

"Get up Boys, 'tis Daylight."

Messrs. Editors.—The day fixed for the election of Delegates to the Southern Congress being at hand, it may not be amiss to offer a few remarks.

Of course it is idle to expect that the Southern Congress will ever meet; and I would suggest that our Co-operation acquaintances ought to be ashamed to name the Southern Congress, which was the last hope of co-operation, and to attain which, they have not made the slightest effort, unless it has been to nominate candidates in those Districts where they thought there was any chance of mortifying the Secession party.

Unless the omens are fallacious, their chance of success is as doubtful as the future existence of an assembly, the name of which has been used as a cloak for doing nothing.

But they have started some candidates, and will, perhaps, slyly start more. They will certainly claim as a Co-operationist, every voter who stays at home on the day of election.—Therefore, it behooves the Secessionists, (the only true Resistance men,) to turn out to a man; for mark me, if the Co-operationists (the do-nothing party) carry one or two Districts, they will claim a triumph; if we carry all the Districts, but our friends do not turn out in their full strength, a wet blanket will be thrown over the whole affair, and it will be said the people take no interest in the election. Turning to the practical object of this communication, I would call public attention to the following:

1st. The Governor having issued and proclaimed the writs of election, it becomes the duty of the managers of election two Sundays at least—to open the polls on the 2d Monday in October and the day following, and hold the election according to the usual rules, and this whether they actually receive the writs or not.

2d. On the usual day for counting the votes, (which is generally Wednesday, with some exceptions, see resolution, 1839, pages 359,) the managers assemble, count the votes, send up the original ballots, and send the same with a certificate (of which a duplicate is kept) to the Governor or Secretary of State, at Columbia, endorsed, and by a sworn messenger, as in cases of Congressional elections, (see 6 Statutes at Large, p. 182.) Then the vote from the different Congressional Districts will be known, and then the Co-operationists will have to seek some other excuse for opposing true resistance. And they will find a plenty of excuses and platforms "under existing circumstances." They are opposed to Secession, and when Co-operation is buried (for it is already dead) some will discover (as Mr. — from — has done,) that the compromise is wise, just and liberal; and that Congress has the Constitutional right not only to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia but to abolish slavery itself in the District of Columbia in the public lands, and in the Territories; others, like the Hon. C. W. Dudley, of Marlborough, will offer as a 2d reason for deceiving the unwary, separate Secession in its consequences, will disturb the whole Union, unsettle its foundations, and put in jeopardy the existence of a mighty Republic." His 24th being: "The State having become a party to the proceedings of the Nashville Convention, is bound in honor not to some (unknown) alternative between Submission and Secession, and finally in his 26th he goes from A to Z, he says: "The ponderous materials of which this Union is now composed together with the reckless spirit with which its government is administered leave no room to doubt that a disruption of its parts, at no distant day, is inevitable. We are forced to contemplate such an event as near at hand, and in suspending the exercise of the right of Secession for the present, we do not only in the expectation of Co-operation to be excited by the further movements of fanaticism, but to arise from a condition of things entirely independent of that cause, and from which a Southern Confederacy must result." (Caught you.)

Indeed, my own impression is that our opponents are in an awkward position; for while some of them are secretly rejoiced at the failure of the Southern Congress (because the chances of disunion are lessened) there are others who are awakening to the stern reality that Secession is the only remaining measure of Resistance. Therefore some of them will frankly say, as Major John S. Preston does in his ninth attempt to define his position, "Lest, however, that this may not seem sufficiently explicit, I beg to repeat the language of my own, published within a month past." If that Congress meets and dissolves without adjusting the preliminaries of a Southern Confederacy, I believe South Carolina will be justified in any course she may choose to adopt. Some few will nobly redeem their pledge and say, "there being no hope of Co-operation, we go for secession;" but I think most of them will respond in the language of my friend—who by the way, never made a bad speech or wrote a good letter—never spoke a foolish thing, and never wrote a wise one. This estimable gentleman seems perfectly willing to give us his advice, but (for this among other reasons) he had no advice to give, as the lawyer filed a plea in abatement on thirteen grounds, the first of which was, that the plaintiff was dead. The Hon. James L. Orr, forms a striking contrast to our friend last named. He, in October last, butted manfully against Federal aggressions. Now he cracks his sides with laughing at the bull that cracked his neck against the locomotive. (His constituents are much astonished at seeing his "agility" in politics, called by another name, as a single minded farmer would be, if he were present to hear the Court of Errors decide that "Or" in his carefully preface'd will, meant "and"—and if, and if, said the farmer.

But enough! *oh jura sartes*, Rabbi Ben Solo omions! The argument is exhausted.

There is no alternative between Secession and base unmitigated Submission. Secession Boys, rally around the Palmetto on the second Monday in October, and show to the Stan lard Patriot and the spirit of that foul mouthed Transcript (which still stalks unavenged among us) that we can lick Giant-do-nothing at the ballot-box, as easily as the Yankees can lick molasses, or as easily as their gifted orators say we will be licked at Fort Moultrie.

"OLD DANGER'S GHOST."

CAMDEN,

TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 7, 1851.

THO. J. WARREN, Editor.

WANTED IMMEDIATELY.

Wanted at this Office a good Journeyman Printer, one who can work Press will be preferred. Oct. 6.

Our Cotton Market.

A slight decline has taken place in the price of cotton since our last. The principal sales were at 7 to 9 cents.

Corn 80 to 85; Flour 4 3-4 to 5 1-4; Bacon 12.

The Crops.

An intelligent planter of Anson County, N. C., writing to his friend in this place, says: "It is now reduced to a certainty, that our Cotton crop will be unusually light. The Anson crop will fall short at least one third, and Union will not make more than half a crop. Corn will be very short, though I believe Anson and Union will be able to make out for bread. As to meat, we shall have to be in a great measure dependent upon the drovers, and fear we will have to pay high for it."

Sons of Temperance.

The following brethren were on Thursday evening last regularly installed as officers of Wateree Division No. 9, to serve the ensuing quarter:

- W. H. R. Workman, W. P.
John J. Workman, W. A.
J. L. Brasington, R. S.
P. E. Woods, A. R. S.
Duncan Shorn, F. S.
W. E. Hughson, T.
A. M. Kennedy, C.
Columbus Nelson, A. C.
James R. Arrants, I. S.
L. W. Ballard, O. S.

On the same evening, the following P.W. P's. were re-elected delegates to the Grand Division, for the present year, viz: W. E. Johnson, W. Tharlow Caston, A. M. Kennedy, Wm. E. Hughson, Tho. J. Warren, J. B. Kershaw, W. M. Shannon, Z. J. DeHay, J. K. Witherspoon, C. A. McDonald, L. W. Ballard, Robert J. McCright and W. H. R. Workman, W. P.

Ex-Governor Johnson's Speech.

We will comply with the request of an esteemed friend and subscriber, and lay this document before our readers on Friday. The press of other matter upon our columns precludes much that we might otherwise publish.

Judge Withers' Letter.

Will be found in another column. It is published at the request of our friends of the Co-operation party of Lancaster.

EX-GOVERNOR RICHARDSON.

Mr. Editor: In your report of the Flat Rock meeting, you represent Gov. Richardson as having in substance, said, that "there was no fear of Federal Executive interference. It was a right with which they dared not interfere." Ex-President Jackson acknowledged this right—a State had a constitutional right to secede. Nullification, Gen. Jackson regarded as treason—he dared not interfere with a seceding State. You must have misunderstood the Governor, or his memory is treacherous. Gen. Jackson's proclamation of the 10th of December 1832 is the only official declaration of his opinion in the matter of State Rights, and State remedies. The Governor and his party in 1832, were supposed to have known something of that disastrous document. In it there is nothing more explicit than his denial of the right of secession, and State sovereignty, from which alone, it can be deduced. To sustain his position, General Jackson and others resorted to reasons the most fallacious and disingenuous, and utterly falsified the history of the country. But he meant roundly to deny the doctrine and destroy its advocates, and he was never remarkably fastidious or scrupulous as to the means, when he had an object, good or bad, to accomplish. '32.

We assure our friend and correspondent '32, that our report of Gov. Richardson's speech at Flat Rock is correct. In our Editorial notice, we quoted almost verbatim, with a slight exception in this particular, we should have represented him as saying, General Jackson regarded Nullification as rebellion against the laws of the Union, and not treason, as we stated. This does not however affect the correctness of our report substantially, and is only a difference in the terms of expression. We now quote Ex-Gov. R. as follows: Secession he (Gov. R.) regarded as the only and true remedy—he believed it altogether a peaceable one—there was no fear of Federal Executive interference—it was a right with which they dared not interfere—a State had the Constitutional right to secede. Nullification General Jackson regarded as rebellion—he dared not interfere with a seceding State. Would Millard Fillmore presume to do so? "Would a fool go where an angel feared to tread?"

This is substantially what Col. Richardson said, as we are fully assured by several gentlemen who were present at the meeting, and heard his admirable speech. This acknowledgment of the right of secession, (it is nothing less) on the part of General Jackson, was made to Mr. Richardson in the course of a conversation held between them subsequent to the events of Nullification, and whilst Mr. Richardson was a member of Congress.

General Jackson held Nullification to be rebellion—a measure of redress in the Union, and as the supreme Executive, he was bound by his oath of office, to put his veto upon it. Had S. Carolina seceded, Gen. Jackson said it would have been a measure out of the Union, consequently beyond his control. That, said he to Col. Richardson, was the remedy for South Carolina. In this connection, we would also state that the Union party of '32, of which Col. Richardson was a prominent member, were favorable to secession, (at least a large and influential number of them,) and were ready to support the State if she adopted that remedy.

To return, however, to General Jackson.—Although he forcibly demonstrated his opposition to State rights and State remedies, in his absolute denial of these rights in the "disastrous document" of '32, to which our correspondent refers, and although he did, in his approval of the Force Bill, take ground against State sovereignty, yet it is well known that he was put right again during the pendency of the nullification controversy, and publicly modified these erroneous expressions, returning to the platform of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions. Possibly the magnanimous reply of the elder Gov. Floyd of Virginia might have had much to do in changing his policy and opinions. Of this we are assured, Gen. Jackson admitted to Col. Richardson, that Secession and not Nullification, was the remedy or measure for South Carolina. One was rebellion in the Union, the other self-protection out of it. These are legitimate inferences of what General Jackson thought upon the subject at the time he held the conversation referred to with the Hon. John P. Richardson, then Member of Congress from this Congressional District. We have no doubt our understanding of Col. Richardson will accord with others who heard his able and eloquent address, which we hope may be published, that all may enjoy the pleasure which we enjoyed. No doubt he will be able to explain satisfactorily, the seeming discrepancies in the opinions of President Jackson, of '32, with the more reasonable man of later years. At all events, be this as it may, Ex-Governor Richardson, (like General Jackson was accustomed to do,) has not feared in the declaration of these opinions, to take the responsibility.

Extract from Col. Memminger's Pencil Sketch.

"If however other Southern States refuse to meet with us, and we are brought to the alternative of submission or resistance! for our I say, let us secede from the Union and abide our fate for better or for worse. If we are to wear chains, I prefer that they should be put on me by force—I, at least will have no part in forcing them; I would prefer to imitate the example of that noble people of an ancient day, who, when their country was overrun by an overwhelming power, refused to yield on any terms, and, rather than submit to a despot, transferred their country to their ships, and resisted to the last extremity. Once prepared for every contingency, our enemies will find us unconquerable. The last evil to which any nation can submit, is degradation. Let us, one and all, therefore, stand up to the last, for Equality or Independence."

Where is Col. Memminger now? Echo faintly answers "where?" Is he still willing to "stand up to the last" for 'Equality or Independence?' Let him say so now; and with Maxey Gregg, "we are willing to follow."

TO CATAWBA.

A short and unpretending article of mine under the heading, "The Mountains labor, lo! a Mouse is born," seems to have attracted the attention of some of the acrobats at that birth. One appearing in the "Southern Republic" of today, I could not with propriety notice further than to say that it does not touch upon the article in question, and is such a perversion, as could only have emanated from a diseased imagination or a corrupt heart. Yours, although not free from misrepresentation, displays certain verdant little innocencies which, in this day of party drill, have quite a fascination for all who are no politicians, but have devoted all my poor energies to prevent the strife which now consumes us, and I would indeed hope that your misrepresentations have been innocently made—I shall therefore address a few remarks to you.

As you have given no intimation of what the article is which you profess to criticize, and as many who read it may have forgotten all about it and many perhaps did not read it, I premise by saying that it only spoke of the impropriety of perverting Southern Rights Associations to party purposes, noticed the objectionable features of the address accompanying the nominations made by them and briefly defended Cols. Preston and Chesnut, from the invectives levelled at them. As for attacking the nominees it was never thought of; its objects are avowed above, and, sir, are they not sustained by facts? Let the origin and objects of these associations answer. Let the proud spirited Lyles, &c. who opposed the nominations in Fairfield answer. Let the Kershaw Association answer; aye, and take the Editorial of the especial organ of your party ("the Carolinian,") of the 8th January last for an answer, and as for the impropriety of the address, they were so obvious that the Camden Journal has never yet published it, although directly urged by a writer in its own columns to do so, and the party in Columbia thought proper to substitute another address of different spirit in its stead.

So much for the article which you have reviewed, and which you have treated as an attack upon Gen. Owens and Hon. Dixon Barnes—with the first of these gentlemen I have no acquaintance; I certainly entertain towards him no ill will, in fact the only tie that ever bound me to any of his name was of such a

nature as would prevent my feeling otherwise than kindly to him, unless for good cause.—With the latter gentleman I have been long and intimately acquainted, and have repeatedly expressed the regret that the manner of his nomination and other circumstances forbid my voting for him; this much in justice to myself, now for some little justice to you. As to your capitals "N. C." "with an impertinent crooked back little fellow behind them asking questions," they are entirely out of place, as "Catawba" is much nearer North Carolina than I have ever lived, and I hope I shall never prove myself quite such a Rip Van Winkle as you evince yourself to be. Your next step proclaims you a modest gentleman who does not appreciate his own writings, for you say that you are "not disposed to give importance to trashy communications." And it further shows that you and our kind friend, the Editor, differ; for he sets you up in his second Editorial column. You say, sir, in quoting the heading of the article "What is the meaning of this?" That question should have been your conclusion. You were then confessedly beyond your depth and should have gone no further. You did not understand the head, nor, to judge you kindly, did you understand the body. For your particular benefit I would inform you that in a free translation, not quite so liberal as yours however, I omitted the word "ridiculous," I now beg leave to amend.

As to the "sanction" of Cols. Preston and Chesnut, I beg permission to inform you that I wear no collar; my intercourse with the former has been slight and casual; you will readily believe it has been pleasant; the latter and myself are personal friends, but no obligation has ever been incurred by either, other than such as springs from mutual regard and confidence. You charge as a mark of "spite" that I omitted the titles of your nominees; you call it small and speak of it as illustrating "how little some people can make themselves appear." Now "Catawba" who looks small? Who feels small? You have made yourself the smallest of all small things, the small critic. The omission, if one at all, was inadvertent, and if I recollect aright, the same occurs in the same paragraph as regards the Co-operation nominees. While in a preceding one they do receive the title "Cols." while your "favorites" do not receive their title; but can a qualification prefixed add dignity to an illustrious name; but I forbear lest you bring another charge of malice against good natured me.

As for the evidence that Cols. Preston and Chesnut "exclusively have a place" in the minds and affections of the people "of this Congressional District"—aye, "Catawba," I have such evidence, and the first Monday in October will "show it," and although we boast no "germs" or "guillotine," and do not desire the death of any one, to furnish a tragedy. We will have a nice little comic affair, in which your "ridiculous mas" shall be deprived of his caudal appendage.

And now, "Catawba," I will notice a part of your performance, in which, it you be sincere, you are really charming. How refreshing it is to find a Secessionist who does not know what is meant by "cocking necks," "prosecution," "sacrifice," &c. &c. If it were possible for you to remain in this blissful state of ignorance, I certainly could not be so cruel as to enlighten you, but I fear you have already been taught, by being dilled in the "awkward squad" ever since that piece was written. I may then say, that statesmen have been threatened to have "their necks cranked before a Federal cow-catcher can pick them up"—that Banks are threatened with a loss of their charters unless their officers keep out of politics, and that chosen organ of your party, "The Carolinian," remarkable for its good taste, decency, and disinterested patriotism, opens its columns to those who threaten judges with the loss of their gowns. Well may you, if you be a lover of your country, exclaim, "Won't some body read the riot act?" for there is a spirit abroad in the land which thirsts to pull down to its own level, all that is elevated and pure, and which, if not checked, will destroy the reputation of our State, heretofore remarkable for the gentleness and proprieties of private life.

I feel assured, Catawba, if you will take the trouble to read my article over again, you will see that you have misrepresented me most grossly, I would hope unintentionally. Of that you can best judge. In this day, sir, when malignity and a hiding place are regarded as the essential characteristics of a Junius, I am loth to enter the lists of anonymous scribblers, and therefore wrote over a description which here, "under existing circumstances" was equivalent to the announcement of my name. (I never contemplated attracting the attention of "Lancaster.") Wishing to avoid notoriety, however, further than you have forced it upon me, I forbear to use my own name at it, and subscribe myself CAROLINA.

LETTER JUDGE WITHERS TO THE LANCASTER MEETING.

Gentlemen: I have received your invitation, on behalf of the Co-operation and Southern Rights party of Lancaster District, to attend a meeting fixed for the first day of October next. As you anticipated that I could not be present, you ask, in that case, for an expression of my views and opinions by letter upon the all-absorbing questions that now agitate the State.

Many of them have been already expressed, and have gained such degree of publicity as to render them accessable to those who read co-operation Newspapers. So far they remain unchanged.

I am opposed to the scheme of separate nationality, prescribed by a party for S. Carolina. I have read whatever I could lay my hands on in favor of that course, and I am wholly unable to understand what good it will bring to the people of this State. In former letters, however, I have suggested many aggravated evils, to which, I believe, it would lead. Do we want more territory for the contingency of a surplus slave-population? By taking a solitary, isolated position, we cut ourselves off from every square foot of that which is now unoccupied and open to us, beyond the limits of South Carolina. Do we want peace and security for life, liberty, and property, and the

pursuit of happiness in every mode in which it is sought? Is it not a singular policy to pursue such paramount objects in the face of a hostility the most intense and formidable, by quitting an association, solitary and alone, wherein if we have enemies, we have also friends, who, if we do not refuse them by perverse arrogance, must ultimately be bound to us by something stronger than hooks of steel? Is it not an incomprehensible sort of logic that tells us, that we now see, by recent elections, none of these friends will co-operate with us, and in the next breath assures us, that if we will still further affront them, by the act of Separate Secession, they will fly to our arms? This is the latest phase of Secession logic that I have observed. It has had other phases. At one time we were told, that we had better not meet our confederates at all—lest their coldness might render us somewhat frigid; that our true course was to enter alone into the harvest of free trade and reap the whole crop; that if our error should chance to be interrupted by a floating Custom-house, foreign guns, and active privateering would relieve us of that obstacle—that if (after the Spanish fashion) a cordon of collecting agents should surround our borders, why then like the British adventurers in the Spanish case, we would resort to smuggling, and tempt our neighbors to confederate in that. The long and bloody war, that grew out of the case recommended as our model, has never been communicated, I believe to enquirers. I do not know that such considerations have been urged upon you of Lancaster; if they have, I should be shocked to know, that a scheme which contains the germ of a foreign protectorate, especially that of the British Crown, or one that bases national prosperity upon national prostitution—should command the favor of many of you.

Let any of your "State Army" friends inform you, if he can, how Separate Secession will give you any of California—how it will help you into New Mexico or Utah—how it will repeal the law forbidding the Slave-trade in the District of Columbia—how it will dull the edge, or turn away the shafts, of the malignant enemies of the Carolina slave-holder—how a runaway slave will be captured with more facility than he may now be—whether he can then be recovered even in Georgia, Tennessee, or North Carolina—whether a slave can be carried into either of those States, or into any territory now within the limits of the Union? If he affirms we shall procure a Southern Confederacy, you may well inquire why he now affirms that co-operation is an obsolete idea? Beg him to explain how he will contrive to drag Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, &c. into his embrace? If finally, he mounts into the heroes, and proclaims, that it is becoming in South Carolina to drive into the glories of martyrdom, to play the part of Sampson (who by the bye had only himself to sacrifice) by seizing, in a fit of desperate revenge, the pillars of the Temple, and burying, in common ruin, himself and her enemies suggest to your friend that the fury of his indignation may have dethroned his judgment; that you prefer to entrust the destinies of a Commonwealth in the keeping of those who are neither as furious as Sampson, nor as blind; that you have a degree of apprehension that our Sampsons may play the part of him of old, with a certain variation, to-wit: that they may contrive to bury themselves and their friends in ruin, and not our enemies. Gentlemen, it is of the last importance not to mistake the question, nor allow others to substitute one that is fictitious. It is not one of resisting one or a given set of measures. It is this: How shall slave-owners provide new guards for their security? All the world, external to them, is malignant against them. The enemy is formidable indeed, sleepless, venomous, watching every opportunity to make a fatal attack. All the slave-power combined is not too strong for the contest, and the whole is, and will continue to be, the object of incessant assaults. Shall we offer ourselves in detail to be cut off as an easy prey? Shall we weaken our own position and the common cause, by an act not peculiarly necessary now, or at a given time, rather than at some other, against which our confederates protest, as unnecessary and unwise in their judgments? I say no—and would take every opportunity at the ballot-box to proclaim the sentiment. If you concur with me, you will do likewise. Believing you are right in the cause you advocate, I wish you success.

Your ob't serv't. T. J. WITHERS. To Gen. McD. Witherspoon, Esq., and others, Committee, &c.

NEW-ORLEANS Oct. 3.

On Friday Cotton was active, and four thousand bales changed hands. Middling was worth 8 1/4. The sales of the week comprise sixteen thousand, and the receipts for the same period twenty-nine thousand, and for the season seventy six thousand bales. The stock amounts to sixty five thousand bales.

BALTIMORE, Oct. 4.

The Promachus has arrived at New York with \$100,000 in gold. She brings San Francisco dates to the 6th ult. The Whig majority in the city of San Francisco is a thousand. The returns indicate the election of a Whig Governor, and Democratic Congressmen. The Legislature is doubtful. "Another account says that BAGLER, (Dem.) will probably be elected Governor.

Vitality of Seeds.—"Ion," a Washington correspondent of the Baltimore Sun, in a letter to that paper, says:

"I received last winter two seeds, said to be wheat, which were found in the folds of the Egyptian mummy which Mr. Gliddon unrolled in Boston. The mummy was supposed to be one of the Pharaohs. It proved to be a priestess, and to be more than thirty centuries old.

"The seeds were shaped something like pearl barley, and of that size, and were of a dark tinge, and if colored by the same preparation which had been used in the process of embalming.

"I planted the two seeds in a flower-pot in the spring. They germinated, grew freely, and one of the plants bears a hundred or more grains. The other is more backward, and is still in flower. The leaf resembles maize, and the