, then, with you, that the Conven-