



TARBOROUGH

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1832.

The Cholera.—The Edenton Miscellany, of last Wednesday, states that the Cholera has at length taken a decided stand in that town, several cases having occurred among the colored population....and has also received information from a respectable source that the malady has appeared at Ocracoke. At Elizabeth City, 13 deaths are reported since our last, 8 of which are said to have been from Cholera: it has also broken out on several neighboring plantations. At Richmond, Va. it is supposed there are from 70 to 80 cases a day, and from 20 to 25 deaths: the disease has also appeared in the Penitentiary. It has also broken out with unparalleled severity in some of the plantations on the Potomac, 20 or 30 miles below Washington. In other places the disease has disappeared, or is rapidly subsiding.

Review.—The two regiments of this county were reviewed week before last by Brig. Gen. Louis D. Wilson....the first regiment at this place, and the second at James Bridges's. The first regiment, under the command of Col. Bell, assisted by Col. Carter Jones, who kindly volunteered his services with those of his excellent band of music, performed several military evolutions much to the satisfaction of the commanding General, and to the gratification of our citizens. The high state of discipline and warlike appearance of our volunteer companies, the Swift Creek Grays, the Tarborough Guards, and the Edgecombe Cavalry, excited universal admiration. We learn that Gen. Wilson was much pleased with the discipline, &c. of both regiments.

Presidential Election.—As the Presidential election, which takes place in this State on Thursday, the 8th November next, is rapidly approaching, much speculation is afloat respecting the probable result. The following statement exhibits the number of Electors of President and Vice President, to which each State is entitled under the new apportionment—also the number of votes given to each of the Presidential candidates at the last election, in 1828:—

Electors in 1832. Jackson. Adams.		
1 New York,	42	20
2 Pennsylvania,	30	28
3 Virginia,	23	24
4 Ohio,	21	16
5 North Carolina,	15	15
6 Kentucky,	15	14
7 Tennessee,	15	11
8 Massachusetts,	14	15
9 South Carolina,	11	11
10 Georgia,	11	9
11 Maryland,	10	5
12 Maine,	10	1
13 Indiana,	9	5
14 New Jersey,	8	8
15 Connecticut,	8	8
16 Vermont,	7	7
17 New Hampshire,	7	8
18 Alabama,	7	5
19 Louisiana,	5	5
20 Illinois,	5	3
21 Rhode Island,	4	4
22 Missouri,	4	3
23 Mississippi,	4	3
24 Delaware,	3	3
Total,	288	178
		83

Since 1828, however, public sentiment appears somewhat to have changed: in Maine and New Hampshire the Jackson party have acquired the ascendancy; and New York, having adopted the general ticket system, will now give her undivided vote to one of the candidates. Adding the votes of these States to those which at the last election voted for Gen. Jackson, he will receive 239 votes; leaving 49 votes to be divided between Messrs. Clay and Wirt. But the Opposition appear to be confident of obtaining the votes of New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Maine, Indiana, and Louisiana, making in all 132 votes; which added to those conceded to them, would amount to 181 votes; leaving 107 votes for Gen. Jackson, and of these, the 11 votes of South Carolina are considered somewhat doubtful.

It will thus be seen, that the votes mutually conceded by all parties, stand for the Administration, 96; for the Opposition, 49; doubtful, 143. The anti-masons and national republicans having doubled teams against Gen. Jackson in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, are in hopes thus to defeat his election by the people and throw it in the House of Representatives; but we doubt not they will be woefully disappointed.

As regards the Vice Presidency, an election by the people is rather more doubtful. Mr. Van Buren will run on the Jackson ticket, without opposition, except in Pennsylvania and the six Southern States. The Jacksonians in Pennsylvania appear determined to give the vote of

that State to Mr. Wilkins; and powerful efforts are making to give the votes of the Southern States to Judge Barbour: what will be the result it is impossible to say, as both parties appear to be sanguine of success.

Electoral Tickets.—The Raleigh Constitutionalist of last Wednesday says: "It affords us pleasure to state that we expect to be able to announce the names of the Jackson and Van Buren Electors in our next paper. Every district being filled with the exception of two, and in these steps have been taken to make a nomination; we hope also by that time to be furnished with the Address of the Central Committee, which is anxiously looked for." The Star says:

"So numerous have the applications been of late to know whether the Jackson and Barbour Electoral Ticket of this State has been formed, and why it has not been announced in the papers, that for the purpose of gratifying those who feel an interest on the subject, we take the liberty of anticipating the Central Committee in their announcement of the Ticket, by publishing the names of such persons as have been selected as candidates for Electors; by which it will be seen that the Ticket only requires Electoral candidates for the 5th and 13th districts, (usually called the Caswell and Edgecombe districts,) to render it complete. These vacancies, we are in hopes, will be filled in a few days, when the Ticket will be speedily announced by the Central Committee."

- 1st dist. Gen. John M'Dowell, of Rutherford.
- 2d, Col. Anderson Mitchell, of Ashe.
- 3d, Col. Wm. J. Alexander, of Mecklenburg.
- 4th, John Giles, Esq. of Rowan.
- 5th,
- 6th, Charles J. Williams, Esq. of Chatham.
- 7th, Archibald M'Bryde, Esq. of Moore.
- 8th, James Mebane, Esq. of Orange.
- 9th, Gen. Nicholson Washington, of Wayne.
- 10th, Hon. Willis Alston, of Halifax.
- 11th, George B. Outlaw, Esq. of Bertie.
- 12th, Gen. Richard T. Brownrigg, of Chowan.
- 13th,
- 14th, Col. Isaac Croom, of Lenoir.
- 15th, John Owen, Esq. of Bladen.

The Correspondence.—We have received the correspondence between Gov. Hamilton and Vice President Calhoun, on the subject of State Rights. We regret that the extreme length of Mr. Calhoun's letter precludes its insertion; we may, however, hereafter give some extracts.

[P] We insert below the correspondence between the Committee of the Shocco meeting and Judge Barbour, relative to the Protective System, Internal Improvements, U. S. Bank, and Nullification. The Judge, it seems, is opposed to Nullification, and is of the opinion, that when the reserved rights of the States are invaded by the General Government, "the only rightful remedy is that of secession." We freely confess that on this point we differ—Nullification may lead to disunion, which we regard as the greatest calamity, save that of a loss of liberty, that could befall these States individually and collectively; but the secession of one State only, immediately severs the chain, perhaps forever, which heretofore has united us so happily and so prosperously. Would it not be better, when the reserved rights of a State are supposed to be invaded by either branch of the General Government in such a vital manner that its citizens would prefer disunion to submission, that the authorities of the State should declare the obnoxious law, decree, or decision, inoperative within its limits, and thus present an opportunity for an amicable adjustment, than for them immediately to declare that her reserved rights are invaded, and they are determined no longer to remain in the Union? Would it have been better for Georgia, instead of nullifying the mandate of the Supreme Court in the Indian case, immediately on the receipt of the mandamus to have declared that her reserved rights were invaded, that she must be regarded as no longer a member of the Union, and have adopted measures for a separation from her sister States? Would it be better for South Carolina to adopt this course respecting the Tariff, in preference to arresting its operation within her limits? In the one case, we think, *disunion* is inevitable; in the other, it may be avoided. Viewing Nullification in this light, we regard it as a conservative rather than a destructive principle, and prefer it to secession, as "a rightful remedy."

From the Raleigh Constitutionalist.

Copy of a letter addressed to Philip P. Barbour, Esq. in conformity to a resolution adopted at a political meeting held at Shocco Springs, N. C. on the 25th ult. by the Committee appointed to correspond with Messrs. Barbour and Van Buren; with Mr. Barbour's reply.

Shocco Springs, N. C. Aug. 25, 1832.
SIR: At a numerous meeting of citizens from various parts of our State, brought together by accident and composed of persons differing in opinion on the several important subjects embraced in the resolutions herein enclosed, and differing

also in their views on the election of a Vice President of the United States. The resolutions herewith forwarded were unanimously adopted, and we were appointed in conformity with said resolutions a Committee charged with forwarding you a copy, and respectfully soliciting an early reply, to the several questions therein proposed.

It is unnecessary for us to add our desire for an explicit avowal of your views on these subjects, for you must be aware that they are producing much excitement throughout our country, and it is a matter of great importance that the public should distinctly understand those who are candidates for high and distinguished stations on all the leading topics which agitate the public mind.—We have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servants,

Jos. H. Bryan,
J. T. Granberry,
Memucan Hunt.

Hon. P. P. Barbour.

Frescati, Sept. 9th, 1832.

GENTLEMEN: I have received your letter of the 25th ult. enclosing certain resolutions adopted at a political meeting, held on that day, at Shocco Springs, Warren county, North Carolina.

In conformity to one of those resolutions, you ask me to state my sentiments in relation to the *Protective System, Internal Improvement, the Bank of the United States and Nullification.*

Whilst I should be altogether unwilling to obtrude my opinions in regard to political questions upon the public, I am equally loth to withhold them, when thus publicly and explicitly called upon to express them. I therefore without hesitancy proceed to answer the inquiries. I understand the committee to ask what my opinions are, not by what process of reasoning I have been led to adopt them.

First then as to the Protective System, by which I mean the laying of imposts, not to raise revenue for the sake of revenue, but to support domestic manufactures against foreign competition. I am decidedly, and utterly opposed to the whole system, upon the various grounds of its being in violation of the *spirit of the Constitution*, and being unjust, unequal and oppressive in its operation. I enclose two speeches delivered by me on this subject, in the House of Representatives; the first in 1820, and the other in 1824, in which you will see my views at length, on all these grounds.

Next in order is the subject of Internal Improvement. I consider that whole system, when attempted to be executed by Congress, whether in the form of *construction, or appropriation by way of subscription, to what is to be constructed* by others, as unconstitutional, as highly inexpedient, and as calculated to undermine the independence of the States and the virtue of the people, in a struggle for the spoils of the Treasury. My views at large upon this subject will be exhibited in two speeches now enclosed, delivered by me in the House of Representatives, the one in 1818 and the other in 1830.

The Bank of the United States, is the next subject. Besides the objections of this upon the score of expediency, particularly the mighty power arising from the concentration in an organized form of countless millions of dollars, I consider this as being altogether beyond the constitutional competency of Congress.

The latitude of construction, which would bring this within the pale of the Constitution, would in my estimation, utterly destroy all those restrictions and reservations which make the Federal Government a limited one. And I feel that I do not state the case too strongly, when I say that it resolves itself into a question between a supposed convenience to the public in the administration of the finances and the character of the circulating medium, and the creation of a power by the government, which may sooner or later, become stronger than the government itself. The Journals of Congress will shew, that when the present Bank was chartered in 1816, I voted against it.

The last subject embraced in the resolution is that of *Nullification.*

I understand this term as meant to import the right of the several States, by interposing their sovereign power, to de-

clare void, within their respective borders, any law which they may think unconstitutional.

Thus understanding it, I am opposed to it. I will endeavor briefly to state my doctrine upon the subject. In general when a question arises whether an act of Congress is constitutional or not, it belongs to the Judicial department to decide it, because in general the question arises in a *case*, either in law or equity, that is, in a controversy between *parties*, which had taken a shape for judicial decision.

But when the question is one of *political power*, that is, between the Federal Government and the States, whether the former has invaded the reserved rights of the latter, I hold that questions of this kind, do not belong to judicial cognizance. That the people of the States are parties to the Federal compact, in their character of *States*. That the Constitution has not conferred upon the Judicial department, any political power whatever. That therefore in relation to questions of this character there is no common umpire. And that consequently, the States must decide for themselves. This is the right, but what is the remedy? My opinion is, that the only rightful remedy is that of *secession*. The argument which attempts to maintain, the right of one State to nullify, and thus suspend the operation of a law passed according to the forms of the Constitution, until three-fourths of the States act under a clause providing for amendments, seems to me to be based upon this error. That in every case of a contested power, the question is, what does the Constitution grant as it *now is*? Whereas under an amendment proposed, the question always is, not what the Constitution now is, but what it *shall hereafter be*. I have said that I hold the right of the States to secede. But this right I consider as the last resort. I would say in relation to it, as I have heretofore said, that as in cases of physical malady, arsenic is never administered, but the patient is otherwise utterly despaired of, so in those of a political character, this remedy should be applied only, in cases of *hopeless extremity*.

I cannot conclude this letter, without offering a fervent prayer, to him who rules the destinies of nations, that he would save our beloved country from this sad catastrophe. For come when it may no tongue can adequately tell the evils, which lie hid in the then mysterious future. With sentiments of esteem,
Yours, respectfully,
P. P. BARBOUR.

Messrs. J. H. Bryan, Josiah T. Granberry, M. Hunt, Committee of a political meeting at Shocco Springs, N. C.

The following private letter from Gen. Jos. H. Bryan, one of the Committee, to the Editor, accompanied the above correspondence.

Oxford, Sept. 28, 1832.

SIR: You will herewith receive the correspondence between the Committee appointed by the Shocco meeting and the Hon. P. P. Barbour, also accompanying it two speeches delivered by Mr. Barbour, embracing more at large his views on the subject of enquiry. I received yesterday from a gentleman in Albany a letter informing me that the letter and inclosures directed to Mr. Van Buren had reached their destination, and had been opened by Mr. John Van Buren, Martin Van Buren being absent in the western part of the State travelling; that as soon as it could be ascertained at what point a letter could reach him, they would be forwarded, though it is not likely he thinks than any answer will be received in less than three weeks. Under such circumstances, in justice to Mr. Barbour we cannot longer withhold his answer from the public. I have already had it in possession two weeks, waiting for the reply of Mr. Van Buren.

You will publish it in your paper, and provide each of the other editors with a copy, and also furnish them with the speeches that they may make such extracts as they may deem material. I have not seen Mr. Granberry, but Maj. Hunt concurs in the opinion that we should publish without further delay. Very respectfully, your obedient servant.

JOS. H. BRYAN.