

EDENTON GAZETTE.

"THE NEWS OF OUR MORNING, NOON, AND EVENING CRY."

VOL. XXVII. . . . No. 26.

EDENTON, N. C. WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 1831.

WHOLE No. 1378.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
WM. E. FELL,
FOR THE PROPRIETOR,
At Three Dollars per annum, in advance.
Advertisements inserted on the usual terms.
Letters to the Editor, must be post paid.

POLITICAL.

On Tuesday the 21st of June, a number of the citizens of the county of Chowan assembled at the Court House in this town, and were severally addressed by our present candidates for Congress.

In reply to Mr. Wm. B. Shepard, Mr. John H. Wheeler, said that he hoped the patience of the company would permit him to make a few remarks in reply to the charges preferred against him by his opponent. The right of self defence was the first law of nature, and he knew that the people of Chowan were too generous and charitable to condemn him unheard. I am charged said Mr. Wheeler, with the crime of nullification. I know that a public man is the property of the public. In this free country where every man thinks what he pleases, and speaks what he thinks, it should not excite the surprise of any candidate that his public character should be examined and his motives of action closely scrutinized. I never shrink from public scrutiny. This charge as favouring the doctrine of nullification is no new charge. Party spirit long ago engendered it, calumny and envy have long brooded over it. But recently the charge appeared against me in a Virginia paper (Norfolk Herald of 17th June) written by some correspondent from this district, who endeavored by an anonymous communication to escape responsibility. Although the blow was aimed at me directly, the writer insidiously endeavored to injure others by his malicious attack. When the charge was made by an anonymous communication, I did not deem it worthy of notice; but it has assumed a responsible character since Mr. Shepard has repeated the charge. Let us examine and then judge whether the charge be just. In the last session of the Legislature of North Carolina of which body I was a member, certain resolutions were introduced by a Mr. Worth of Randolph. The resolutions have been read to you correctly. The first, declaring that although the Tariff was unwise and oppressive to the South yet this Legislature does not recognize as constitutional the right of an individual state to nullify a law of the U. S. The second declared that in the sentiment "This Union must be preserved" we recognize principles that challenge the approbation of every republican. These resolutions gave rise to much animated debate. It is well known that many of the leading citizens of South Carolina had declared that when a law of Congress was oppressive, unjust and a palpable infraction of the Constitution, that a State was not bound to obey. These views of South Carolina were severely commented on in our Legislature. A leading member of the House of Commons (S. D. Henry of Fayetteville) denounced those who entertained such sentiments as traitors to their country! I did not mingle in the debate. I thought that we had nothing to do with the conduct of South Carolina. We were the Legislature of North Carolina endeavoring to relieve your wants and to ameliorate your condition. We were not empanelled as a Jury to try the State of South Carolina, but we were assembled in the discharge of our duty to redress the grievances and to strengthen the laws of our common country. I therefore voted against the resolution because the subject was not an appropriate one for our deliberation, and we were spending

the people's money by idle and useless debate. I did not by thus voting admit the doctrine of nullification. Far from it. Indeed my vote on the second resolution containing the sentiment that "the Union must be preserved" showed whether I was a nullifier, for I and every member of the House voted for the resolution (see Journal of last Legislature page 259.) I am no nullifier. If another reason is demanded for my vote, it is this, since our South Carolina neighbors have taken the bold stand as regards this subject; I thought that we as the representatives of North Carolina, should not brand her citizens with the epithet of traitors or construe their actions into treason. It was going beyond the path of our duty. It was deliberately offering in an official character an insult to a high minded honourable community. South Carolina needs no eulogy from me. Look at the pages of our history, and you will see that in "those times that tried men's souls" in our great struggle for independence, South Carolina acted a noble part. Look at the hard fought battles of our revolution; go to the fields that drank the holy blood of freemen and of patriots, and ask if no South Carolina blood was spilled there? And in the last war where was there in the whole Union a State that so willingly and so gallantly threw into the combat the full tribute of her valour and her chivalry? Shall we charge such men with an attempt to sever this Union? They are our neighbors, our friends, our brothers. If they are wrong we should be charitable; if the proud blood of their gallant ancestry spurs them beyond the bounds of prudence we must forgive, and in the language of Burke "pardon something to the spirit of Liberty."

I will notice another remark. The gentleman said in his speech that "he was surprised on his return home after two years laborious duty to see an opposing candidate on the field." We are "indeed fallen on evil times" if in a free country each man is not allowed to pursue any course that duty or inclination may point out. Does the gentleman think that no one had a right to oppose him? I had thought that in this country in the language of our declaration of Independence that "all men were born free and equal" and that here riches gave no title to power. I had thought, too, that the poorest man was on a level with the richest, and however humble an individual might be, if he have honesty, if he have ability, that there is no post of honour that a free people can bestow on him, to which he may not aspire. These were my principles. The gentleman's seem to be different, and expresses his surprise that after two years laborious duty any one should oppose him. Had he accomplished so much good for his constituents in his two years laborious duty? Did he fancy himself to be some mighty conqueror returning from the field of victory, and that as he made his mighty advances "the servile crowd should roll back at his approach." Did he think that a single session of Congress had clothed him in the imperial purple, and that

"we were wretched slaves that must bend our bodies
If CREAN but carelessly nod on us!"
Where are his trophies of victory? What mighty benefit has he done? What great good has he accomplished? I ask the question. Two years ago speaking of the Roanoke Inlet he says "Try me, if I do not do something for you, then frown me back with contempt and indignation and contempt." He has been two laborious sessions in Congress; he has had a strong memorial from citizens of this and other counties urging the great impor-

tance of the opening of Roanoke Inlet—He has had the solemn resolution of the Legislature, but he has done—nothing!—Take him then at his word, "frown him back with indignation and contempt." It is "the penalty of his bond" the conditions of which were drawn by himself. To me and to the people at large, the whole political career of the gentleman has been any thing but satisfactory. In his "two years laborious sessions" he has labored to throw away the money of the public with a lavish indiscriminate. No matter what was the character of the appropriation, whether it was local objects as the Maysville road in Kentucky; (for which he voted) he stopped at nothing. He went "the whole hog." Such a course will corrupt the people and eventually bankrupt the nation. If the gentleman had represented a manufacturing town in Massachusetts, his course could not have been more faithful to them, than it has been prejudicial to our interests. He recognizes the doctrine that a majority imperatively should govern is true. But in a government like ours, the majority must be governed by the Constitution. In England the Parliament is omnipotent, here the constitution is the supreme law of the Land. The great object to be secured by a written constitution is the protection of the rights and privileges of every man in the community, nor can any majority trample on the rights and privileges of any man in the community however humble. Yet this would be the rational conclusion of the admission of the principle that the majority can do any thing. This principle would make power and right the same—but alas the history of man shows too plainly how often men when "they have power, forget right." Such doctrines are subversive to liberty. If such is the principle of our government, I would prefer living under the despotism of the Grand Turk, for then perhaps sometimes pity would cause him to listen to my wrongs, and a sense of justice prompt him to relieve them. But a majority of numbers has no pity, no justice. Had the man of these principles lived in 1776, he would have said that Parliament have taxed us, they are a majority we must submit. Yes, submit we must, and bend our necks to the foreign yoke. Had the man who professes these principles lived in the eventful period of 1798, he would have said, a majority have passed the "Alien and Sedition laws," the people should submit. Such are the ideas of one who is willing to submit to a "government of unlimited powers." Let such bend to the Dagon of power. Let them rejoice in the splendor of "one grand consolidated government," but let them be assured that the price of such a government is the freedom of the people and the happiness of the nation.

Mr. Shepard further said, that he had independence enough in his course "to vote against Gen. Jackson," and he instanced the veto on the Maysville road bill. This, no one denies. He may have arrayed his mighty self, and even in his own mind he may have made even the hero of New Orleans quail before him. I never knew that he was accused of being too strong a Jackson man. I have heard him call himself a Jackson man. I have also seen his speech on the Buffalo Road Bill, reported in the Gazette of date the 17th May 1830, in which he says "that no honorable man believes in the corruption of Adams and Clay, and that the charge had been consigned to the kennel of forgotten calumnies." Strange expression for a Jackson man, respecting a majority of Jackson constituents! For this Mr. Shepard

FOREIGN.

From the Norfolk Herald.
GREAT BRITAIN.

The general, we had almost said all absorbing topic in most of our coteries is, as to the expediency of parliamentary reform carried to the extent intended by the king and ministry of England. It is thought by some and even pertinaciously insisted that it is premature and will result in the destruction of the country. We are of a quite different opinion. Let it be remembered that liberty is of very ancient growth in that country; indeed we hardly know its antiquity. Neither Blackstone nor De Lolme were able to trace its origin, and when such men relinquish the pursuit how can we presume to succeed in such an investigation?

We have however certain knowledge of its having been acquired and lost more than once. The Saxon ancestors of the British might have brought it from Germany into Britain; and after a lapse of many years it was almost annihilated by the Danes, but recovered by Alfred, and entirely lost at the Norman conquest.

During a long succession of tyrannical rulers with little intermission from the epoch of William the conqueror, the Catholic Clergy became the protectors of the people and formed a junction with them in a cause in which it might be said to be king and nobility versus clergy and people, but it was during the dark ages when the clergy looked up learning and light from every body but themselves.

We have said nothing of the violation offered to the Goddess of liberty by the Romans. But as they brought light they in some degree indemnified the oppressed for the diminution of their liberty.

Nobody will dispute that on the death of Charles the first, the British completely resuscitated the long lost deity by the presentation of the head of that luckless monarch at her shrine. And nobody will dispute that, had the liberty of the press existed in full force as it now does, she ever could again have almost disappeared.

While under the Lord Protector, as a republic when was England more respected, we ought to have said dreaded, (for national dread is most likely to inspire respect?) Cardinal Richelieu who was by no means very short sighted in politics, sacrificed much ambitious private feeling to be on good terms with Oliver Cromwell. The Cardinal aspired to the conquest of Europe with a view to the establishing an universal monarchy for his son, Louis XIV. for so he was thought to be, and knowing that England perhaps alone could prevent such a scheme, he left nothing undone that would conciliate her through Oliver, whose feet he would have licked for the accomplishment of his purpose.

By the restoration of Charles II. with the clergy and nobility, liberty received a dreadful check—a check from which she hardly recovered until the appearance of that great political comet Janus, from which time the British people have been every restless. Hence plots, treasons, executions.

Let it be remembered, that the tree of Liberty was transplanted to America from England in 1638 by a handful of Englishmen; and that under skillful gardeners like their descendant's Washington, old Franklin, Jefferson, &c. it has flourished as well as its most ardent votaries could wish. That since the U. States have acquired their independence but one trial for high treason has taken place; and the result showed that that might as well have been abandoned, from the circumstance of its

BILLS OF LADING

For sale at this Office.

WARRANTS,

For sale at this Office.