

**POLITICAL.**

FROM THE CHARLESTON MERCURY.

Mr. VERPLANCK's letter to Col. DEAY, in support of the constitutionality of the Tariff, occupies nearly three columns of the New York Post. From the high standing of the writer, and the formidable manner in which his essay was announced, we had expected at least some new argument, or some striking display of ingenuity. In this we have been completely disappointed. It is written, indeed, with great calmness and moderation, but it has neither novelty of view, or strength of reasoning, to recommend it; and we hazard but little in opining, as we do, that however Col. D. may be gratified by the personal regard and admiration of the essayist, his opinion will remain unshaken by his logic.

Mr. V. relies, as usual, upon the power "to regulate commerce" and the power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, and excises." Both of these positions have been so frequently refuted, that it is almost unnecessary to examine them again. The power "to regulate commerce" was intended for the benefit of commerce, and certainly neither conveys an authority to destroy it, nor a right to build up any other interest upon its ruins. The power to "lay taxes and duties" was exclusively given "to pay the debts and to provide for the common defence and general welfare of the U. States"—in other words for the purposes of revenue, and the support of the government, and for none other. These are the plain dictates of common sense, and the manifest intention of the framers of the constitution. Mr. V. contends, however, that the powers "to regulate commerce," and "to lay taxes and duties" may not only be properly used without any reference to the interest of commerce, on the objects of revenue, but that they may be totally merged in the exercise of another and very different power, nowhere granted in the Constitution, and for the purpose of promoting interests which were never committed to their care. His attempt to sustain this monstrous doctrine is the very essence of sophistry. He admits—he is obliged to admit—that "Congress has no power over manufactures." One would think that here was an end of the controversy: that having conceded that, he had given up every thing; and that, as a republican statesman, he certainly could not claim for Congress a constitutional right to legislate for the advancement of objects over which he unequivocally admits that they have no power. But no: although he makes this precious confession, it is only to show his ingenuity in proving that they can do indirectly what they cannot do directly. And how does he accomplish this? Why by this extraordinary argument: that Congress having power "to regulate commerce," have the whole power of action upon that subject; and that although they have no power over manufactures, yet, they may use their power over commerce to promote them; "the end or motive of any regulations they may make, being matter of discretion merely." So the power to regulate commerce, confers discretionary power, not only to cripple or destroy it, but to exercise another power not granted, and essentially different from it in every point of view. If this doctrine be correct, of what use is the constitution, or who will say that we do not live under unlimited government? The Constitution confers upon Congress certain well defined, enumerated powers: and it also invests it with authority to pass such laws "as may be necessary and proper" to carry those powers into execution. The first are what are usually denominated primary powers; the other, incidental. Thus Congress has power "to regulate commerce," and consequently to pass such laws as may be bona fide proper for commercial regulation. So again it has power "to lay taxes and duties, to pay the debts of the United States; and, of course, to lay them to such an amount as may be necessary for the ordinary expenses of government. This is the true power, and should be the regular action of our government.

But if Mr. Verplanck's notions be correct, the whole doctrine of primary and incidental powers is totally subverted, and instead of laws being passed only as incidental to the execution of primary powers, primary powers may themselves be used for the execution of other and unknown powers, not granted by the charter. And the authority upon which Mr. V. relies is about as far-fetched and inapplicable as his doctrine itself is revolting and extravagant. He has been amusing himself, it seems, during the recess of Congress, "with a discursive study of the history of the revolution;" and he has discovered, from the early diplomatic correspondence of the United States, that in the discussions respecting the right of the British Parliament to tax the Colonies; a distinction, was generally drawn between the right "to lay taxes for revenue," and to impose duties for the "regulation of trade; that the first was denounced as "tyrannical and unconstitutional," whilst the other was only complained of "as an unequal

and oppressive exercise of legitimate authority," that these phrases had acquired a fixed and definite meaning, and were well understood by the politicians of the day; and that, consequently, when the framers of the Constitution gave to Congress the power to regulate commerce, "the imposition of duties, for the restriction of foreign trade and the fostering of other interests, was included." Now all this may really appear to Mr. V. to be new light upon the subject, and we certainly would not deprive him either of the merit or the pleasure of what he evidently considers a very great discovery. The plain answer to this diplomatic argument, however, is simply this: that even admitting every thing he has quoted from the revolutionary correspondence, it does not follow that the power to regulate commerce, given by the Constitution, confers a power to establish manufactures. And why? Why for the very unanswerable reason, that the Federal Convention drew a very broad and marked distinction between them, and whilst they gave one, positively refused the other. Why didn't Mr. V. refer us to the Constitution, or to the proceedings of the Federal Convention, instead of the "early diplomatic correspondence?" He would there have seen that the power to protect manufactures was proposed, and rejected; and perhaps he would have passed before he so broadly asserted the right of Congress to do indirectly, what it is so positively inhibited from doing directly. But the most extraordinary part of Mr. Verplanck's letter is, that whilst he so boldly claims this unlimited power for the Federal Government, he considers himself a Free Trade man, and an opponent of the Tariff. But what kind of an opponent? Let us hear him on this subject. He says, for instance, "I have been, for several years, the steady opponent of all attempts to increase the duties upon importations with a view of fostering domestic manufactures;" and yet he now asserts the constitutional right of Congress to extend them even to absolute prohibition. Again, "I regarded and still regard every step to prohibition as a hazardous interference with the natural direction of labor and enterprise, producing possible benefit to some, to the equal or greater injury of others"—but still he asserts the constitutional right of Congress to legislate unequally, for the benefit of the North, to the equal or greater injury of the South. Again: "I dreaded and still dread, every fresh measure of restriction as affording fresh cause of irritation, and because several of those States which must bear much of the burden, have no reasonable prospect of compensation"—but still it is perfectly constitutional that those several States should bear the burden, and without any prospect of ultimate advantage, because it is for the "general welfare" of certain other States, or because Mr. Verplanck has been reading the history of the revolution. Again he says, and he says this too after proclaiming his steady opposition to the Tariff, "I could never agree with those with whom I acted, in denouncing the Tariff as not only impolitic and unequal, but as unconstitutional.

"The question of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the protecting system appeared to me to have no connection with the broader question of the strict or liberal construction of the Constitution—I look upon it as a pure question of the meaning of words." Now what are the questions involved in this controversy? They are, whether Congress has a right to exercise undelegated power—to commit gross and oppressive violations of the Constitution; to pervert powers given for certain purposes to the accomplishment of other purposes with which it is expressly forbidden to interfere; to pervert a compact entered into by equal and sovereign States, for the equal and common benefit of all, into an instrument for effecting the enrichment of some at the expense and to the irremediable injury, of others; and in one word, whether our Government shall be confederate or consolidated, limited or unlimited, equal or impartial or arbitrary, and oppressive. And these grave questions, involving as they do the rights of the States, and the very existence of the union, "have no connection with a strict or liberal construction of the constitution!" Oh no, says Mr. V., "I look upon it as a pure question of the meaning of words." And how does he decide it, upon this new principle of construction? Why he finds in a dictionary, that the word "regulate" means "to govern the action of any thing by fixed rules;" and upon the strength of this high authority he argues most conclusively that the right "to regulate commerce" includes all power over it, even the power "to designate the places and the persons with whom it may be carried on, and the commodities on which it may be employed." Now all this may be very correct according to the dictionary, but what says the Constitution? That instrument says, "Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and between the several States." This is all. It gives no other. Suppose then that Congress should determine that trade should be carried on only with certain designated persons, or only between certain parts of the U. States, would not

this be clearly unconstitutional? Common sense would say yes; but Mr. Verplanck would say No, because "to regulate," means "to govern;" and "to govern" means any and every thing you please. But enough. If Mr. V. imagines that the people of the South do not understand their rights, or that they will allow them to be decided by a dictionary or a grammar, he is most egregiously mistaken. They look to the Constitution, and to that only, and they will hold their brethren to the strict letter of the compact.

A little more than a year ago it was announced, by the Tariff Party, with a flourish of trumpets, that a merchant at Salem had established, beyond dispute, the important fact that we could ship domestic cotton fabrics to the East Indies and there undersell the British. To meet this reported fact, we published a communication from a merchant in Philadelphia, doubting this statement, and for the simple reason that he had but recently imported, into Philadelphia, East India cotton fabrics of a coarse texture, that he had sold, for exportation, to a profit; which had the other statement been correct, would have presented the anomaly of two shipments of the same commodity, each being sent to the place of production of the other, and sold to a profit. The mystery has at length been cleared up. It is true that the Salem merchant shipped domestic cottons to Manila, which, arriving there upon a scanty market, were sold at a profit of ten to twenty per centum. But it is also true, that other shipments, made since, to the same place, from Salem, by other merchants, drawn into the trade by the accidental success of the first experiment, have resulted in a loss of twenty to forty per centum. But this is not all. The same merchant who made the lucky hit at Manila, has, by his enterprise, made another discovery, by which he is at this moment profiting. He has found that he can purchase, in England, at 6cts. per yard, the precise sort of cotton goods which he would have to pay for, here, 8 to 8½ cents, and has recently made a shipment from that country, either to the East Indies, or to the Pacific Ocean. This fact we have from a source which we believe is to be relied on.

A writer in the Richmond Enquirer, who is opposed to nullification, suggests the following means of redress against the oppressions of the Tariff:

1. Appeal to public opinion.
2. Appeal to our sister States for co-operation.
3. Appeal to the Congress of the United States, by the Memorial of the Free Trade Convention, supported by resolutions of the Legislatures of all the Anti-Tariff States.
4. If these fail, the Legislatures of the Southern States may recommend a convention of the States. If they fail in that, they may
5. "Try a Convention among themselves, for the sole purpose of devising the best means of appealing to their sister States, and quietly and peaceably obtaining amendments to the Constitution.
6. "It is only when all other peaceable expedients fail, when this system of abuse, in which the South never can argue is likely to be fastened permanently upon our necks, that we are to decide whether we are to shake hands with our brethren, and part with them; or, whether we are to remain 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.' Let the manufacturers and politicians of the East, think of these things—for a *passer sub muniton* to such a system, is not to be thought of by an oppressed people."

From the New York Evening Post. A table showing the amount of taxes paid on articles of daily consumption.

Articles	Duty
Sugar, brown	3 cents per lb.
powdered	4 do
loaf	12 do
Tea, black	24 do
green	58 do
Coffee	3 do
Salt	15 do per 56 lbs.
Molasses	10 do per gallon
Mustard	12 do per lb.
Pepper, Black	2 do do
cayenne	15 do do
Currants	3 do do
Raisins	4 do do
Oil	15 do do
Coal	52 16 per chald.
Rum Gin & Brandy	53 to 60 cts. per gal
Hardware, an average	
of 334 per cent or 1/3	
of the cost and upwards	
at the place whence imported,	being 1/4 of the cost
Earthenware, 20 per cent	1-6 cost here
Glass, about 50 do	being 1/3 cost here
Woolens, cloths, coarse,	
for negroes in the Southern States, fifty inches wide	51 cts. per yd.
Cloths worn by farmers, mechanics, &c. 50 inches wide	70 cts do
Flannels & Baizes 27 do	16 1/2 do
Blankets, 35 per cent ad-valorem on the quantity	

Do do 11 quarters	76 do the pair
Do do 12 do	98 do do
Do do 13 do	103 do do
Bombazines, 35 per ct. ad valorem	2 to 3 cts. per yd.
Bombazines, 33 1/2 do	0 to 18 do
Stockings, woolen and worsted	6 to 9 do the pr.
Do cotton, 25 per cent 4 to 6 do	do do
Cottons, average 75 per ct. ad valorem	
Do 27 inches wide	6 1/2 cent the yard
Do 30 do	8 1/2 cent the yard
Do thread	16 do
Linens, shirtings	12 1/2 to 25 cts. per yard
All other linens 25 per cent ad valorem, or 15 of the cost here	
Hats, mens, 30 per cent ad valorem	\$1, 50
Leather, 30 per cent ad valorem	\$ the cost.
Do shoes	50 cents per pair
Do Boots	\$1 50 do
Hats, women's, Leghorn 50 cts. \$3 50 a p. Do do straw 50 do do do	
Bees-wax, upwards, 150 per cent	
do	15 cts. per gallon

The above table may not be quite accurate, but the inaccuracies will be generally, in not having fixed the duties high enough. For instance, as regards woolen cloths, the duty is calculated at 45 per cent upon the minimum price they come under, which is the nominal duty in the Tariff. Take a cloth costing exactly 4s 6d sterling, or one dollar the square yard the duty would be 45 per cent; but if it should be appraised to have cost 4s 6d sterling, or one dollar and one cent the square yard, the duty would be 110 per cent; and this has been the case with three fourths of the dollar minimum woolen goods imported have paid an average of 70 per cent, and cottons still more.

A tolerably correct rule by which a person may know the amount of duty he pays, will be by setting down one third of the cost of every thing which comes into his house, except his animal food, his bread and other vegetables, and his chairs and tables and other wood work.

From the above table, it will be found that a man who has a wife and three children, living in this city, will pay at least one dollar a week tax to support a few overgrown manufacturers. With regard to the article of coal, which pays \$2 16 a chaldron, it will not be enough for the advocates of high duties to say that coal is found in sufficient abundance at home, because we would have Sidney and Picton bituminous coal the year round if it were duty free, at from 5 to \$6 the chaldron, and Liverpool at from 7 to \$8 and if the export duty upon the latter should be repealed; which it most probably will be, the coal would be as low as the Picton.

FACTS.—The *Ramner of the Constitu-tion* mentions that in August last, a gentleman purchased a suit of Clothes, superfine Coat, Vest, and Pantaloon, in Montreal, for \$40. The cost of the same in New York is \$62. The difference in price actually paid the expenses of the purchaser from New York to Montreal, and back. So that the rich, who can travel, escape the duty, while the poor must stay at home and submit. Another gentleman saved \$200 in duties upon the stock of clothes he brought with him from Europe.

RELIGIOUS REVIVAL.  
From the Beaufort Gazette.  
We had frequently heard of religious revivals, with no concern we regret to say, when our little town became the scene of one of those striking and interesting events. The Rev. Daniel Baker of Savannah, has been with us for some time and never surely since the days of the Apostles, has more fervid zeal, or ardent piety, or untiring labour been devoted by a Christian Minister to his cause. For ten unwearied days from morning until nine at night, have we heard the strongest and most impassioned appeals to the heads and hearts of his hearers. All that is terrible or beautiful, all that is winning or appalling, all that could steal, and charm, and soothe the heart, or shake its careless security, and command its attention to the truths of religion, we have seen pressed upon our citizens with an earnestness, energy, and affectionate persuasiveness, almost irresistible.

The effect no one can conceive who was not present. Politics were forgotten.—Business stood still—the shops and stores were shut—the schools closed—one subject only appeared to occupy all minds and engross all hearts. The church was filled to overflowing—seats, galleries, aisles, exhibited a dense mass of human beings from hoary age to childhood. In this multitude of ages and conditions, there were occasional pauses of breathless silence, during which a pin-dropping might have been distinctly heard. When the solemn silence was broken by the voice of the preacher, citing the impotent to appear before the judgment seat of Heaven, reproving, persuading, imploring by the most thrilling appeals to every principle of his nature; and when crowds moved forward and fell prostrate at the foot of the altar, and the rich music of hundreds

of voices, and the solemn accents of praise or woe over the kneeling multitude, it was not in human hearts to resist the influence that spoke its sympathies, and spoke to its purest and most elevated feelings.

There stood the messenger of truth, there stood the legate of the skies! His theme divine, His office sacred, his credentials clear. By him the violated law spoke out his thunders, and by him in strains a sweet As angels use, the gospel whispered peace. The union of sects produced on the occasion, was not the least striking feature of the event. Distinctions were laid aside, christians of all denominations met and worshipped together indiscriminately in either church, and the cordiality of their teacher "love one another." Animosities long continued were sacrificed, coldness and formality were forgotten, our community seemed like one great family, and it was impossible not to exclaim, what a beautiful thing is this! religion!—how it cheers and warms and elevates!—how successfully it insinuates peace on earth and good will among men.

The cordial co-operation of our pastors was another interesting circumstance. There was not petty jealousy, no hanging back. They rewarded themselves as laborers in one vineyard, and the minor interests of a part were merged for the time in the larger and more comprehensive concerns of the whole christian church, of which they were all equally members.

We are not surprised that these revivals are hailed with enthusiastic delight by professors of religion. They are triumphs indeed of the faith to which they adhere, and the accounts of them must fall upon their ears like glad tidings of great joy. Even to the most careless observer, however disposed to be sceptical or speculative, or occupying as he may, the cold and cheerless region of a self dependent philosophy, such a scene as we have lately witnessed must possess no small interest. He sees religion in a new aspect, arrayed in beauty that he never dreamed of.

Not harsh or crabbed—  
But musical as is Appollo's lute  
And a perpetual feast of nectar'd sweets  
Where no crude surfeit reigns.  
What, may he say, if the christian is wrong? His joys are, nevertheless, pure, elevated, and intellectual, and he is animated through life with the cheering hope of an immortality of happiness. If his be a delusion, it is one to be envied not avoided.  
But what if he should be right!

Southern Review.—The fifteenth number of this valuable periodical has just issued from the press. Circumstances have only permitted us as yet to make a cursory examination of its contents, but we feel perfectly warranted in saying from that examination, brief as it was, that the present number will be found inferior to none that have preceded it either in ability, elegance, or taste. The opening article "on the Bank of the United States" gives a candid and lucid exposition of the arguments both for and against that institution. It is drawn up with moderation and ability, and presents a fair view of the merits and demerits, of the advantages and dangers of the Bank. This article should be generally read by all who wish to understand the principal grounds upon which the renewal of the Character is advocated and opposed.—The reviewer himself is averse to the renewal. He thinks the Bank not only utterly unconstitutional, but dangerous to the liberties of the people, conflicting with the rights of the States, and exceedingly overrated as regards its benefits, and is decidedly of opinion that it had much better be abolished than retained. The article upon "Indirect Taxation" is also a valuable paper, in which the predominant political topics of the day are treated in a manner, and with a spirit and ability, eminently calculated to arrest attention. It proves conclusively the right of a State to nullify an unconstitutional act of Congress and clearly points out the mode in which it should be exercised. The other essays generally are of an agreeable and miscellaneous character, written with taste and spirit and vivacity, and well adapted to gratify the lovers of polite literature. This number, we are glad to see, is neatly printed, and whilst we cheerfully award this credit to the publisher, we trust that he will be suitably compensated for the labor and expense necessarily connected with such a publication. The Southern Review already ranks high, we might even say highest, amongst works of a similar description in the country. It has conferred honor upon the South, and should be liberally and extensively sustained. It has given us a distinguished and enviable name, not only in the United States, but in Europe, and the Southern people should remember, that in supporting it, they support the rights, the institutions, and the literary reputation of the South.  
Charleston Mercury.

Henry Clay reformed.—Mr. Clay, in a late letter to a committee in Virginia, says that he eats no more public dinners for the present. *Columbia Times.*