FARMERS' GAZETTE.

JOHN STEIN, EDITOR.

New Terms

Two Dollars and Fifty cents per annum, payable in advance, or $3 00 if not paid within three months from the time of subscribing.

Those of our present subscribers who have not already paid, will be entitled to their paper, at $2 50 per annum, by adding to our list another name, *and paying up their Subscriptions.* A club of five new Subscribers, remitting $10, will each be entitled to a copy. No paper discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the Publisher.

ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding fifteen lines, inserted for 75 cents the first, and 37½ cents each subsequent time. For insertions at intervals of two weeks, 50 cents after the first, and 75 cents f the intervals are longer.

☞ A liberal discount will be made to those who advertise by the year.

FARMERS' GAZETTE.

Cheraw, Tuesday, September 24, 1844.

Pee Dee Agricultural Society.

This Society will meet at the Town Hall, in Cheraw, on Friday, the first day of November next, when the following Premiums on Stock will be awarded:

For the best Bull over two years old, a Silver Cup of the value of $10.

For the best Bull under two years old, a Silver Cup of the value of $5.

For the best milch Cow, a Silver Cup of the value of $5.

For the best Boar, a Silver Cup of the value of $5.

For the best Sow, a Silver Cup of the value of $5.

For the Farmers' Gazette.

MR. EDITOR:—The *Gazette* of the 10th inst. contains a request from Darlington District, signed "Many Voters," urging the Candidates for the Legislature to answer several questions propounded to them. Believing it to be the right and duty of the people to become acquainted with the laws and business of the State; also, the necessity of Candidates making known their sentiments, I proceed to answer the questions propounded, and make some further observations.

I am not in favor of a State Convention to Nullify the Tariff law of 1842, for several reasons. By the Constitution which has given existence to the Federal Government, the States have delivered up to the General Government, a portion of their rights. Amongst those given up, is the right to levy direct taxes, and the exclusive right to levy duties on foreign goods. It is true, that I advocated Nullification in 1832, but did not claim from the Constitution the right to Nullify. I believed it an original right, being the same which my Father claimed, when he joined the rebellion against the unjust taxes of the British Government. Those who Nullified in 1832, had hopes that South Carolina would have been more unanimous than she proved to be; and also expected to have been joined by some of the neighboring States. She being disappointed in these reasonable hopes, was obliged to submit to a compromise, which is now set aside by a majority in Congress. At this time, the State is more divided in opinion, and the adjoining States are more disposed to favor the Manufacturing interest than formerly; so that I see no hopes from Nullification. I believe a Southern Convention, authorized by the State to make a Treaty, is unconstitutional, and should not be adopted until we are determined to bear oppression no longer. One or more States have not a right, according to the Constitution, to secede from the Union, without the consent of the other States. The Government of the United States is in its nature two-fold: it is Federal, for the purpose of protecting our liberties, allowing each State a right to make laws suited to its peculiar prejudices and different customs; and Consolidated, for the purpose of strength to support itself against foreign powers and internal commotions. To prove that it is consolidated, no further evidence is needed, than that it has the power to levy and collect taxes throughout the country, which power was partially exercised during the last war with England, our State compromising for the tax on land by paying our quota in advance. The right of taxing was not only exercised by John Adam's administration, but the Federal army was sent into the Democratic and manufacturing State of Pennsylvania, to force obedience amongst the Whiskey distillers, to the excise laws. Before we make up our minds to resist the protective duties, we should soberly enquire how much we are injured by them, and who they are that oppose us. In this matter, the people of Darlington, in my opinion, have not had a fair statement laid before them. The improvement and competition in manufacturing are so great as to keep the prices of goods much lower than might be expected from so high a Tariff. I admit the low prices of goods is a matter of opinion, which cannot fairly be tested. But as to those who oppose us, there can be no doubt, that instead of a few thousand pale faced voters from the spinning jennies of New England, as represented to us, they are the stout and healthy wheat growers of Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, and the States West of them; also, the wool growers of New York and the hemp growers of Kentucky, with many friends in other parts of the country. The five States of New England, which have been so much vilified for supporting a high tariff, voted against it as late as the tariff of 1828; the votes in both Houses stood 15 for and 28 against the Tariff. I would not be surprised if the New England States, being forced from their own mercantile pursuits, much against their will, have now joined the protective policy.

At the Effingham meeting, a few days since, the people were told that if old BENJ. FRANKLIN was to revisit this world, he could hardly be made to believe that a few lordly manufacturers now trampled on the rights of seventeen millions of the descendants of a people whom his wisdom aided in making free. If the old man retained his former disposition for reading, he would find that this mischief, or general welfare, or whatever else it may be called, was not projected by manufacturers, but by giant minds like his own—by THOMAS JEFFERSON and JOHN C. CALHOUN. In his Message of 1808, Mr. JEFFERSON says:—"The suspension of foreign commerce, produced by the injustice of the belligerent powers, and the contingent losses and sacrifices of our citizens, are subjects of just concern. The situation into which we have thus been forced, has compelled us to

Farmers' Gazette.

"Our object is, to admonish, not to sting; to improve, not to wound; to correct the errors of men, not to obstruct them in their career."

WHOLE NUMBER—398. CHERAW, SOUTH-CAROLINA, SEPTEMBER 24, 1844. NEW SERIES—VOL. 2. NO. 28.

apply a portion of our industry and capital to internal improvements. The extent of this conversion is daily increasing, and little doubt remains that the establishments formed and forming, will, under the auspices of cheaper material and substance, the freedom of labor from taxation with us, and protecting duties and prohibitions, become permanent." It is well known that in 1816, Mr. CALHOUN advocated an increase of duties, for the double purpose of raising revenue and giving protection to manufactures.

In the call made on the candidates for Darlington, some doubt is expressed as to the constitutionality of the Legislature electing Electors for President. I have no doubt on this subject. This is one instance where it was intended that the people might act to suit themselves. The Constitution directs, that the members of Congress be chosen by the people of the several States; but concerning the Electors for President, it says: "each State shall appoint in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct." The word *State*, as used here, means the Government, and not the People, and, *appoint*, here means to create. The true meaning then, is, that the Legislature may give the election to the people, or otherwise appoint the Electors as it might think proper.

If the Constitution of the United States could be altered, so that all the States should vote alike, I would prefer that the people in each Congressional District, should elect one Elector, and the Legislature two; making the number equal to the Members of both Houses of Congress. I am against the general ticket system, because it would put the election entirely into the hands of a few leading men and demagogues, besides destroying the privilege that minorities might have by the District system.

We have suffered no ill by the present mode of electing the Governor of this State. But as it is the genius of our people to seek for and maintain their rights, and as it would give a greater disposition to the people, for enquiring into the business of our State Government, I would be willing to have the election of Governor to come before the people.

I could vote for neither of the candidates for President, who are now before the people, with a free good will. Mr. CLAY has long been represented as an honorable man, who would not wilfully sacrifice the interests of his country for personal aggrandizement, or for party advancement. But I object to him, because he advocates, as I think, an unjust Tariff; one which injures one section of the country, for the benefit of another. Mr. POLK has been brought before the people somewhat suddenly. I knew of him in Gen. JACKSON's administration, as Speaker in Congress. He was represented by those opposed to the administration as acting very partially in the appointments of committees; particularly in the one raised for the purpose of examining into the alledged malpractice of some of the officers, friends of the administration. He has been in comparative obscurity since, and I think it very strange, that the Convention which nominated him, should have passed by Mr. CALHOUN, and a host of others, who have characters of their own, and settled upon one, whose reputation is mostly borrowed from Gen. JACKSON and Mr. VAN BUREN. I cannot make up my mind fully about this matter, until this mysterious nomination is better explained.

As to the tenure of the Judges, I am willing to hold on as we are, until I see better the propriety of changing. All agree in the necessity of an able and independent judiciary. By the present law, an incompetent or unfaithful Judge may be and has been removed. It would be a reflection on our Legislature to say that sympathy or any other cause would hinder the members in future to discharge their duty as faithfully, as the former members have done. Putting out of the question the propriety of turning men out of office, who have given their best days to the service of the State, it well may be doubted whether justice would be better administered by the proposed change; for who has not seen, that much time is wasted on the first circuit of a new Judge, before it be determined who shall rule the Court, the Judge or the Lawyers.

Texas, being annexed to the United States, would make the boundary line of the latter no longer than it now is, and instead of a land boundary, through a good cotton country, would have a sea coast of three or four hundred miles; and making a line North-Westward, from the Gulf of Mexico, between the waters which run into the Red River and those which fall into the River Del Norte, it would pass through some good land, but mostly on a high ridge of poor land, making a much better boundary than the present one. On this account, it is advisable that Texas be annexed to the United States, if all the parties concerned would consent to it. It is more the interest of the manufacturing States of the North and the wheat growing States of the West to have it done, than it is of the Southern States. I think a treaty of annexation might have been made, had the attempt not been mixed with some mystery and usurpation of authority by our President. A treaty will yet be made, if a majority of the people in both Governments wish it; but it would be madness in the Southern States to attach themselves to Texas, (as some say they should do if a majority of the States will not agree to annexation.) If a Southern Confederacy was formed, Texas being admitted, the slave population would immediately be moving towards Texas, and gradually be diminished in Maryland. The Constitution of the United States allows a slaveholder in one State to go into a free State and retake a slave who might have escaped from him; but the Union being dissolved, this privilege would no longer be granted. The consequence would be, that slaves could not be kept advantageously in Maryland, she then would join the free States; Virginia would next be a frontier State; afterwards North Carolina, and in time it would be the turn of South Carolina. But supposing that I am mistaken in the course Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky and Missouri would take, and they remain slave States; the expense of protecting so endless a frontier, and especially keeping the slaves from crossing the boundary line, would require a taxation greater than would willingly be submitted to by any man in Darlington District.

With these views, I submit to the election of the people, believing that Legislators are bound to carry out their wishes or give room to those who will. DAVID GREGG.

SOCIETY HILL, Sept. 18th, 1844.

For the Farmers' Gazette.

Col. Sims's Letter.

MR. EDITOR:—In times of such exciting interest as the present are to the whole country, and especially to South Carolina, we note with restless anxiety every political movement, and watch the various causes and effects as they succeed each other, with eager anticipation. Nothing tends more readily to awaken the people to a sense of their rights, and promote the exercise of their sovereign authority, than the nomination of a candidate to represent their will in the public councils. Hence arises the numerous interrogatories to the various candidates for representation throughout the State, and hence the impatient waiting for, and careful criticism of the answers, when afforded.

Under these circumstances, and with these feelings, as one of the voters, I looked with peculiar interest, for an expression of opinion from Mr. SIMS, on the leading questions of the times, when I saw his name announced in your paper. In the course of the revolutions of your press, his communication was at last turned up to my expe ting eyes. I sat down, I must confess, with considerable confidence, to the perusal of his sentiments, as they should be, "most thoughtfully entertained and candidly communicated." I had no doubt of finding a bold and unwavering expression of opinion, a noble sympathy for the wrongs of the South, and a firm stand for her rights.

I was led to this conclusion, by the recollection of Mr. S.'s decided stand on the "Jeffersonian Resolutions" of '42, and the active and conspicuous part he played at the Darlington meeting which took into consideration the Texas question. But I must candidly confess, (and in doing this I only presume upon the right of a voter to form an opinion and express it,) that I was disappointed in the *object* which was expressed and implied; the *character*, which is confused and rather contradictory, and the *principles* of the communication, which are *commito-non-commital*, if I may so express myself, and anti-Carolinian; rhyming with the "fairy-like music" of the "Mermaid," as taught in the school of "Jupiter Catawampus," the great "Ah Him!"

Accordingly, I find the express object of Mr. S. is to make known his views upon certain questions put to his "competitor;" while, at the same time, I can plainly discover an electioneering design running through the whole communication. I would not censure him for employing any honest means to acquire his object—for this he has a perfect right to do, and no one can object to it—but it should be our constant aim to keep out of view these little means and schemes. All of us resort to sinister causes to secure the desired result, yet nothing tends so much to arouse suspicion, disclose our weakness, and thus defeat our object, as being detected in the use of these artifices, such as assumed confidence, pretended similarity of sympathies, &c. When the hook is thus clumsily baited, he indeed must be a *gudgeon* that will be caught upon it.

It was necessary, therefore, for Mr. SIMS to assure us that "*numerous* applications were made" to him, not only by his "neighbors," but crowds of "others living in various and remote parts of the Congressional District," thus commencing the race with the ballot box in his own hands. It was necessary for him, also, in declaring "the obvious cause" of those numerous applications" in this way, to hint that the same cause brought over a large and respectable body of voters to his side; for it cannot be denied that he looks mainly to Mr. CAMPBELL's party for support. And lastly, it was necessary, in order that the reader should lay down the exposition with an idea of his popularity, and to "clap the climax" with the "*argumentum ad hominum*,"—to hint that himself and Mr. CALHOUN agree precisely on a certain question of great moment to the State.

There is, by the way, something rather unintelligible in the manner in which Mr. S throws out this last suggestion. He "understands this from some *editorial* remarks in the *South Carolinian*." Is PEMBERTON the mouth-piece of the great? The amount of it is, he "*understands*" that the editor of the Carolinian *supposes* that it is the *opinion* of Mr. CALHOUN, that "our relief is in the ascendancy of the Democratic party," and such is Mr. SIMS' opinion also.

In sifting his opinions, however, I will take the order in which he has arranged them. He of course leaves us to conclude, by his silence, that he stands committed, with Gen. M'QUEEN, in "public speeches," or in signing reports as Chairman of public meetings, for the "*immediate*" annexation of Texas. We will see how this coincides with his opinion that all action should be delayed until the close of the present national canvass, and with his opinion of the result of the whole upon Mr. CLAY's election.

In reference, then, to "the plan he proposes," for the "consummation" of *immediate* annexation, he relies upon "future negociation;" such "negociation" as can be decently, "hopefully," "safely" and "successfully" offered only by "Mr. POLK and his administration." Brightening up with the "increasing prospect of Democratic ascendancy," he would fain indulge a hope that "the dismembered valley of the Mississippi will be restored to its integrity." A strong expectation of such a result would be a source of great satisfaction. "But on the other hand, *should* the Whig ticket" for the Presidency "succeed," he sees "no *prospect* or *propriety* of renewing the negociation;" upon that event, he "fears, without the interposition of some unknown contingency, Texas will probably be lost to this country." Thus, in view of all the terrible results arising from our losing Texas, and British influence and authority taking place—such as loss of real and personal estate—an abolition crusade against slavery—civil discord and intestine wars, and even the dismemberment of the Union—no feeling is manifested, but simply an indifferent "*fear*" is expressed that "Texas will be lost." No *unusual* effort is to be made, but an uncertain reliance is to be placed upon the very doubtful chance of the success of the Democratic party. At this juncture, we expected to have heard the beatings of an insulted and indignant heart, and seen the ebullitions of warm Southern feelings. But instead, we find him making every effort to lead the people off from the true issue, to that of the minor consideration of President making.

To smooth over the whole affair, however, and in order that he might, with some complacency, look up in the face of a pure high toned Southern Democrat, after condemning the remaining plan named in the interrogatories, "avoiding sectional appearances and steering clear of segregating tendencies," and suggesting a "concentrating co-operating" measure of his own, which, in the nature of the case would defeat itself—else why was not a ratification of the treaty obtained by consent of the States when represented in Congress,—he comes out with one single additional observation—that we *should* look to unusual means, after all the regular and ordinary had hopelessly failed. This opinion, too, is "thoughtfully entertained and candidly communicated," in the face of the one he had just expressed, of the probable loss of Texas, and of the impropriety of ever "renewing the negociations" in case Mr. CLAY should be elected.

To recapitulate, then, we find Mr. SIMS, in his plan for *immediate* annexation, recommending *future* negotiations, which are to take place at a time which it is doubtful will ever arrive—the election of the Democratic President. We find him, at the same time, condemning all resistance or Southern action, as inefficient and unlawful, and yet advising us to resort to unusual means when all others have failed! To close the matter, in case Mr. CLAY should be elected, he leaves us the satisfaction of believing that Texas will be entirely and unavoidably lost to this country. This is the noble stand—this the bulwark of defence against the machinations of Abolitionism and Northern intriguers. This our hope in Mr. SIMS for future peace and prosperity.

As to the measures of relief from the Tariff, Mr. SIMS forbears and expects, and I suppose would forbear and expect until the principles of protection are rivetted upon us never to be shaken off. All of the means mentioned are unlawful, without authority, and "seem to desire disunion." Resistance is a disorganizing measure, and should not be resorted to until we are "prepared to make an end of government." Nothwithstanding, as I am told, he stood forth in its defence as a *peaceful* remedy. Here, again, we are at a loss to find Mr. S.—"put your finger on him, and he is not there." According to his own shewing, he voted "heartily" for a resolution passed in '42, in which he declares that so long as he could hope for a returning sense of justice to redress the wrong, he would submit, (which hope, to all reasonable men, is a forlorn, dead hope,) but when his *reasonable expectations* should be disappointed, he felt bound to adopt *peculiar measures* of redress, in accordance with his former principles and *recorded* pledges. Yet the same Tariff now exists that Mr. S. then had reference to, and now denounces as a "violation of the Constitution, operating as injustice and oppression on some classes and sections, and bounties on others, and palpably invading and disregarding the principles of the compromise." I would here remark, that Mr. S. talks strangely about redeeming "a pledge, *supposed* to have been made by the General Assembly," when the resolution he quotes immediately afterwards, speaks in so many words of redeeming certain "*recorded pledges*" actually made.

I would here, Mr. Editor, have closed my remarks, had it not been for that enervating, compromising sentence near the close of Mr. SIMS' communication—another of the many examples of his suffering, believing charity, that would embrace all parties in its creed. He tells us that there is a modifying principle in the present Tariff, tending to reduce it to the proper level, which should cause us to forbear *all* action upon this subject; the heavy receipts from imports will over fill the Treasury beyond the wants of the Government, and there will consequently be no necessity of so high a Tariff. Does Mr. S. then believe that the present Tariff is one for Revenue and not for Protection? or if it is one for Revenue, does he not know that there is a strong party who contend for a monied, aristocratic government—the very party which has been grinding us with the oppression of which we complain? Does he not know, too, that a protective Tariff will, in the course of time, require to be protected itself? Is our life blood to be sucked up, and we remain quiet until the gorged reptile drops off of its own weight? Shall the enemy lacerate our arm of support, and while writhing and chafing from the pain and irreparable injury, shall we be soothed with the assurance that it will soon slough off, and all will be well? Have we not, fellow citizens, great and sacred rights to contend for as well as individual pecuniary loss? Principles and events are daily developing themselves, which will sooner or later tell upon the immortal destiny of our beloved country. Whatever, therefore, we intend to do, it behoves us to do *promptly, energetically and boldly.*

URBANUS.

For the Farmers' Gazette.

Nullification.

"Pee Dee," after laying down the plain premises that the General Government is one of limited powers, granted by the States, and that if it usurps powers not granted, its acts are not binding upon the people, adds as follows: "The question then arises—Who is the judge? My answer is, that there being no common arbiter, the principal has the right to judge of the extent of the powers it has granted to its agent." *My* answer to this is, not always, if ever. The agent has as much right to judge as the principal. Where there really is no common arbiter, might makes right, of necessity; but third parties will judge from the terms of the grant. But "Pee Dee" adds in the same connection, "There must have been an arbiter contemplated somewhere, and as Congress has not the right of saying who that arbiter shall be, by the powers given to *it*, the States have the right of so saying, by the right reserved to *them*"! Exactly so. If the premises are true, the conclusion is irresistible. *The* States (not *a* State) have the right, and the argument breaks the neck of the writer's Nullification theory. If the States are the principal, a twenty-sixth part cannot control the agent of the whole, against the will of the remaining twenty-five parts; especially as it is not even pretended that the articles of agreement contain any stipulation to that effect.

A reference to the Constitution will shew that the postulate of "Pee Dee," in the first of the above quotations, viz: "There being no common arbiter," is incorrect, and that his assumed postulate, in the second quotation, viz: "There must have been an arbiter contemplated somewhere," is correct. The following is the language of the Constitution, (*Art. III., Sec. 2, Clause 1.*) "*The Judicial power* shall extend to *all* cases in law and equity, arising *under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, &c.*" When this "arbiter," or judge of the last resort, appointed by the parties to the constitutional compact to determine *all* cases arising *under this compact*, decides a power to have been granted in the articles of agreement, it is technically there, and its exercise is according to the provisions of the Constitution, whatever to the contrary may be the opinion of individual parties to the compact. Any other doctrine would not only be contrary to the express terms of the Constitution, but if carried into practice, would also be anarchcial and render the administration of the Government impracticable. If a dozen or more men form a partnership, with written articles of agreement, one of which names an arbiter or tribunal to decide and settle all controversies arising under the articles, the decision of this tribunal is conclusive and binding on all the parties, even when it is against the opinion of the majority, or of all except one; and much more is it so, when it is against the opinion of only a minority, or an individual party. Otherwise the arbiter is no arbiter, and his appointment is worse than vain. The certain knowledge of an individual party that the interpretation put upon the language in which the articles of agreement are expressed, is altogether different from his meaning and intention in acceding to them, does not alter the case. It shows only that he was not careful enough at the beginning, in the selection of his words or his arbiter, or in seeing that the words were understood in the same sense by himself and the other parties. When a party enters into a written agreement, the language is to be interpreted by, and to govern others as well as himself, and it would be a one-sided business to make him alone the judge of its meaning. But the Nullifier alleges that the clause of the Constitution quoted above, refers only to controversies between individuals. Another clause of the same section, however, extends the same judicial power "to controversies to which the United States shall be a party," it matters not who or what the other party may be, nor what the subject of controversy. But it is said that in a controversy with a State, the Government is a party and therefore cannot be a judge. But is not the State also a party, and does not the same rule exclude it from judging? In controversies with individuals, as well as in controversies with a State, the Government is a party; if this excludes it from judging in the one case it does in the other; so that if the objection is valid, the Government can have no jurisdiction whatever. But it is said that to make the Federal Government a judge of its own powers would be to make it essentially a consolidated Government. True; and it is plainly and unquestionably a consolidated Government, *with limited powers.* All the powers granted are as fully consolidated to form one General *Government* as are the powers granted by the people of a State to form a State Government. The general and State Governments are similar. Their sphere of action and range of powers are different; but their essential character and mode of operation are the same. The Constitution is not a treaty of alliance operating upon collective communities or States, but a form of Government which enforces its own laws upon the separate individuals over whom it extends. To deny that such a Government is consolidated or constituted by a consolidation of the powers granted, is a contradiction in terms. The security provided in the general Government against abuse or usurpation of powers, is the same as that provided in the State Governments. It is not exactly correct to consider either an individual unity judging of its own powers. They are composed of distinct and independent departments, each department a check upon the others; and all controled by the forms of law, and of their respective Constitutions, as well as, ultimately, by the popular elections. These are the securities provided in both the general and State Governments; and no balance-wheel or check-weight of Nullification was contemplated or provided in one case more than the other. Such a thing as a conflict of jurisdiction, or contest for power, between the general and State Governments cannot occur under the operation of the Constitution. Its framers were too wise to fall into any such fatal error. The Government operating directly on individuals, if any individual or number of individuals resist the law, it matters not who they are, or what pretext they allege, they expose themselves to the penalties provided by law for such resistance. No combination for resistance can shelter itself under the Ægis of State authority or State sovereignty. No such thing is known to the Government, as an obstacle to the exercise of its powers, or can be recognized by it, *in that respect.* All officers of the Federal and State Governments are sworn to support the Constitution, and the President is sworn faithfully to administer the Government, that is to execute the laws. And how is to be ascertained what acts, are and what are not laws? The Constitution answers this question in language by no means univocal or doubtful. Its rule is, that every bill which, having passed both houses of Congress, is signed by the President, or being returned by him with his objections, is subsequently passed by a majority of two-thirds in each house, "shall become a law." But is there no exception, or qualification to this rule? Yes, the Constitution provides for a judiciary department with power to interpret the laws and pass judgment upon their conformity or non-conformity to the Constitution. If this department decide a law to be in accordance with the Constitution, is there no other tribunal to which its constitutionality can be carried for adjudication? If there is, let the clause of the Constitution which provided for it be pointed out. When a bill has passed the legislative department of the Government and is sustained by the judicial department, the President is bound by his oath of office to execute it without regard to an attempted veto from any other quarter whatever.

These, then, are the guarantees which the States in forming a National Government provided against the usurpation or abuse of powers:

1. In the first place, all laws must be passed by a majority of both houses of Congress, one house composed of members elected by the State Legislatures, and the other of members chosen by popular vote in the several States; all these members, of course, possessing the confidence of their constituents, accountable to them, soon to return to a political equality with the rest of the people, and always themselves subject to the laws which they enact; whilst each house is perfectly independent of the other and a check upon it.

2. In the second place, if a majority, first of one house and then of the other, should by corruption and perjury, or through error, pass a bill abusing or usurping power, a check is provided in the President, chosen by popular vote of the whole country, to serve for a brief period, after which he too returns into the mass of the people. If he send back the bill, with his objections, then,

3. In the third place, it must pass by a majority of two thirds of each house before it can become a law.

4. And in the fourth place, if two-thirds of each house of Congress, or the President and a majority of each house, violate their oaths and the confidence reposed in them, by usurping or abusing power, in passing laws to operate upon themselves as well as their constituents, there is still another check provided in the judiciary. The humblest individual in the land upon whom a law is brought to bear, if he doubts the constitutional power of Congress to enact such law, has a right to make the question before the Judicial tribunals of the land, and carry it up to the Supreme Court of the United States. Here especially if it is a question of importance, it will be discussed, on both sides, by some of the ablest lawyers in the country, and will then, after mature deliberation, be decided on oath by men selected for their wisdom, integrity, patriotism, and legal knowledge, to decide such and similar questions. With these securities against usurpation the States were satisfied when they adopted the Constitution, and they provided no other, unless the right reserved by them to amend that instrument in the way prescribed by itself, be deemed an exception. When those who adopted the Constitution are not satisfied with the exercise of powers under it, they can change their representatives at the next elections. If notwithstanding all these checks, powers are exercised which, in their opinion were not granted, the remedy which they "contemplated" and provided, is to declare authoritatively by an amendment to the Constitution that such power shall not be exercised. But if only one of the parties, or too small a number to change the Constitution are of opinion the power is not granted, what then? The only alternatives are acquiescence or rebellion. This is a principle which lies at the foundation of all Republican Governments. Majorities must govern and minorities must submit, with the protection of such constitutional restrictions as can be laid upon the majorities. If you give up this principle, there is no point at which you can stop short of absolute anarchy, in which every man does as he pleases so far as he has the physical power, and might gives right.

When civilized communities form *Governments*, they provide for the peaceable settlement of *all* controversies which *can arise* among themselves. The law or power of Government operating directly on individuals it is peaceably enforced upon them in spite of any and all opposition or resistance which they can make. In *treaties* of commerce, amity or alliance the case is different. When the parties to a treaty differ and quarrel, *because the treaty operates not upon individuals but upon communities*, and obedience is to be rendered to it by communities in their collective and organic capacity, it can be enforced against the will of the recussant party only by war, the *ultima ratio regum.* Now is the Constitution of the United States a treaty of alliance, or is it a form of Government? It would seem superfluous to discuss this point,—one which is made so plain by the language and numerous provisions of the Constitution itself, as well as by the operations of the *Government* from the time of its establishment. Yet the Nullification theory is base upon the assumption that the Constitution is in fact only a treaty, or mere articles of treaty compact between sovereign and independent powers, controversities in regard to the meaning and execution of which are to be settled, like other controversies between sovereign powers, by force of arms, *when the parties cannot come to an amicable agreement.* That this assumption is the foundation of the theory I shall shew in another number, and state such objections to it as occur to me, and as I shall have room for. A TRUE CAROLINIAN.

ERRATA.—In my brief acknowledgment last week, of the compliments of "Batista," for "irritable" read *veritable.*

For the Farmers' Gazette.

Meeting at Effingham, Darlington.

Pursuant to notice given, a meeting of the citizens of this place and its vicinity, as well as from other parts of Darlington District, for the discussion of certain important political subjects, affecting materially our interests as well as our privileges, was held in the building owned by the Elim Church. A very respectable number having convened, the meeting was called to order by Col. Jos. WOODS. The Rev. J. M. TIMMONS was chosen to fulfil the duties of Chairman, and J. THWING, as Secretary of the meeting.

The Chairman, in a brief manner, explained the objects of the meeting, to wit:—A discussion of the following political subjects, viz:

1st. The present constitutional method of electing the President and Vice President of the United States.