

say that such a tax imposes unequal burdens upon the inhabitants of the South, where woollens, from the nature of the climate, cannot, to a great extent, become a necessary of life, but rather a luxury; while, from the rigid coldness of ours, all, from infancy to old age, have to be clothed with it most parts of the year. Now I have no doubt that, of the duties collected on this article, four dollars per man are paid by those North of this, to one dollar by those of the South, if it were levied and collected like direct taxes according to the rule of the Constitution; and yet this tax upon woollens is the one relied upon by the Senator from South Carolina to make out his case of unequal burdens.

This very duty was the great cause of excitement at the South, and the very hotbed that occasioned their most absurd doctrine of nullification. Sir, it would not have been much more absurd for them to have nullified a law which should impose a duty on warmings, an article never seen at the South, because, like woollens, there is no necessity for them; but which, from our cold and rigorous climate, can be found in every cottage and farm house in New England.

Sir, I have endeavored to show why the people of the North do not complain that duties are laid on articles which they do not raise—such as sugar—and also that there is no good reason for complaint from the South for other duties, which they regard as unequal and oppressive. And I have done this for the purpose of removing impressions and opinions of Southern friends, which I believe to be incorrect, and not to advocate exorbitant rates of duties upon any imports. I am not in favor of such, and do not mean to contend for them. My purpose, in what I have said on the subject of the rates of duties, has been to answer the inquiries so repeatedly pressed by the Senator from South Carolina, and to show that the South would have no particular reason to complain, if the rates of duties should not be reduced, as I expected they will be.

And I now desire to say a few words on the subject embraced in the resolutions, concerning the manner of raising the amount of revenue necessary to an economical administration of the Government.—It appears plain to me, from all that has been said on the subject of reductions, that the amount for all purposes must be twenty-six millions, including what is proper to be paid toward the existing debt. The resolutions propose that, in raising this sum, the provisions of the compromise act shall be generally adhered to. To this general rule, as explained by the mover of the resolutions, there are to be such exceptions as may appear to be just: as, for instance, if any particular branch of industry should be in manifest danger of very great injury, or of absolute destruction by the application of the general rule, then good policy and justice might require that it should be treated as an exception from it. This was understood when the law was passed.

This law plainly declares that a sufficient amount of revenue shall be raised by duties on imports, for an economical administration of the Government. It neither refers to, nor relies upon, any other means than duties for that object. But I have known no law to be more misapprehended than this has been, nor one in which public opinion appears to be so much divided.

This has resulted, no doubt, from the various conflicting opinions expressed in regard to it at the time of its passage, and in some instances since, from a determination to misrepresent and condemn it. But I am bound to believe that a portion of the men of this last class, if correctly informed of its character and of its capacities to carry out the objects intended, would cease to condemn it. The objects of this law can be best understood by looking at its provisions in connection with the state of the Treasury at the time of its passage. This will show its true spirit and intent. At that time it was estimated that the wants of the Government would not exceed fifteen millions of dollars annually. The debt was paid, and the ordinary expenses had not exceeded thirteen millions a year the previous eight years. Every plan presented at that session of Congress proposed to reduce the rates of duties, so that the revenue should not exceed the wants of the Government, and with more or less professed regard to the incidental encouragement of American labor. The free-trade, or what was regarded as the Southern, doctrine was, that duties should be levied on all articles alike, whether coming in competition with products of our own or not; and at a rate no higher than was sufficient to raise the requisite sum, which was then estimated at twelve to thirteen per cent.

They contended for this, and it was at that time justly called a "horizontal tariff"; and I perceive by some memorials that the act which passed at that session has the same term applied to it—whether justly or not, a further examination will show. The law referred to, instead of providing that the duties should be levied on all articles alike, declared that many upon which duties had before been laid, especially such articles as did not interfere with, but which were necessary to, our own productions, should afterwards be admitted free, and that where any reduction of the rates should be necessary, in order to diminish the amount of revenue, such reduction should be gradual, and reaching through a period of nine or ten years; should eventually come to a rate (20 per cent.) at which a sufficient amount of revenue could be raised, on that class of articles, for an economical administration of the Government.

It is therefore manifest that the law contemplated a discrimination between the articles which come in competition with those produced by American labor and those which did not, to the full extent of collecting the entire revenue by duties levied on the first, and permitting the last to be admitted entirely free. This is the very intent and spirit of the law, when viewed with reference to the state of the public Treasury at the time the law was framed. It is true, times have since changed, un-

expectedly and unfavorably changed, in reference to the ability of the country to consume and pay for dutiable imports, as well as to the increased expenditures, and consequent necessities for increased revenues. This change, which is often adverted to by the advocates of free trade as if it were desired by the friends of American labor, because it creates a necessity for higher duties than was expected, is not, in fact, favorable to any kind of productive labor in this country, to my knowledge. It weighs down the prosperity of all, it destroys confidence, and, with it, the value of all kinds of property.

Neither does it furnish an opportunity to carry out peculiar doctrines of discrimination; in levying duties, between imports which do, and those which do not compete with our labor. So far as the principle of protection is supposed to consist in discriminating duties, the necessity for an increase of duties has operated against the development of that peculiar feature of the law.—But, if the capacity of the country to consume imports had continued as it was expected, and if the necessities of the Government had not become greater than when the law was passed, we should have had a discrimination between these two classes of imports equalling the entire duty, or twenty per cent.; but as it now stands, no such distinction between the two kinds of imports can be expected.

The free articles, or most of them, are already raised to that rate; and to enjoy the discrimination of twenty per cent. contemplated in the bill, the duties on the articles intended to be protected could not be reduced much below what they are seen to have been during the late administration, viz: a rate of duty of at least forty per cent. A high rate I have no wish to see continued, especially as we have the most convincing proof that so high duties are evaded in almost all cases; and we have reason to believe that, from their being so high, they occasion many of those numerous frauds which have driven almost all honest American merchants from the business of importing, as well as defeated both revenue and protection. This leaves every American interest to become a victim either to the cupidty of the foreigner who imports, or to the necessities of the foreign producer abroad. At any rate, sir, I prefer that certainty which is secured by the provisions of that law, of collecting whatever rate of duty may be levied, by having the basis of it under the control of our officers and our laws, through a home valuation, to any mere nominal rate of duties, however high. And there is abundant evidence before the country that all rates are but nominal, so long as you permit the foreigner to fix the basis by his invoices, although you should require them to be skinged over with oaths.

I have been induced to say this much of the provisions of the compromise act, because it has often been asserted that it rendered the principle of protection. But we have seen that, when taken in connection with the wants of the Treasury, as estimated at the time of its passage, and with the prosperous condition of the country, affecting its capacity to consume imports, it contained all the security for the encouragement of American labor which the condition of the Treasury and other controlling circumstances would permit.

It provided for such rates of duties as would produce a sufficient revenue, according to the estimate then made, for an economical administration of the Government, and provided that those duties should be levied upon such articles as interfered with similar productions of ours in our own market, leaving those articles which did not so interfere either to pay or not to pay duties, according to our circumstances, and to be resorted to from time to time as more necessities in the scales, upon any casual deficiency in the revenue.

It is also provided that these rates of duties, or such as should be necessary to raise a sufficient revenue for the economical administration of the Government, should be levied upon imports according to their value in this country, under such regulations as should thereafter be prescribed by law, and that these duties should be paid in cash. I do not pretend to say that in this adjustment nothing was conceded on the part of the uniform and consistent friends of American labor. Very much was conceded, with the very best motives, in my opinion, and with the best effect. This adjustment restored harmony to the people of this nation. There was no just cause, it is true, for the estrangement which existed; but it had taken place, and it was wise to restore good feelings. So I thought at the time; and, although every dollar of property of mine in the world, depended on the capacity of this law to give an adequate encouragement to our productions, I was in favor of it when it passed, and have defended it ever since; and I am now for carrying its provisions into effect, according to its true interpretation, as given by the honorable mover of those resolutions. When I say this, I do not deny that very different opinions are and have been, all along, entertained by many of my constituents, and by men of intelligence, whose views are entitled to respect. They have great apprehensions about its practical effects; and some among them, and many in other parts of New England, consider that by this law the principle of protection to American labor is surrendered.

They seem to think that the principle of protection consists in the mode of laying duties; that a horizontal tariff, as they call it, is an abandonment of protection. All this must depend upon other circumstances than the manner of levying the duties.—They will not pretend that a uniform rate of duty on all articles of fifty or a hundred per cent., will not give an adequate protection to such as are produced in our country. Besides, as I have already shown, this law, when it was framed and passed, did not contemplate placing the same duties on all articles alike; but it was expected they would be placed, as it is now insisted they should be, upon such foreign articles as come in competition with our own.

At that time, those who contended that it

abandoned this principle of protection, said it was because it did not provide for discrimination among what is called protected articles—asserting that a given rate of duty might protect one interest, as sugar for instance, while a higher one might be necessary for iron, &c.

This sentiment has since changed, and now a strong preference is manifested for specific duties. There may be a great deal said in favor of all these propositions; but, in my humble judgment, there is no principle involved in any of them: they all relate to a mere matter of expediency, as to the most judicious mode of levying duties; and that expediency depends upon too many considerations to require an examination of them all. Nobody disputes the right of this Government to lay duties for revenue, and incidentally to encourage our own industry. I do not believe it good policy to discriminate among what are called protected articles, unless it shall be as an exception to a general rule, and one made in favor of some branch of industry which is in its infancy, or else entitled to be an exception from some such cause; and this is the intention of the law.

But it opposes discrimination in favor of any interest when at maturity. It has given nine long years for all to reach that maturity, and then relies with confidence on the capacity of each to live in common with their fellows. This has the effect to bring all classes of American producers into one common family, with agriculture at the head; and agriculture will take that rank, notwithstanding the attempts of the honorable Senator from New Hampshire to seduce it from its American connexions. It will keep with them, and take its chance with the rest; and all will, I trust, find adequate encouragement.

According to my apprehension, there is as little propriety in insisting that the principle of protection is to be found in specific duties, as there is in seeking to make distinctions in the various kinds of industry by discriminations in the duties to be laid. It is, but another form of levying duties for revenue; and the only advantage it has over a general ad valorem rate is, that it means anything—it may be exercised arbitrarily or capriciously for any, or for all purposes. In some cases, it is the most convenient form of levying duties, and could sometimes be resorted to for its convenience; it has no other merits over the other modes.

From every examination I have given this subject of the compromise act, I cannot discover that it abandons any principle. It provides a mode for laying duties on imports, one which, in the circumstances under which it was passed, was a highly expedient one. It gives all that incidental encouragement to home labor, which could well be given in exercising the revenue power.

But the principle of protection does not depend upon any law of Congress; it has its abiding place in the Constitution, and cannot be taken out but by amendment.—Nay, it lies even deeper, and at the very foundation upon which that society is built, which framed this Constitution.

To afford protection to the labor of this country is not a matter of choice, even with the masses; it is a matter of necessity.—They must, and therefore will have it. It is not like an ordinary regulation of property; it is a question that involves the means of personal subsistence, one in which those have the greatest interest who have most children. Labor has generally been protected by the exercise of the revenue power in the form of duties on imports. Should the same mode fail to protect it hereafter, in consequence of the legislation or the necessities of foreign countries, there is a more ample power given to the Government in its control over commerce. That can be exercised for the same object, either by controlling or prohibitory legislation.

In exercising the revenue power, under the provisions of existing laws, it is quite certain we shall be obliged to stop the reductions before they reach the contemplated point of 20 per cent. Upon the present dutiable articles not more than fourteen or fifteen millions would be raised; but with a home valuation, and from twenty-five to thirty per cent., the amount would be raised in ordinary times, I have no doubt.

But for a year or two to come, I am confident, the estimate of the honorable Senator from Kentucky is too high for the exports of last year, and five-eighths of those exports were cotton, which was last year twenty per cent. higher than it is now.—This would make a difference of twelve or thirteen millions; and I confess I see nothing to justify a hope that prices of any of our great staples are soon to improve. The honorable Senator from New Hampshire said yesterday, that he professed to know about cotton; and spoke in derision of the quantity of East India cotton. But I look upon the recent accounts concerning this article as full of interest to us.

Making an aggregate (without a bale from us) of more than a year's consumption. A supply for such a period gives the holder such a command of the market as to leave no prospect to us of an early improvement in prices. We are certainly unwise to overlook this position in our affairs, as affecting our ability to import, and, therefore, to raise a permanent revenue. It will not be overlooked by the statesmen of the country, who have attained to this position in reference to us. If they appear to rely upon our dependence on them for a market, we certainly should not be unmindful of their exertions to be independent of us for their supplies. If they have determined on this so far as regards cotton, their whole history is a guaranty

that they will accomplish it; and we may soon expect to see a higher discriminating duty in favor of India cotton than now exists—about 1 of a cent per lb. Suppose it should be three cents, will not our friends of the South stand by us, and aid us to make some countervailing regulation, which may induce them to observe something like reciprocity in their trade with us?

But the safest course is to make such regulations for ourselves, as will make us more independent of all others. If our capabilities had been encouraged by steady legislation in favor of our industry, I have little doubt we should now be sending more pounds of manufactured cotton round the Cape of Good Hope, than the entire crop was when this legislation commenced. I think it likely we have in some years exported nearly as many already. And I suppose the consumption in this country now, is at least four times the quantity that was then raised.

Does not our rapid advance in the culture of this crop, by the extensive consumption of it in our manufactures, and by our export of it in a manufactured as well as a raw state, furnish to Senators more satisfactory proof of the favorable influences of that national policy which protects our industry, than the theories of free-trade and hard-money men? Can they rely upon the results of their theories as satisfactory, should we adopt their scheme? Does the present condition of the country, produced by a partial trial of their doctrine, speak at all in favor of continuing to practise them? The Senator from South Carolina often insists that if we would come to this free-trade and hard-money system, there would be such a reduction of the wages of labor that we could compete with any part of the world with our exports of manufactures! It has always appeared to me that these modern theorists mistake the character of our people. They are different from the laborers of Europe; for these are pressed by a pinching necessity to the utmost exertion, while here labor can only be stimulated by generous rewards to its highest capacity for production. And it is upon the development of the production of the country, that its capacity to consume depends.

The Senator from New Hampshire says, and says truly, that high duties produced larger importations. Duties high enough to encourage labor on your own productions increase them, and also the means to consume other articles; and therefore, under a protective and prosperous system, lower rates of duty will more certainly produce a sufficient revenue, than higher duties can do while we continue in our present crippled condition. Revise the law, therefore, give certainty to the collection of your duties, by adopting a proper valuation of imports, predicated upon their fair value in our own ports, for a year or two past, and, by a duty of 25 or 30 per cent., you will revive confidence and give new hopes to the country.

This course would put a smile on the now gloomy face of things in the space of sixty days. I say 25 or 30 per cent. with a home valuation of imports, will do this, because the certainty of collection will more than compensate for the reduction of the rates.

I am at a loss to account for the reason why it is insisted that such a rule of valuation is impracticable, or why it will not insure the certainty of collection as well as to have specific duties. So far as it is important that any duty should bear a due proportion to the value of the article taxed, it is far better than specific duties; and if there be a real desire to carry out the compromise act on the part of the Senator from South Carolina, I cannot account for his opposing this provision of that bill. He knows that the bill itself could not have passed without it; but, upon an incidental debate, upon the appointment of a clerk of the other day, he insisted that this part of the law was unconstitutional. It appears to me to be a singular objection for him to make against carrying into effect a provision of the act which he voted for himself, and one, too, without which the compromise act itself would not have passed.

[Here Mr. CALHOUN interposed, and said the Senator from Rhode Island was mistaken as to his voting for the amendment.]

Mr. SIMMONS resumed. I cannot be mistaken that the Senator's vote upon the amendment. He voted for it, and at the time undertook to stipulate as to the mode in which it should be carried into effect; and Mr. Smith, of Maryland, told him it would be the law, and not the Senator's speech, which would determine that matter.

[Mr. Calhoun interrupted again, and said he hoped the Senator did not intend to misrepresent him as to his vote on the amendment. He recollected that he voted against the amendment, but voted for the bill, notwithstanding the amendment had prevailed; and the remarks referred to were made when he gave his vote on the bill.—He was certain that the Senator had made a mistake, and hoped he would not persist in it.]

Mr. SIMMONS resumed. And I am quite certain that the Senator from South Carolina is mistaken, and therefore repeat that he voted for the amendment, and for the bill after the amendment was in. He voted for both, and said, when he voted for this home valuation, he did so because the bill would not pass without it.

[Mr. CALHOUN rose again, and protested that he did not vote for the home valuation, for he considered it a violation of the Constitution at the time. If the Senator from Rhode Island meant to persist in his statement, he must insist on his right to correct it by appealing to the Journals, asking the Secretary to turn to the Journals and read the votes.]

Mr. SIMMONS resumed. I have certainly no motive nor wish to state that the vote of the Senator was different from what it was. I am not apt to forget in such a matter; and as I really believe he is mistaken, I shall go on upon that supposition.

[The Secretary could not find the journal. Mr. C. found one, came in, and began to read the eyes and noses; finding his own name among the eyes, and in favor of the home valuation, he said he was mistaken.] Mr. S. resumed. I was not a little sur-

prised when the Senator declared that the section requiring that goods should be valued in this country, instead of Europe, was unconstitutional; but more so to find that he was willing to admit that he voted for the law with such a provision in it. And when I looked at the proceedings, and found that he voted for the amendment requiring the valuation of goods to be made in this country, I concluded to be surprised at nothing after this.

[Mr. CALHOUN, having obtained the debates of the session of 1833, again interposed and asked for an opportunity to read the speech he made on the amendment.]

Mr. S. declined yielding the floor, and said: Sir, I hope the honorable Senator will allow me to go on. I am willing to admit that his speech was a good one—that the reasons were conclusive against the amendment—all I ask is, that the Senate may remember the fact that he voted for it, after all he had said against it. As it is now known by whose votes this provision was inserted, I will endeavor to show that the valuation it requires is practicable. It is no doubt a subject of great labor to make a correct valuation of imports, and declare it in the law; but it is equally certain that it is the only mode by which you can prevent extensive frauds upon the revenue.

I hold in my hand a paper containing the various provisions fixing the duties on linens by the tariff of England. This is done by counting the threads in the warp. It may be seen to cover one side of this sheet of paper. It seems the English do not think it too much trouble to go into these details.—This is from the late revision of their tariff, and reducing the duties under their new doctrine of free trade, I suppose.

It provides a variety of rates. I will read their extremes, and show what their proposed reductions amount to. On the cheapest goods it reduces the rate per square yards from 5 to 4 cents, and on the highest goods from 38 to 36 cents on a square yard.

We are not without some experience in providing a legal valuation for goods. One of our earliest laws for the encouragement of the cotton manufacturer had inserted in it the value of plain cottons. The value was, at the time, the market value, twenty-five cents the square yard. It was called a minimum valuation, and in these respects differed from the valuation contemplated in the compromise, because it valued only such goods as cost that price and under, and imposed a higher duty on all which cost more than the declared value. But there can be no objection to declaring what is the actual value of an article, and specifying in a law, that it shall be so valued, and the general rates of duties levied upon it. No difficulty will be found in providing how and at what periods, such value shall be revised and corrected, if the market value shall have changed; until it is so altered, the duties will continue as when the value is ascertained and inserted in the law.

I believe that three-fourths of the imports in amount can be so valued with fairness and convenience. There can be no difficulty in taking the average of cotton for the last year; at New York, for instance, suppose it was 10 cents per pound, then say, in the bill, that cotton should be valued at ten cents per pound, and charged with duties upon that value. The duties would then be uniform, for this would be the value on which the duty would be assessed in all the ports of the country.

So with foreign coal; the value has been about eight for chaldron. We can certainly say, in the law, that foreign coal shall be valued at eight dollars the chaldron, (36 bushels,) and charged with duties accordingly. This, at 25 per cent., would give a duty of two dollars per chaldron, in all ports in the country. So we could say of pig iron, that it shall be valued at thirty dollars per ton, which, at the same rate of duty, would be seven and a half dollars—about ten cents per ton more than it has paid for the last two years. We can value sugar at what has brought the last year, say at 6 or 7 cents per pound; and at 25 per cent. it would give a duty of 1-1/2 to 1-3/4 cents per pound.

It may be said that this is the same as fixing specific duties; if so, it will not be objected to by those who like specific duties. As to those who prefer that duties should be levied according to value, they must be satisfied if we can get a fair market value, and there can be no difficulty in this, in almost all cases, at least three-fourths.

If any object to it, the presumption will be indeed very strong that those who do so object must wish to defraud the Government, and that they would adhere to the foreign valuation, because such fraud would be beyond the reach of detection. If the rule of valuation be a uniform one, it can make no difference, because, by raising the value, we shall be able to reduce the rate of duties. There is an advantage in this mode over that of assessing specific duties, because it will be better understood by those who pay duties, and designing men cannot deceive the people and produce discontent so easily as with specific duties. The country will be willing to pay such a rate of duty as, when levied on the value of imports, will furnish adequate revenue.

If you put a specific duty of five cents a gallon on molasses, a man in N. Hampshire, who designed to produce discontent with the duty, would take up a price current of molasses at Matanzas, and at a dull season it would be quoted at 5 to 8 cents in that market, or certainly as low as 5 cents at some place in the interior. They would tell the purchaser that he paid one hundred per cent. duty! and that, if it was valued at the wholesale price here, (20 cts. per gallon,) and twenty-five per centum assessed, the duty would be the same.

This mode carries with it the evidence of its own correctness. What is intended to be done will be known, and it can easily be perceived whether it is done precisely. I have heard no objection to the execution of this part of the law which has any soundness in it. If it be desired, it can be fairly carried in practice. The law abandons no principle of protection. It commences with giving substance and protec-

tion to industry in its infancy, asserts for it confidence and equality when at maturity, and gives a steady encouragement and preference, at all times, to the products of American labor, through the legitimate exercise of the revenue power, relying for absolute security, in the last resort, upon the exercise of the higher constitutional powers of the Government, in the control it possesses over the national commerce, should controlling or prohibitory legislation become necessary to protect the national industry or honor.

[Mr. Calhoun read his remarks at the time he voted for the amendment to the compromise bill providing for the home valuation, and said he voted for the amendment although he considered it impracticable and unconstitutional; but that it became necessary, in order to insure the passage of the bill, but never to be carried out.]

Mr. Simmons replied that, if the Senator was willing to avow such motives for legislation, he was willing he should enjoy all the honor the avowal might give him.

#### PROCEEDINGS OF THE WAYNESVILLE TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

Waynesville, Haywood Co., N. C., April 23, 1842.

At a meeting of a number of citizens of Waynesville and the surrounding neighborhood, for the purpose of organizing a Temperance Society, Rev. John Haynes, of the Baptist Church, was called to the chair, and Augustus Grahl appointed Secretary.

The object of the meeting having been explained by the chairman, and some remarks made on the importance of temperance, both in a spiritual, domestic, and political point of view, a draft of a Constitution was presented, which was ordered to be read by the Secretary; when it was considered, article by article, amended, and then adopted as a whole, and ordered to be signed by the Chairman and Secretary.

#### Constitution of Waynesville Teetotal Abstinence Society.

ARTICLE 1st. This Society shall be called the "Waynesville Teetotal Abstinence Society."

ART. 2d. This Society shall be auxiliary to the Washington Teetotal Abstinence Society of North Carolina.

ART. 3d. The officers of this Society shall be a President, two Vice Presidents, and a Recording Secretary, who shall be elected by the Society.

ART. 4th. The President, or in his absence either of the Vice Presidents present, shall preside over the deliberations of all meetings of the Society, and in case of the absence of both Vice Presidents, the Society present shall have power out of their own number to appoint a President pro tem.

ART. 5th. It shall be the duty of the Recording Secretary to keep a correct account of all the proceedings of this Society, in a book, to be read or referred to, as occasion may require.

ART. 6th. This Society shall meet at least twice a year, but if thought advisable a number not less than three members shall have power to call a meeting at such time and place as shall seem most convenient. No addition or amendment, however, of this Constitution, or the standing rules of the Society, shall be made at any such meeting, unless a majority of the whole number of the members of this Society shall be present, and concur in such addition or amendment.

ART. 7th. Eight members present shall constitute a quorum to transact business of the Society at any meeting, not in violation of the latter clause of the preceding article.

To which is added the following pledge of abstinence:

We, the undersigned, do pledge ourselves, that we will neither make, drink, sell, buy, or give intoxicating drinks to any person or persons (except in cases of disease, when prescribed by a temperate physician,) but to discountenance the use of the same by all suitable means.

JOHN HAYNES, Chairman.

Augustus Grahl, Rec. Sec.

After the reading and adoption of the amended Constitution on motion of Rev. D. White, of the M. E. C.,

Resolved, That the Chairman be requested to nominate some suitable person present to address this meeting on the cause of temperance, before the pledge be offered for subscription; whereupon Row J. C. Carson, of the Presbyterian church, was nominated and requested by the Chair to address the meeting.

After conclusion of the address, on motion of Rev. D. White—

Resolved, That the pledge be now presented for subscription.

On motion of W. Welsh, Esq.—

Resolved, That the ladies be invited to take the lead in subscribing the pledge.

Whereupon, 25 females and 36 males, total 61, persons presented their names to the Secretary for subscription.

After the signing of the pledge had been completed, on motion the Society went into election of officers, which resulted in the following selection:

Rev. John Haynes, President,

Rev. J. R. Sensesbaugh, Vice Pres'ts,

E. B. Horon,

Augustus Grahl, Rec. Sec.

On motion of A. T. Davidson, Esq.—

Resolved, That a number of three persons each of the male and female members of this Society be nominated to constitute a Vigilance Committee, with instructions to use their utmost influence to impress upon their friends and neighbors the necessity of becoming members of this Society. When A. T. Davidson, Thos. J. Dawson and David McCrackin, Esq., of the males, and Mrs. Elizabeth Davidson, Mrs. Maria Love and Mrs. Margaret Carson, of the females, were nominated and appointed said Committee.

On motion Resolved, That the Recording Secretary be authorized to receive subscriptions to the pledge at any time, and report the same to the next ensuing meeting.

On motion Resolved, That the members of the Vigilance Committee be furnished each with a copy of the pledge, and be author-