...ctual address. The Admirals, Captains and Crews have merited the eulogiums which the Chamber has bestowed upon them.

FIAT JUSTITIA RUAT COELUM.

Salisbury:

OCTOBER 31, 1831.

☞ We refer our readers to the communication of "One of the People" which will be found in another column of our paper, and ask for it an attentive perusal.

We set out in our political career with the resolute determination, which is yet unabated, to support the government and constitution of our Republick, which being vitally allied with the liberty and happiness of the American people; their perpetuation is well worthy of the high regard of every press in the Union. In what manner these great interests of the general liberty of mankind are best observed is the difficult question which divides the public sentiment of the American people. We stood still and meditated upon this question before we ventured to form our opinion or to turn either to the right or to the left or to make a step either onward or backward. We have decided, and we have done so without prejudice, as to the best mode of securing the constitution from violation and destruction—of perpetuating the government and to protect and insure the liberty, peace and happiness of the people.

The constitution was made and adopted by the ... with some view. It was intended to secure the people of the States against the evil consequences which flow from a perpetual collision between the general and State governments. This was the consideration upon which the compact was entered into by the States. Will the violation of this compact secure the people of the several States against the unhappy consequences of a perpetual collision between the Federal and State governments? Or is not this violation the very apple of discord between them? Has not the Union been shaken to its very centre from these unhappy conflicts? Is it not at this moment upon the very brink of the precipice, pushed there by those who think that they risk nothing in the violation of the constitution?

Believing that the observance of the principles upon which our government is based is the most solid foundation of our national happiness and glory, we have felt it our duty to resist, with our feeble strength, every encroachment upon that sacred instrument, the constitution, which is the ligament of the Union between the States. By whomsoever made we have never hesitated for a moment to enter our protest agaist its violation. In this view of the subject we do not consider ourselves as belonging to any party.

But we know, and experience fully sustains the truth of the observation, that it is impossible to get any man whose administration is to be conducted upon principle, as was designed in the formation of our government who can meet entirely the views and wishes of his party. We do not ask it, we could not expect it. We feel it to be our duty then to support that man for the Presidency who is the best qualified to administer the government upon the strict and rigid principles of the constitution. We do then sincerely believe that the existence of the Republican party depends upon the re-election of Gen. Jackson, as a Republican, who will resist every violation of the Constitution, and who can not be deterred from the honest discharge of his duty.

☞ We have received the first number of a review of the "address to the people of the United States from the Free Trade Convention," signed "Hamilton," evidently written by Mr. Carey of Philadelphia. We will not speak of it farther than to say (and we do not think it deserves any other notice) that if Mr. Carey be the author of it, he is one of the dullest, most tedious writers in the world, and withal is a run-mad Federalist. We verily believe that so presumptuous a man never lived as Mr. Carey. If we would believe his racket, to use a phrase of Swift's, we would be forced to believe, that he could star to the moon and take it betwen his teeth.

His passion for carrying is uncontrollable, and we may venture to say, within the confines of truth, that his effusions are not read by one reading man in a hundred. He had as well spare the labor and expense which the writing and circulation of these papers will cost him.

FOR THE WESTERN CAROLINIAN.

Mr. CALHOUN'S EXPOSITION.

It was my determination to have addressed some remarks upon the exposition of Mr. Calhoun to the people of North Carolina shortly after it was given to the public, but my engagements were such as to lead my mind entirely from the consideration of the questions it embraced, and left me no time to commit my first thoughts to paper. Even at this moment I have not sufficient leisure to meet my original design, to compare the views of Mr. Calhoun with those of the distinguished republicans who have performed eminent services for their country, and who have attained to the most respectable and dignified stations in our government. If I had the time and the means convenient to collect the opinions of the sages of the republican party as to the true relation between the Federal and State governments, I do not think any important difference would be discovered to exist between their views and those of the Vice-President.

In addressing these reflections to the people of North Carolina, who have ever borne the solid and enviable reputation of sober, deliberate actors, whose reason and not their prejudices sway their political and moral conduct, I entertain the confidence that they will meet with respectful notice from them, if they do not square with the conclusions they may have formed upon the same subject. I am aware of the contemptuous discredit in which the doctrine of nullification is held in many parts of this State, and how quick the people are to seize upon every principle which is not of modern Madison stamp and villify it as seditious, disorganical and riotous; but I would warn such with the sincerity of that friendship which glows in the bosom of one whose greatest delight is to witness the liberty, prosperity and happiness of his fellow-citizens, to pause and consider what may be the consequences of this promiscuous distrust and condemnation of all the strict republican principles of our Federal government. I would not be thought for a moment, to question the honest and patriotick intentions of such men; but to ask and conjure them to look well before they lean—to examine the article before they strike the bargain. If you be a republican who reads this permit me to give you a maxim by which to be guided in forming opinions of the orthodoxy of the sentiments of those who belong to your party. Believe every thing to be in strict conformity with your republican faith, until upon the clearest and most convincing evidence it is established to be error and a departure from the universal faith of your party. Unless you do this you will bend like the reed to every wind that blows, until finally you will find yourself and your country prostrate. Adopt this maxim in Mr. Calhoun's case. He is a Southern man. He is a republican. He is a wise and great man. Many Northern men, many federalists, many ignorant and little men say that Mr. Calhoun is in error and that his principles are dangerous. But will you repose a confidence in a batch of Coffee-House politicians who batten upon detraction and scandal, and give the reasoning and authority of Mr. Calhoun no weight? I reject the thought even. To the wise it is but proper to listen, and it is prudent to follow their counsels. None have yet ventured to suggest a doubt whether Mr. Calhoun's opinions spring from the convictions of a pure and upright mind, singly bent upon the welfare and prosperity of his country. They have only questioned the soundness of the policy which he suggests as the most solid and permanent basis of our political institutions. It is my intention therefore only to separate the different parts of Mr. Calhoun's address, and to point out wherein he has conformed strictly to the republican doctrine of the Virginia school. In doing this I shall not attempt to quote the opinions of distinguished men, but will proceed to shew first, what was the Virginia doctrine; secondly, how Mr. Calhoun understands it; and thirdly, that in theory and practise they, are both the same.

When the 'Alien and sedition laws,' recommended by the elder Adams, were passed by Congress, the State of Virginia believing that they were a direct and manifest violation of the Federal compact, and thinking that she foresaw the fatal consequences which would grow out of such infractions of the constitution, if a timely interposition did not arrest the evil, passed with that view the celebrated Virginia Resolutions. What did those Resolutions contemplate? To suppose that they projected a mere declaration of the opinion of their framers as to the origin and tendency of those laws which led to their passage would be to reject the evidence of those men who drew up the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions. They must then have had some point—some object beyond the simple expression of the opinions of the Legislatures of Virginia and Kentucky as to the tendency of the 'alien and sedition laws,' the passage of which led to their adoption and promulgation. How shall we ascertain the object of these Resolutions? Shall we not act very safely in adopting that rule of law which in all things refers us to the instrument itself, whatever it may be, to ascertain the intention of the parties? We will refer to those Resolutions to arrive at the design of the several Legislatures which passed them. We extract from the Virginia Resolutions as follows: "That in case of a deliberate, palpable and dangerous exercise of other powers, not granted by the said compact, THE STATES, who are parties thereto, *have the right* to interpose, for ARRESTING the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits, the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them." This passage means, if words have any meaning, that they were intended to *arrest the progress of an unconstitutional law*. How will they *arrest*? By a mere *declaration of their opinion* as to the soundness of these laws? Surely, if such an inference could be fairly admitted, they must have entertained a high regard for the efficacy of their *opinions*. But let us assume the more reasonable inference and believe that they contemplated to arrest the progress of this unconstitutional law in the manner thereinafter set forth, as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the good people of the Commonwealth having ever felt, and now feeling to feel, the most sincere affection for their brethren of the other States—the truest anxiety for establishing and perpetuating the Union of all—and the most scrupulous fidelity to that Constitution which is the pledge of mutual friendship, and the instrument of mutual happiness—the General Assembly doth solemnly appeal to the like dispositions of the other States in confidence that they will concur with this Commonwealth in declaring, as it does hereby declare, that the acts aforesaid are unconstitutional; and that the necessary and proper measures will be taken by each for co-operating with this State for maintaining unimpaired the authorities, rights, and liberties, reserved to the States respectively, or to the People."

Here then is the mode pointed out by these Resolutions to rid themselves of an unconstitutional, unauthorized, tyrannical and oppressive law. Virginia puts her Veto upon the "alien and sedition laws" after which she calls upon the other States of the Union to follow up her example. Did these Resolutions adopted by the Virginia Legislature annihilate the laws entirely? Nothing of the kind was contemplated—but a suspension of their operation was clearly designed, until the constitutional authority, THREE FOURTHS of the STATES, could decide upon their force and tendency. Is Mr. Calhoun then a nullifier? He proposes only to put the veto of a State upon an unconstitutional law, and to suspend its operation within the limits of that particular State—not to destroy it forever. Mark the distinction between Mr. Calhoun's doctrine and nullification. The one suspends and the other destroys. Does Mr. Calhoun travel out of the Virginia doctrine? Virginia put her veto, in the shape of Resolutions, upon the "Alien and Sedition laws" and they were repealed. Let us lay aside cavilling and sophistry and come to the plain matter of fact, which does not support the assertion that the Virginia doctrine and Mr. Calhoun's are variant. True, the Veto may not prove efficacious in all cases. But this is no argument against its sound policy.

Mr. Calhoun does not propose, as is generally believed to be the doctrine of the nullifyers, that one State may judge of the unconstitutionality of a law of Congress, and that only three fourths of the States can control the decision of this one state. His idea is that the three fourths of the States are the only judges which no man who ever read the constitution can deny—for that power has made many amendments to the constitution. The idea of the Veto is only a mode or manner of bringing the question before this great arbiter of constitutional questions. Inasmuch as it proved effectual when Virginia and Kentucky put their Veto upon the 'Alien and Sedition laws,' Mr. Calhoun thinks it would be prudent and safe to exercise it in all cases of a similar character. In the Veto itself is involved no *principle*. The state that lays the Veto has no further voice in deciding upon a constitutional question than as *one* of the *three fourths* of the States that the constitution declares may alter or amend that instrument itself. Three fourths of the States may abolish the Supreme Court of the United States—may dispense with a standing army or a navy—in fine may make such alterations or amendments as they may deem fit. Where then is the objectionable feature in Mr. Calhoun's exposition? Mr. Calhoun does not broach any new theory. It is as old as the constitution itself, and no man who has any respect for himself would venture to deny it. If any man doubt let him refer to the constitution. It is perfectly immaterial, so far as it regards consequences, whether the Veto is used, as was done by Virginia and Kentucky, to bring the question before three fourths of the States. This is a mere *modus operandi* and may be changed or varied as the wisdom of a State may determine. Suppose then, that North-Carolina looking upon a law of Congress as unconstitutional, thro' her Legislature, instructs her delegation in Congress to enter their protest against the longer continuance of that particular law. May not this be as effectual as the Veto, and produce the same consequences as resulted from the passage and adoption of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions? It cannot be denied. If the law be repealed North Carolina would surely be satisfied—if not, and the protest of the delegation in Congress resulted in bringsng the question before three fourths of the states, the state would be equally well satisfied. So in the case of the Veto as suggested by Mr. Calhoun.

Listen now to what Mr. Calhoun has to say upon the subject of arresting an unconstitutional law, and we shall discover how exactly his doctrine squares with that of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions. "Against these conclusive arguments" (the arguments in the V. & K. Resolutions)" as they seem to me, it is objected, that if one party have the right to judge of infractions of the constitution, so has the other, and that consequently in cases of contested powers between a State and the General government, each would have a right to maintain its opinion, as is the case when sovereign powers differ in the construction of treaties or compacts, and that of course it would come to be a mere question of force. The error is in the assumption, that the General Government is a party to the Constitutional compact. The States as has been shewn, formed the campact, acting as sovereign and independent Communities. The General Government is but its creature; and though in reality a government with all the rights and authority which belong to any other government within the orb of its powers, it is, nevertheless a government emanating from a compact between sovereigns, and partaking in its nature and object, of the character of a joint commission, appointed to superintend and administer the interests in which all are jointly concerned but having, beyond its proper sphere, no more power than if it did not exist. To deny this would be to deny the most incontestible facts, and the clearest conclusions; while to acknowledge its truth is to destroy utterly the objection, that the appeal would be to force, in the case supposed. For if each party has a right to judge, then under our system of government, the final cognizance of a question of contested power would be in the states, and not in the general government. It would be the duty of the latter, as in all similar cases of a contest between one or more of the principals and a joint commission or agency, to refer the contest to the principles themselves. Such are the plain dictates of reason and analogy both. On no sound principle can the agents have a right to final cognizance, as against the principals, much less to use force against them, to maintain their construction of their powers. Such a right would be monstrous; and has never, heretofore, been claimed in similar cases."

It would be the duty of the general government, says Mr. Calhoun, as in all similar cases of a contest between one or more of the principals and a joint commission or agency, to refer the contest to the *principals* themselves. Mr. Calhoun proposes, then, that in all cases of political difference of which the Supreme Court can not take cognizance, that the States, which formed the Federal compact, shall decide the contested question by the force of the constitution. What mode does the constitution itself point out? The constitution empowers three fourths of the States to alter or amend it. Let us recur again to the sentiments of Mr. Calhoun upon this subject. Mr. Calhoun says "so far from extreme danger I hold that there never was a free state, in which this great conservative principle, indispensable in all, was ever so safely lodged. In others, where the co-estates, representing the dissimilar and conflicting interests of the community came into contact, the only alternative was compromise, submission or force. Not so in ours. Should the General Government, and a state come into conflict, we have a higher remedy; the power which called the General Government into existence, which gave it all of its authority, and can enlarge, contract, or abolish its powers at its pleasure, may be invoked. The states themselves may be appealed to, three fourths of which, in fact, form a tribunal whose decrees are the Constitution itself, and whose voice can silence all discontent. The utmost extent then of the power is, that a State acting in the sovereign capacity, as one of the parties to the Constitutional compact, may compel the Government, created by the compact, to submit a question touching its infraction, to the parties who created it; to avoid the supposed dangers of which, it is purposed to resort to the novel, the hazardous, and, I must add, fatal project of giving to the General Government the sole and final right of interpreting the Constitution, thereby reversing the whole system, making that instrument the creature of its will, instead of a rule of action impressed on it at its creation, and annihilating in fact the authority which imposed it, and from which the government itself derives its existence."

Mr. Calhoun proposes to appeal to three fourths of the States, "whose decrees are the constitution itself." What is the difference then between Mr. Calhoun's opinions and those advanced by the framers of the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions? Or if there be more than "a distinction without a difference," is it not in favour of Mr. Calhoun? Is not, upon the supposition that there is a substantial difference, Mr. Calhoun's the milder doctrine? No candid, unbiassed mind can read both Mr. Calhoun's exposition and those celebrated Resolutions and arrive at any other conclusion.

Let the Southern democrats, the democratic party throughout the United States, rally round Mr. Calhoun, as the most orthodox and powerful man who can be elected to succeed Genl. Jackson after he shall have served out his second term. It is idle verbiage to tell the democrats of the United States that Mr. Calhoun advocates principles which, if acted upon, would lead to a dissolution of the Union. It will not be believed because there is no proof to establish the charge. His doctrines are the doctrines of the democratic party. Time and experience will sustain Mr. Calhoun.

ONE OF THE PEOPLE.

OFFICIAL PAPER.

The following is the translation of the Protocol of the conference held in London, on receiving the news of the march towards Belgium of the French army.—*Globe.*

Protocol No. 31, of the conference held at the Foreign Office, in London, Aug. 6th, 1831.

Present—The Plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Brittain, Prussia, and Russia.

The Plenipotentiary of his Britanic Majesty opened the conference, by the following Declaration to the Ministers of the other Powers;

That the instant the Government of his Britanic Majesty was informed of the renewal of hostilities between Holland and Belgium, orders had been issued for assembling a division of the Fleet in the Downs, as speedily as possible, in order to be ready for the support of such measures as might be hereafter necessary, for re-establishing the armistice which the Five Powers have agreed to maintain between Holland and Belgium—and that since this order was sent, the new King of Belgium had requested the assistance of the Five Powers, and especially the support of the Naval force of Great Brittain.

The Plenipotentiary of his Majesty the King of the French, declared,—that the Sovereign of Belgium had requested of France an armed intervention, in consequence of the renewal of hostilities on the part of Holland. He had even added, that the assistance of the French Government was absolutely necessary, and that not an instant was to be lost, if a general conflagration were to be averted. The danger being of this pressing nature, the King of the French had determined immediately to send an army to assist the Belgians, and force the Duch to retire into their own territories.

The Plenipotentiaries of the other Four Courts having submitted to the Plenipotentiary of France, the declaration made on this head by the King of the French to the Representatives of these Powers in Paris, the Plenipotentiary of France examined the declaration aforesaid, and announced that the French troops would retire into the Department du Nord, as soon as they had accomplished the object of their entry into Belgium.

These declarations being heard, the conference considered that France had not time to consult her allies as agreed, before the above mentioned step; and that in so doing, she has only intended to fulfil her part of the engagements entered into by the Five Powers, for maintaining the armistice between Holland and Belgium.

The Plenipotentiaries of the Five Courts, in consequence, consider that France had no private views in sending his troops into Belgium, and was therein only forwarding the objects of the Conference; and it is understood that the operations of these troops and the length of their stay in Belgium shall be directed by the common consent of the conference of London.

It is also understood that if the co-operation of the English Fleet become necessary, this Fleet shall act only for the accomplishment of the same purposes, and be subject to the same direction.

Moreover, it is agreed, that the French troops shall not pass the old frontiers of Holland; that their operations shall be confined to the left bank of the Meuse; that under no circumstances shall they intest either Maestrictcht or Vanlow; because, in those cases, the war, by approaching too near the confines of Prussia, and Germany, might give rise to disagreeable circumstances, which the Five Powers are anxious to avert; finally, that according to the Declaration made by the Plenipotentiary of France to those of the other Four Courts at Paris, the French troops shall retire within the limits of France as soon as the armistice has been established on the same footing as before the renewal of hostilities.

To conclude, the Conference is convinced that the late occurrences render it more absolutely expedient that they should, as soon as possible, procure a definite treaty, calculated to terminate the existing differences between Holland and Belgium, and to ensure the continuance of a general peace.

ESTERHAZY—WESSENBURG,
TALLEYRAND,
PALMERSTON,
BULOW,
LIEVEN—MATUZCEWITZ.

ATTENTION.

THE ROWAN TROOP of CAVALRY, will parade in the Town of Salisbury, on the last Friday of November, at 10 O'clock, at the Court House. Persons wishing to become members of the company can do so on that day.

HY. GILES, *Capt.*

Oct. 25th, 1831. 4t99

To Saddlers AND Harness. Makers.

THE Subscribers wish to employ one Saddler and two Harness-Makers of steady and industrious habits.

JOHN W. HILTON,
BENJ. J. OAKES.

Oct. 31st 1831. 95tf

A LIST OF LETTERS.

REMAINING in the Post Office in Lexington, N. C. on the 21st October, 1831.

Polly Adams	Danl. Lewey
Martin Byerly	Saml. Luske
David Bowers	Jno. Leathers
John Bowers	John Michael
Charles Brunel	Wm. Meaver
Wm. G. Beard	Theophilus McKay
Eli G. Burton	John Mize
John Burton	Reuben May
Wm. Briant	Saml. Michael
David Bovvier	Evando McIve
Solomon Boss	Jones Myers
Sarah Brown	Peter Owen
Benjamin Bellings	Amos Parks
John Calloway	Anny Parks
Michael Craver	Nathanl. Peebles
Henry Clingamon	John Peacock
Hugh Cunningham	John Richards
Andrew Clinard	Abner Reace
Danl. Evans	Walter Richards
Catharine or Jno. Fouts	Christian Sapperfield
James Gillings	Nicholas Simpson
Wm. Grist	John C. Smith
Phillips Grimes	Thomas Shepherd
Jesse Goovison	Benjamin Saunders
Jacob Goss	Smith Saintsing
Wm. Houk	Benjamin Smith
Geo. Hedreck	Levi Trautham
James Hughs	Thomas Workman
John Haynes	Francis Williams
Thos. O. Ives	Edmond P. Wade
John Rout	Jacob Walser
Henry Keply	Joshua Wilson
Daniel Keply	Catharine Walk
James Kinley	Lucretia Walk
Catharine Lee	Hiram Ward
Adam Lewey	Saml. Yokeley

3t97 B. D. ROUNSAVILL *P. M.*

HENRY HUMPHREY'S & co.

ARE now receiving another supply of NEW GOODS, among which is a variety of *Fancy Dry Goods*. And all articles of Merchandise, which they have lately found in demand by their customers.—

Their Stock is now extensive, and they respectfully invite purchasers, confident that they can suit them satisfactorily.

Lexington 22nd October 1831.

N. B. All kinds of marketable country produce will be received in trade by H. H. &co. 4t99

JOB PRINTING,

OF EVERY DESCRIPTON,
EXECUTED WITH NEATNESS & DISPATCH,
AT THIS OFFICE.