

right. If we fold our arms, and exhibit a perfect indifference whether the Laws of the Union are obeyed or not, all will be quiet! This, I admit, would be an admirable mode to avoid collision and prevent disturbance: but is it one that we can submit to? The moment we fail to counteract the Nullification proceedings of South Carolina, the Union is dissolved; for, in this government of laws union is obedience, and obedience is union. The moment South Carolina—

[Mr. Calhoun.—Who relies upon force in this controversy? I have insisted upon it that South Carolina relied altogether on civil process, and that, if the General Government resorts to force, then only will South Carolina rely upon force. If force be introduced by either party, upon that party will fall the responsibility.]

Mr. Wilkins. The General Government will not appeal in the first instance to force. It will appeal to the patriotism of South Carolina—to that magnanimity of which she boasts so much.

[Mr. Calhoun.—I am sorry that South Carolina cannot appeal to the sense of justice of the General Government.] Order! Order! (from one or two members.)

Mr. Wilkins.—The Government will appeal to that political sense which exhorts obedience to the laws of the country, as the first duty of the citizen. It will appeal to the moral force in the community. If that appeal be in vain, it will appeal to the Judiciary. If the mild arm of the Judiciary be not sufficient to execute the laws, it will call out the civil force to sustain the laws. If that be insufficient, God save and protect us from the last resort. But if the evil does come upon the country, who is responsible for it? If force be brought in to the aid of law, who, I ask of gentlemen, is responsible for it to the people of the United States? That is the question. Talk of it as you please, mystify matters as you will, theorize as you may, pile up abstract propositions to any extent, at last the question resolves itself into one of obedience or resistance of the laws—in other words, of union or disunion. Wherein, said Mr. W., consists our liberty? What is the foundation of our political institutions which we boast of; which we hold up to the world for imitation, and for the enjoyment of which the votary of freedom pants in every country of the globe—what is it? It is that of a government where the people make the laws, and where the people obey the laws which they themselves have made. This is our system of government, and by a large majority of the people it is respected accordingly. Why, Sir, said Mr. W. if you were to carry into effect the ultra doctrine of South Carolina at this moment, repeal your whole protective system, shut up our factories, stop our wheels, extinguish our fires, &c.—nay, ruin us by your legislation—yet would the people of Pennsylvania obey the laws, and abide your decision. But then they would appeal to the people, they would endeavour to bring public opinion to act upon Congress, and bear them back into the right course. They would appeal to moral influence, and to that alone.

I know, said Mr. W. that the gentleman from South Carolina cannot anticipate the application of force in the case now presented: but I pray him, again and again, to advert to one particular paragraph of the Ordinance. There were several cases in which the use of force is referred to in the Ordinance, in which Mr. W. admitted the right to use it. If, for example, as in a case supposed, Congress intended to overrun and subdue the State of South Carolina and overturn their liberties, he admitted the right of resistance by force. But, come down to the contingency in which the Ordinance declares that force shall be used, and it is in the event of the attempt by the U. States to enforce the execution of the Revenue Laws. "Enforce" is the word employed by the Ordinance. For the meaning of this word it was not necessary to resort to Johnson or Webster: the law may be "enforced" by execution, by judicial process, by a simple demand of payment of duties by an U. States Officer. It needs not the iron grasp of power, the naked sword, or fixed bayonet, to constitute enforcement of the laws. You enforce the laws every day, and every hour of every day, in the most tranquil state of society. This enforcement of the laws it is which is, after the 1st of February, to be constructed into an attempt to put down the people of South Carolina, and to justify the calling forth of thousands upon thousands of armed men to resist it!

Mr. W. here referred to the Charleston Mercury, which he held in his hands, containing the proceedings of a great meeting held at Charleston, S. C. on the 21st instant, among which were a number of resolutions, adopting the cockade to which he had reference yesterday, intermingled with notices of "Call to arms!" "Attention, volunteers!" &c. and one of these Resolutions (which he read) declares that the persons assembled at this meeting not only affirm the right of the State peaceably to secede from the Union, but are prepared if need be, to peril their lives in the assertion of this claim, &c. Yes, Sir, said Mr. W. if not prevented, secession is at hand; for the very moment that the Marshal of the District calls out the posse comitatus, and heads that posse to enforce a judgment of the Federal Court to compel the payment of duties on imports (after the first of February) then has the contingency occurred of an attempt

to enforce the laws; then has secession become the alternative. With regard to secession, Mr. W. went on to cite cases to shew the consequences to which the admission of this right in any State would lead, should other States adopt the heresy affirmed by the meeting whose proceedings he had read. This view of the subject he followed by saying, that Nullification, unless merged in revolution, was not to be stopped. The honorable member had told the House, that laying this bill on the table, and passing the bill pending in the other House, would put a stop to nullification. But what surety was there even of this? After the first of February, Nullification, with all its attributes and incidents, was to be in full operation in South Carolina. What would be its political operation? Where would it end? He put this question plainly to the gentleman from South Carolina. A Convention of the States was out of the question; an amendment of the Constitution was out of the question: where was the contest to end? Why, the laws must be suspended. South Carolina, whilst represented on this floor (ably as she is, and he hoped long would be) participating in the making of laws, would be obeying just such of them as she pleased, and no more—cutting and carving with her own sword to suit herself! What a state of things was this!

[Mr. Calhoun here said, that South Carolina would be content to maintain this contest upon the principle of protection, paying without objection whatever taxes might be required to be levied for the purposes of revenue.]

Mr. Wilkins. If South Carolina appeals to the Federal Judiciary, she can bring up the question of the validity of any part of the revenue laws for decision by the Federal Courts. Mr. W. had no doubt of the influence of the Senator from South Carolina over the people of that State, but no one had power to say what course that State would take if the suggestion of the Senator should be adopted. We must take this matter as we unfortunately find it. The merchants of Charleston may import goods free of duty, and the merchants of Baltimore, New York, &c. must pay duties. The people of South Carolina are exempt from all taxation, by duties on imports, which is the only taxation known to our laws; and the people of the rest of the Union are compelled to pay taxes. South Carolina is pledged to maintain, and it declares that no power shall prevent free ingress and egress into and from her ports. Every stream of water in the limits of the State, accessible from the ocean, is made a free port. Wherever goods are introduced and landed, all obligation to pay the duties vanishes before the magical influence of nullification.

[The remainder next week.]

HISTORICAL MYSTERY.

"To be or not to be—that's the question."

A most admirable discussion is now going on in European circles, on the question whether Louis Philippe, King of France, is Louis Philippe. The Baroness Steinberg, formerly Lady Newborough has published a pamphlet, under the title of "Maria Stella, or the criminal exchange of a young girl of the highest birth for a boy of the lowest condition;" in which she denies the legitimacy of Louis Philippe, and asserts her own claim to the throne of France. The facts alleged by this lady, as abridged from the Caledonian Mercury, are, that in 1773 the Duke de Chartres; afterwards Duke d'Orleans, alias Philippe Egalite, travelled in Italy with the Duchess de Chartres, under the name of Joinville; that during the Duchess's accouchement they staid at Modigliana, where she was delivered of a daughter; that Maria Stella, afterwards Lady Newborough and Baroness Steinberg, is that same person, and is accordingly Mademoiselle d'Orleans; that she was by her real father, the Duke de Chartres, exchanged with the jailor, Chiapini, for a boy, of whom Madame Chiapini was delivered about the same time; that Louis Philippe King of the French is that same boy; that the Duke de Chartres' motive for making the exchange was to secure in his family a considerable property, which would have gone past him to another branch unless he had male issue; that the Duchess de Chartres had several daughters before this time, and now despaired of ever having sons; that the Baroness Steinberg found her information respecting her origin strongly confirmed by family likeness, and that she took the opinion of several eminent French lawyers on her case, and always obtained one in her favor. She inserts in her book, letters from several of the gentlemen of the long robe, with their full signatures.

Admitting the facts alleged to be true, they place Louis Philippe in the same predicament with a great many other persons, who are not in reality what they think they are.—*Lucell Journal.*

Plattsburg, N. Y. Jan. 11.—A singular case, and one which has produced no little excitement in the neighborhood of the parties, came before Judge Warford for examination, during the last week, in this village, in which two mothers claimed the same child—the one as her legitimate, the other as her illegitimate offspring. The examination occupied nearly two days, and was ably managed by counsel on both sides. The Judge awarded the child to the unmarried woman.

From the Yaikin and Catawba Journal.  
We earnestly invite the attention of our readers to the following letter, in answer to one received from the secretary of a political committee in Georgia. Gen. Joseph Graham of Lincoln county, is one of the worthies of our glorious revolution, who, no doubt, "died and suffered" as much as most men, now living, to the south, for the establishment of American Independence, and the happy form of government under which we now live." It is exceedingly well written, and should, from its source, command the respect and attention of every one who reveres the grey hairs of the patriots who toiled and shed their blood for the privileges which the people of the U. States enjoy.  
Lincoln Co. N. C. Nov. 15, 1832.

GENTLEMEN: I acknowledge the receipt of yours of the 9th of August, containing the proceedings of a meeting assembled in your state, in the town of Athens, and certain resolutions appointing you a corresponding committee. If the subject you propose, had been only of such a complexion as those we have frequently had for the last forty years; a bickering between the ins and outs for who should rule, I would have remained silent, as in a government like ours we might expect it, and such is often salutary. But when so serious a measure, as resistance to the laws and the government under which we live, and are prospering now as well as heretofore, it ought to alarm every real patriot and true friend to his country.

The views of your committee, I think are correct, in stating that the citizens of the western part of this state, have a common interest with those in the western part of Georgia and South-Carolina; our farmers raise cotton say from one to one hundred bales annually, and market it at Charleston, Columbia, Camden and Fayetteville; we purchase Kentucky and Tennessee hogs, mules and horses, sometimes a slave or two, and pay off former notes and accounts; with the balance of the proceeds of our cotton we purchase goods, in the first place indispensable, such as salt, sugar, tea, &c. then according to the fancy or ability of the purchaser and his family, the rest in finery or stylish articles. Although there is much identity in the mode and manner in which we live, yet I believe on descending into details, we shall discover that we are not oppressed, and perhaps pay but little more, if any, than what is our just proportion, for the support of government, which every good citizen will admit he ought to pay. In the Athens meeting it is stated that the late tariff law is unconstitutional, oppressive and unjust. Though I am no jurist and have no disposition to meet this question with men of such high legal attainments, still I would beg leave to state some facts, and make from them some practical and common sense inferences.—The first tariff law we ever had under our constitution, was approved by President Washington on the 4th day of July, 1789, the preamble of which, among other objects, avows the protection of manufactures, and this act was passed by a Congress, a large part of whom formed the constitution, and when the question was taken on the general principle of protection, it passed unanimously. Afterwards some difference existed in making out the details of the amount on each article. I find that then as at present, (by way of protection,) cotton imported into the United States, was taxed 3 cents per pound, manufactured tobacco 6 cents, snuff 10 cents and cheese 4 cents per pound; beer, ale and cider, 5 cents per gallon, &c. And under every change of the administration of the government from that time to this, (upwards of 40 years) they have legislated on the same principles, and the constitutionality was never questioned, until within a few years past. Those men, executive and legislative, were all sworn to support the constitution of the U. States, and it cannot be that they were so ignorant as not to understand it, nor yet so corrupt as to legislate contrary to the provisions it contained, for many of them were men of superior talents and integrity, and of more political honesty and real patriotism, than can be found in the same number at the present day. Indeed, all the fathers of the political church concurred in this opinion, until the politicians of yesterday are for giving us a new version of the constitution. It may be answered, that although Congress did legislate for the protection of manufactures, still the duties were lower than at present—granted, but it is constitutional to give one cent duty by way of protection, where is its limit? The judgment of those who administer the government, must determine how far it is politic or expedient to extend it.

Another charge made by the Athens meeting is, that the tariff is unequal and therefore unjust. In any system of taxation, perfect equality is not attainable, in some of the states, for state purposes, their taxes are laid on the capital each man possesses. In North-Carolina, we have it on lands, slaves, polls, &c. bonds and money are not included. Every state has its own mode; that which approximates nearest equality is best, but you will find none of them are so. The constitution of the U. S. assumes the ratio of representation as the basis of equality, for direct taxation; and that of indirect, may in some measure be ascertained by the same scale.

Agreeably to the last census taken, we have about 12,000,000 federal numbers, and all appear to concur, that about that number of dollars is sufficient to defray the

ordinary expenses of the government—therefore, if I or any other house-keeper, pay no more dollars than we have federal numbers in our family, we come short of our just proportion. I have tried this rule with eight or ten substantial planters, as far as they could recollect of what they had purchased of imported articles for twelve months past, and calculated the duties imposed on each article, and it lacks considerable of a fair ratio, with each of them. One cause of this may be that most families manufacture clothing for their negroes; it is spun by their women in wet days and bad weather, when they cannot work out, and it is commonly wove at home. Sheep thrive as well here, as in any other place; each family have wool enough for domestic use, and you will see the slaves in the winter well clad with linsey woolsey, (cotton and wool) an article superior for that purpose to the imported plains and Kendall cottons; indeed many of the whites, for common use, are dressed in the same style.—Such cloth, a yard wide, is sold at from 30 to 40 cents per yard. Now these details you may think descending to small things, but small things are the foundation of great ones, and I fear the want of attention to them, is the cause at the present time of the excitement that threatens our peace.—I cannot discover that it makes any difference with me, or others, whether the duties required to defray the common expenses, are levied on one article, or twenty, or on every thing supported; provided there is an equality of consumption in proportion to the ability of each to pay it; but to the authority with which the constitution has vested this power, I cheerfully submit in the confidence that they will exercise it judiciously. In the act passed by the last Congress, I find woollens taxed rather higher than any other article, and it is contended that this is levying a tax on the south for the benefit of the north. Now is there a state to the north, where there is more than one in every two hundred souls engaged in the manufacture of woollens? And does not their climate require them to wear more woollens than ours? If the duties therefore enhance the price of woollens, have they not to pay the same as we, deducting the transportation and mercantile profit? Is it not probable that they pay more than their proportion on this article? and yet we do not hear the other one hundred and ninety-nine complaining of oppression. As to the growth of wool itself, any where above the sand hills, we can raise it cheaper than they can to the north. The subsistence of sheep here will not cost half as much as in New-Hampshire, agreeable to the evidence taken by the committee on manufactures some years past. A duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem is imposed on manufactures of cotton; no purchaser pays this on any of the common kinds used; it is only on the finer sort, wanted by a few, that this tax operates. The fact is, that the supply of the domestic manufacture, is pursued to an extent which far exceeds the demands for home use, and a surplus is exported to South America, where they compete with the British in that market; the natural consequence is, that domestic competition brings down the prices to the lowest cost of production. It is not only so with the manufactures of cotton, but of every other article. We make a supply beyond the demand for home consumption. In one principle, all parties agree, that it is to the interest of the community, to purchase every thing they want at the cheapest rate; but they are not agreed how this is attainable. But practically, I think it is plain that when the home manufacture is added to the foreign importation, the market is then supplied to repletion, and beyond the demand.

I find, all that might be advanced in detail on this subject, far exceeds the bounds of a letter; it would take volumes. But why undertake to chop logic or reason on abstract theory? Practically—who is oppressed by the tariff, when every thing is much cheaper than they were when the tariff was lower than at present? It is not the costs of production that is the measure of value to the manufacturer, nor yet the price paid by the merchant. They both have to take for it what they can get in the market. If it stays on their hands and cannot be sold at cost, it is so much dead or unproductive capital to them; hence it is their interest to dispose of it at some price. This often occurs when there is an abundant supply in the market beyond the demand, as at present of most articles.—Competition for supply, and that from various places, is the soul of business, and the more of it the better for the purchasers, and domestic competition more so than any other, because it has a tendency to produce uniformity of prices, and is often effected by exchanges of the farmers' surpluses of one kind of property for another, and is not subject to the disturbing causes of foreign policy or foreign laws, or the contingencies of long voyages and insurances at a high premium.

The farmer does not always purchase his necessities where he can buy the cheapest; but finds it most for his interest where he can pay the easiest. On examining the subject in all its bearings, it is believed the excitement produced by the tariff to the south, is fanciful, and not warranted by the occasion; and that at no time since the federal government commenced, could citizens who are clear of debt, practice a moderate degree of industry and economy, not enga-

ging in speculation or living in extravagance beyond their means to support it, live as comfortable as any many of the necessaries and even luxuries of life, at a moderate rate as they can do at present.

But if the tariff is as oppressive as it is represented to be, is resistance to it, or nullification, the proper and constitutional mode of redress? The constitution says, the President shall take care that the laws are faithfully executed. And an act of Congress approved by Gen. Washington on the 28th of February, 1795, defines his duty in such cases, and another act to the same purpose approved by Mr. Jefferson on the 3d of March, 1807. Would it not have been prudent to have repealed or nullified those two acts of Congress first? That the President will feel himself bound to discharge the duties enjoined on him by these acts of Congress, is not to be doubted, but the consequences be what they may, as you solicit information on the subject, as far as I can learn, none of the citizens of this State, or any where north of the 35th degree of latitude, will co-operate, aid or abet, in resistance to the tariff, or any other laws passed by Congress.

Feeling conscious, that in proportion to my capacity, I have done and suffered as much as most men, now living, to the South, for the establishment of American Independence, and the happy form of government under which we live; and having realized for half a century, all the blessings and protection from it that I anticipated in the dark period of 1779, 80 and 81, and having from that time witnessed the rapid progression in wealth, numbers, civilization and happiness of my country; and ardently wishing that it might so continue to the end of time; you may judge what must be our sensations to see any attempt to blight these fair prospects, by one part of our country pursuing a course that may lead to civil war, or a separation of the states, without any adequate cause. I have always considered the whole United States as one and indivisible, and the general government, under constitutional limits, exercising a paternal jurisdiction over the interests of the states, like an indulgent parent with his children, affording them assistance or protection, when needed, the such assistance and protection from time to time has been afforded to the state of Georgia, more than most of the other states. I think will be acknowledged.

It would have been courteous to myself and other fellow soldiers, that you would have delayed a few years until we should have joined the ranks of our former commanders, WASHINGTON, LINCOLN and GREENE, and not have the mortification to witness from all our toils, dangers and privations were for naught, that the government we assisted to establish, which appeared calculated to promote the happiness of the human race, beyond any that preceded it, to see it tumble into ruins, must be appalling to every patriot that has a practical knowledge of what the establishment of it cost. I am, gentlemen, with great respect, yet most obedient servant,  
JOS. GRAHAM.

Samuel Rockwell, Esq. Secretary of the Athens Committee at Millidgeville, Georgia.

FOREIGN ITEMS.

A wife of two Husbands!—There is now living at Sandiacre, a woman who has married two husbands. They both live in the same village, and she, very conveniently, sometimes is found with one, and sometimes with the other, and amongst them all the greatest peace and harmony prevails!  
*Nottingham Review.*

Among the prizes awarded by the Paris Academy of Sciences, at their last sitting, was the following:—"To Israel Robert, workman, for the substitution of the action of a machine for that of the human lungs, in glass blowing, 8,000 francs. By means of this valuable invention the health of the glass blower will, in future, be preserved, and the product of his manufacture greatly improved both as regards accuracy of form and the capability of making articles of greater dimensions than was formerly possible."

A communication de lunatico inquired sat at Gray's Inn Coffee House, London, to try the soundness of mind of Mr. C. Wright, the well known wine merchant of the Opera Colonnade, when a verdict was returned, that he had been of unsound mind since the 15th May, 1830. Amongst other delusions under which this celebrated individual is laboring, he fancies that he is the son of the late Duke of York; that he has got Madame Vestris' legs instead of his own; that all the money in the Bank of England belongs to him; and that he is the proprietor of the Opera House and Drury-lane Theatre.

Stultz.—The celebrated London tailor, Stultz, lately died at Aries in the South of France, on an estate lately bought by him for £103,000; his property besides this exceeds £400,000.

The Queen is very fond of driving out, at Brighton, in a carriage drawn by four beautiful greys, and on these occasions, the outriders are mounted on horses of the same color. This has given rise to the following squib:

"In times full of changing, as these are, all say, The King and the Queen still adhere to the Grey. With this only difference—a most trifling thing— The Queen drives the Greys, while the Greys drive the King."