BY AUTHORITY.

Law of the United States,

PASSED AT THE FIRST SESSION OF THE TWENTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

[PUBLIC, No. 5.]

AN ACT to change the times for commencing the sessions of the Court of the United States in the District of Delaware.

Be it Enacted, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, That the sessions of the circuit court and district court of the United States in the District of Delaware, shall commence at the times hereafter mentioned, instead of the times now appointed by law; that is to say: the sessions of the said circuit court shall commence at Newcastle, on the Tuesday next following the fourth Monday of May, and at Dover on the Tuesday next following the third Monday of October, annually; and the sessions of the said district court shall commence at Newcastle on the third Tuesday of June, and second Tuesday of December; and at Dover on the Tuesday next following the third Monday of March, and the Tuesday next following the fourth Monday of September, annually; and that no process, recognizance, or bail bond, returnable to the next term of either of said courts, shall be avoided, or impaired, or affected, by this change as to the commencement of said term; but that all process, bail bonds, and recognizances, returnable to the next term of either of said courts, shall be returnable and returned to the said court next held, accordingly to this act; in the same manner as if so made returnable on the face thereof, and shall have full effect accordingly; and that all continuances in either of said courts shall be from the last term to the day appointed by this act for the commencement of the next session thereof.

A. STEVENSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
M. VAN BUREN,
Vice-President of the United States, and President of the Senate.

Approved: March 24th, 1834.
ANDREW JACKSON.

The National Portrait Gallery OF Distinguished Americans.

THIS WORK is now in a course of publication, and those parts already issued may be confidently appealed to as an evidence of its claims upon public favor. The universal applause which its execution has elicited, is sufficient to dispel whatever distrust may have been encountered by the original prospectus.

The design of this Work is, to present the Portraits, engraved on Steel, in the highest style of the art, with concise but accurate Biographical Sketches, of the most Eminent Citizens of our country. The selection will not be limited by any considerations of party feeling or local interest; but will impartially embrace the Historic and Portrait of such individuals, *throughout the whole Union*, as, by common consent, are admitted to possess an interest in the minds of their fellow-citizens, by their reputation for genius, acquirements, official standing, or public services. For this purpose, recourse will invariably be had to the most authentic materials that can be obtained in personal history, as well as in portraiture.

The value of such a publication cannot fail to be appreciated by all who feel an interest in the preservation of the most essential ingredients in the history of their country. Taste and patriotism are equally invited to sustain an enterprise which aims to supply the future historian with those materials, the absence of which is so often regretted in resorting to the annals of our earlier times.

It is intended, in the course of publication, to give Portraits of all the Presidents, as well as others who have filled the important offices of State, during and subsequent to the Revolution, including the Military and Naval professions, and those whose attainments in Science and the Arts may have identified them with patriotic recollections.

In the arrangement of Portraits, both of the past and present times, the general tone of public sentiment will be consulted in the selection, as before intimated, without reference to the bias or antipathies of the divisions of party.

The Work will be conducted by JAMES B. LONGACRE of the City of Philadelphia, and JAMES HERRING of the City of New York, *under the superintendence of the Board of Directors of the American Academy of Fine Arts.*

☞ It will be issued in monthly parts, each containing three Portraits engraved on steel, with not less than twenty-four pages of History. Twelve Numbers, or Parts, will make One Volume. All subscriptions will be payable in advance, and will be put at the following moderate rates for the respective editions published: In Royal Quarto, at $10 per annum—in Imperial Octavo, at $6 per annum—in Royal Octavo, at $5.

☞ An Agency for the above Work has been established in Salisbury, at the Office of THE WESTERN CAROLINIAN, where Specimens of the Work can be seen, and where subscriptions will be thankfully received.

☞ Ten Parts have already issued from the Press, (six of which are to be seen at this Office,) containing Portraits and Biographical Sketches of the following distinguished personages:

Part I. Charles Carroll of Carrollton; Thomas Macdonough, U.S.N.; Samuel L. Mitchell, M.D. LL.D.

Part II. Major-Gen. Israel Putnam, U. S. A.; Andrew Jackson, President of the United States; Miss C. M. Sedgwick, the Authoress.

Part III. John Marshall, Chief-Justice of the United States; Lewis Cass, Secretary of War; William Wirt.

Part IV. Daniel D. Tompkins, Late Vice-President of the United States; Henry Clay; Major-Gen. William Moultrie, U. S. A.

Part V. Major-Gen. Alexander Macomb, U. S. A.; Joel R. Poinsett; Joel Barlow.

Part VI. Major-Gen'l. Anthony Wayne, U. S. A.; Edward Livingston; Col. John Trumbull, F.A.A.F.A.

The forthcoming Nos. will contain, among many others, the following:

All the Presidents; Hon. W. Gaston, John Stanly, Esq., and Gen. W. R. Davie, of North Carolina; Robert Y. Hayne, and John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina; General Brown, Commodore Chauncey, De Witt Clinton, J. Fenimore Cooper, Washington Irving, General Greene, Hon. J. S. Johnson, Gen'l. Knox, Louis McLane, Benj. Watkins Leigh, Gen. Morgan, Lindley Murray, Com. Perry, Gov. Shelby, Chief-Justice Shippen, Gilbert Stuart, Mrs. George Washington, Daniel Webster, Right Rev. Bishop White, Noah Webster.

Salisbury, March 22, 1834.—6t

☞ Book Lost. ☜

THE Subscriber has lost a Volume of "AYSCOUGH'S SHAKSPEARE," for which he will pay its full value to any person who will deliver it to him. JOHN BEARD, Jr.

Salisbury, March 22, 1834.

FIAT JUSTITIA RUAT CŒLUM.

Western Carolinian.

SALISBURY:

SATURDAY.....APRIL 5, 1834.

☞ Want of room compelled us to omit, last week, a communication signed "A North Carolinian," which will be found in our columns to-day.

It is from the pen of an intelligent consistent Federalist, whom, while we differ with him in politics, we esteem no less for his political candor than for his many private virtues.

We should be sorry indeed to think our old friend, the writer of this communication, or the mass of the party to which he belongs, friendly to a General Government with *unlimited powers*.

The *honesty* of the Federal party we never have questioned: on the contrary, when we took charge of this paper, ten months ago, we did them justice, by ascribing to them *patriotic motives*, while at the same time we expressed the belief that *some of* their theories would, if carried into operation, ultimately lead to *one Consolidated Government*. True, this single Government, or Sovereignty, would not necessarily be unlimited in its *power at first*; but such would be its final character if State Sovereignty were destroyed; and we are prepared to show that this was the opinion of many leading Federalists at the time the Constitution was formed, and is the opinion of many of the present day.

It is clear, from the remarks of "A North Carolinian," that he believes in the existence of *one*, and *only one*, *Sovereignty* in the United States. If this be true, then we have *already* a Great Consolidated General Government: for, let it be remembered, 'consolidated' does not necessarily imply unlimited power. The Government of North Carolina, or of any other State, is consolidated—that is to say, it is constituted by the whole body of the People in the State, a majority of whom have the right to give the Government of the State what power they please. If the Constitution of the United States was formed by the People of all the States as *one single community*, as many assert—and if the States never had any Sovereignty, as some say, or gave up their Sovereignty when they adopted the Constitution, as is declared by others, why then the General Government *is consolidated*; and a majority of the People, of course, without regard to State boundaries, have a right to give the General Government any power they choose. And they may even, if they please, make it a Monarchy.

If the Constitution was the work of the People as *one body*, and not of the People of the several States as distinct independent bodies, then it is in the power of *six States* to make a total and radical change: for there are six States that, together, contain a majority of the People of the United States. Such a doctrine, if admitted, would of course place the People of eighteen States at the mercy of the People of six. For, agreeably to the Republican maxim, which we of the West are now contending for, in every independent State or Sovereignty the majority have the right to rule. There is no middle ground between the Sovereignty of the States, severally, and Consolidation.

If the Constitution was formed by the States, it is a compact between them, and cannot be changed except by the mode agreed to in the compact....namely, by the consent of three-fourths of the States. But, if it is a contract between the People of the United States as one community, then a *majority* have the right to alter it:—and, as six States contain a majority of the People of the whole Union, it is in the power of one-fourth part of the States, *instead of three-fourths*, to alter the Constitution!

Our esteemed correspondent, though wrong in his conclusions, argues from correct premises. He denies, and so do we, that the Constitution was adopted by the States "in their Legislative capacities." He asserts, and we are glad to hear him admit it, that, before the adoption of the Constitution, there were thirteen independent Sovereignties, and that those Sovereignties adopted the Constitution. So far we entirely agree; but he argues that, by the adoption of the Constitution, the States gave up their Sovereignty. True, he does not say this in so many words, but such is the purport of his reasoning. We admit that the States abridged some of the powers they had before given to "their State Governments," but we deny that by so doing they gave up their Sovereignty. It must be shown that they gave up *all* their Sovereign rights, before we can admit that their Sovereignty is sunk. In an article we wrote two weeks ago, we endeavored to explain the meaning of "Sovereignty;" and, to save room, we must now refer to it to show that the delegation of certain powers does not destroy the sovereignty of the party delegating.

Our correspondent says: "When we speak of sovereignty, we attach to it the idea that there is no superior." This is politically true; but he applies it incorrectly. We insist that in the United States there is *no absolute superior*: there are twenty-four *equal* Sovereignties—*within their respective limits, each is superior to all the others*....beyond those limits, they are *politically equal*.

Our correspondent surely does not contend that the General Government is a Sovereign! We know that some, who even profess to be *Republicans*, assert this; but he, surely, does not! In the old Monarchies of Europe, this doctrine prevails; there the *law-makers* are called *Sovereigns*. In England, however, a celebrated writer of the last century (Junius) denied that sovereignty belonged to the *law-makers*. He says:

"The power of King, Lords, and Commons, is not an arbitrary power. They are the *trustees*, not the owners, of the estate. The fee-simple is in us, [the People.] They cannot alienate, they cannot waste. When we say that the Legislature is *supreme*, we mean that it is the highest power known to the Constitution—that it is the highest in comparison with the other subordinate powers established by the laws. In this sense, the word *supreme* is relative, not absolute. The power of the Legislature is limited, not only by the general rules of natural justice, and the welfare of the community, but by the forms and principles of our particular Constitution. If this doctrine be not true, we must admit that King, Lords, and Commons, have no rule to direct their resolutions, but merely their own will and pleasure.—They might unite the Legislative and Executive power in the same hands, and dissolve the Constitution by an act of Parliament."

This theory has been carried out in America. Here, sovereignty belongs to the *Constitution-makers*. In a single State, a majority of the People have the right to make and alter their Constitution: they, therefore, are Sovereign. The Constitution of the United States was formed by the *States*, standing to each other in the same relation that individuals do in a single State—with this distinction, however, that in a *single* State the will of a *majority* binds the *minority*; but this rule was not considered applicable to the States, for the Constitution was not binding on Rhode Island, (the smallest of all the States but one,) even after the other *twelve* had adopted it, until *she consented for herself*.

This, alone, ought to be sufficient evidence of State Sovereignty.

If Sovereignty, then, belongs only to those who can make Constitutions, it surely cannot belong to the General Government, which is only the *creature* of the Constitution....or, in the language of Junius, the *trustee* of Sovereignty. Nor is it in a majority of the People of the United States, considered as *one community*: for, if Congress should propose a new Constitution, or certain amendments to the present one, and the People of *seventeen* States should *unanimously* agree to them, still they would not be valid. And why?.....because, when the States adopted the present Constitution, they agreed that it should not be altered except by the consent of *three-fourths of the States*.

This is the only real abridgment of State Sovereignty. The consent of *every one* was necessary to make the Constitution obligatory on all; but, by mutual consent, the will of *three-fourths* can alter the contract. And this shows the extreme caution of the States in guarding their Sovereignty: for, in this case, the abridgment of their individual rights is much smaller than is the abridgment of the rights of individual persons in forming a State Constitution. In the latter case, a bare majority of *one vote* may bind the whole minority.

Our correspondent admits that the States were sovereign up to the time they adopted the Constitution. In admitting this, he shows more understanding and more candor than some who make much greater pretensions. We have already attempted, briefly, to prove that the States did not relinquish their Sovereignty by the adoption of the Constitution; and we shall hereafter show, from their own speeches and writings, that many of the most distinguished Federalists at the time the Constitution was formed, and ever since, not only denied that the Sovereignty of the States was taken away, but advocated the Constitution on the ground that its provisions were calculated to *preserve* that Sovereignty.

Does our esteemed correspondent put confidence in the opinions and arguments of such men as John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, Fisher Ames, Judge Jas. Iredell the elder, Gen. Wm. R. Davie, &c.? We believe that he properly appreciates their genius and their integrity. And we shall show that they and many others, who were leading Federalists, admitted and even contended for the Sovereignty of the States, as the only means of securing the liberty of the People.

☞ THE COLLAR BEGINS TO CHOKE.

Poulson's Daily Advertiser, of the 21st ult., contains an account of a large meeting of the People in Philadelphia, on the 20th—the details of which are so interesting at this crisis, that we have copied them entire in our paper of to-day.

When the Force Bill was passed, the Hon. Richard Coulter was the only one of the Pennsylvania Delegation who had the justice or the magnanimity to raise his voice and cry Hold! When South Carolina was arraying her chivalry to defend her Sovereignty and the Constitution against the sword of the usurper, Philadelphians were among the first to cry *Treason!*

Then, those people could see nothing in the conduct of South Carolina, but selfishness; they could not conceive of such patriotism as resisted a law that was filling *their pockets* with money, not only at the expense of the People of the South, but, as the latter believed, in contempt of the Constitution. But mark the end!

No sooner does *he* whom they clothed with power to enforce *that law* "assume the responsibility" to remove the deposites, whereby their pecuniary interests are in danger, than they all at once get their eyes open, and see that their late *Idol* is a *Despot!*

Perhaps, however, the descendants of the illustrious Penn were only acting conscientiously in accordance with the peaceful maxim of their sect; and, having now been smitten upon both cheeks, consider the law satisfied, and resistance justifiable. By whatever motive they were before restrained, and are now excited, we rejoice to find that there is some spirit among them—we hope enough to keep them all from *dying* with the collar around their necks.

True, we have not yet heard that the notable hero, Col. Pluck, the fit military emblem of collar-wearing Pennsylvania,* has been ejected; and we are aware that she has a Governor of whom even "Old Rip" would be ashamed—a meek, timid, submissive *sheep* in WOLF's clothing. Still, unless this extraordinary meeting be a ridiculous pageant, a senseless farce, got up to please children, a spirit is beginning to arouse Pennsylvania, similar to that which placed South Carolina in an attitude of proud defiance to the foes of the Constitution.

The 'iron-workers' of Philadelphia have given some proof that they, at least, possess hearts of steel, and will rather die like freemen than live like slaves. *They* seem determined, if it be necessary, to forge a *sword* for those who have been forging *chains* for *them*.

If the People generally would show a determined spirit, usurpation would soon retreat, without the shedding of blood; but, if they submit but a little longer, they will have no alternative but slavery or the sword, thing but praises and honor to him who is trampling upon the Constitution and Laws of the country.

We shall see whether the late example of Philadelphia will dispel the charm, and restore Pennsylvania to the elevated rank she once occupied among the free States of the Confederacy.

The New York Regency tactics, however, have gained such an ascendancy in Pennsylvania, and even in Virginia, that we should not be surprised if North Carolina, much as she has been taunted for lethargy, should yet be found ahead of both her old compeers in the contest for *principle*. She was the first, be it ever remembered, to *declare Independence*, and she fought gallantly to secure it. When the war had ceased, and eleven other States had adopted the new Constitution, North Carolina still for a while held back, through jealousy of the new Government; and she was the *first*, as we shall shortly prove, to resist the attempted encroachments of the General Government.

These things we have a right to be proud of, and we trust the recollection of them will stimulate our People to pursue a course worthy the descendants of a generation some of whom are still lingering among us, anxious spectators of passing events.

* No State in the Union is so entirely degraded, by *man-worship*, as Pennsylvania. Her People voted at first for General Jackson, professedly believing him to be a *Republican*. In vain some of the sagacious old Republicans warned them of the consequences of electing a man who had recommended it to a former President (Mr. Monroe) to destroy all party distinctions.—Their Hero was elected: he raised up the altar of *man-worship*, upon the ruins of political *principle*; and his votaries cried out, "Great is Andrew, who can do no wrong!"

He was popular in Pennsylvania because the People believed him to be friendly to the Tariff and Internal Improvements. His measures on these subjects have fluctuated, being sometimes *for* and sometimes *against* them; but, true to the man, Pennsylvanians cry out, "Well done Andrew!"

In less than three years he sacrificed, as far as he could, the reputation of two favorite sons of Pennsylvania, (Ingham and Duane,) by turning them out of office for honest independence: but still Pennsylvanians shouted the praises of the "old Roman!"

Pennsylvania was more unanimous than any other State in favor of the United States Bank: her commerce, her manufactures, and her vast schemes of internal improvement, have been crippled, if not ruined, by the President's conduct towards the Bank: but still the *destroyer* is worshipped as something far superior to Washington or any other mortal!

George Wolf, Governor of Pennsylvania, is one of the Idol's high priests: and like others of the craft, who either always enjoy or expect rewards, he ascribes no-

UNITED STATES BANK.

On the 18th ultimo, Mr. Webster introduced, in the Senate, a bill relating to this institution. It proposes to continue the present Bank six years beyond the time for which it was at first chartered; that Congress shall reserve the right to establish another before the end of the six years; that the public money hereafter collected shall be deposited in the old Bank during its existence.....subject, however, to the control of Congress; that, for the use of such deposites, the Bank shall pay the United States $200,000 annually.—These are all the important provisions of the bill. It seems to be the opinion, at Washington, that it will not pass either House. Its consideration has been postponed until the last of April.

Mr. Calhoun has introduced a proposition on the same subject, which it is thought will probably succeed. He proposes to renew the charter for twelve or fifteen years; and, in order to insure to the country a larger specie currency, he proposes to prohibit the Bank from issuing, for the first six years, any bills under $10, and after six years, any less than $20. Another important suggestion was made by Mr. Calhoun, which was, to *raise the standard value of Gold*. In the U. States, gold does not bear the same value, in proportion to silver, that it does in Europe; and the consequence is, that we see none in circulation here, because it is sent where it is worth more.

The speech of Mr. Calhoun, on introducing his proposition, was highly conciliatory in its spirit, and, as usual, very able. He has acted on this subject in such a manner as to extort praise from all but the inmates of the Executive Kitchen and their implacable Chief; and, if his proposition fails, it will probably be owing entirely to the fact that it originated with one for whom the President and his partisans cherish a hatred "not to be changed by time or place."

COL. DAVID CROCKETT.

A bill being lately before the House of Representatives, making appropriations for the Army, a clause allowing $1825 for defraying a Surgeon's expenses in making "*experiments*" on the stomach of a wounded soldier, elicited a good deal of wit and severe rebuke of other "experiments" which are now in a course of determination. The honest but eccentric individual whose name stands at the head of this article, spoke as follows:

"Gentlemen objected to paying for experiments; but in these days, when we were trying experiments on the currency, why not try experiments on the sciences!—For his part, however, he thought it hardly necessary to make any appropriations at all, for this or any thing else. He had been almost ready to go against all appropriation bills, till he knew where the money was. If one man could take all the money, what was the use of passing any bills about it! It was a mockery—it was childish to sit there and appropriate at all. If one man could take the money, and put it where the law had not placed it, how did the House know where it was!—how could they tell but it might be in his Royal Majesty's breeches pocket, or in the pocket of that imp of flumine, his Fourth Auditor! He would vote for one experiment, but he should go against the other."

RIP VAN WINKLE.

As a newspaper is a kind of periodical encyclopedia designed to convey 'all sorts' of matter to 'all sorts' of readers, we shall make no apology to our political friends for giving a place to the well-told story of "Rip Van Winkle," a part of which will be found on the fourth page of this paper.

There are, doubtless, thousands who have never read the adventures of this remarkable old gentleman, who was a personification of somnolency; to them, therefore, the tale will be particularly interesting, as it will not only amuse them while reading it, but will enable them to understand the frequent allusions made to old 'Rip,' by comparing North Carolina, in her endless lethargy, to that poor wight of hen-pecked and sleepy memory.

SOUTHERN CHRISTIAN HERALD.

We have received the second number of this paper, published in Columbia, S. C., and regret that we cannot now find space for an extract from its columns, to show with what ability it has begun its contributions to religion, morality, and literature. The selections are peculiarly interesting, and the Editor's comments upon them well-written—both evincing a freedom from sectarian intolerance.

It is published weekly, by the Rev. R. S. Gladney, at $3 per annum, in advance.

☞ The reader is referred to the article from the Charleston Courier. It will be seen that the British authorities of Nassau have exercised such aggression upon the property of American Citizens, and indignity to our National Flag, as will call for the speedy and decided interference of our Government. We hope the statement may prove to be highly colored; but, if not, we feel sure that justice will be demanded by our authorities, and awarded by the English Government.

FOR THE WESTERN CAROLINIAN.

Mr. Editor: I have read, in your paper of the 22d of February, the Speech of James Whitaker, Esq., delivered to the Freemen of Macon County in June last; from it I have extracted the following paragraph:

"And here let it be remembered, that there is now, "and ever has been, since the war of the Revolution, "two powerful parties in the Government, entertaining "precisely different principles and different views of "administering the affairs of the Union: the one party "in favor of a Great National Consolidated Government, in which the States are merged into one General Government with unlimited powers—the other "party contending that the individual States are so "many Sovereignties....or, as Washington styles them, "distinct communities; that the States are the constituent members of the General Government, which is "the creature of the States, and has no further power "than what is delegated to it by the States, in the Constitution," &c.

If there is any such party as Mr. Whitaker describes, who are in favor of a National Consolidated Government with unlimited powers, I have never known or heard of them. There is, however, a Political Party in the United States, who believe that the Government of the United States is such as the Sovereign People of the States intended to make it, to attain the objects for which it was established, as expressly set forth in the Preamble to the Constitution of the United States, in the following words: "We the People of the United "States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for "the common defence, promote the general welfare, "and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and "our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution "for the United States of America."

It clearly appears, from the language used in this preamble, that it was not the several States in their Legislative capacities, under the authority of their State Constitutions, who have adopted this Constitution for the government of the People; but the People in their sovereign capacity, (who are of higher authority than their State Legislatures,) by their delegates in convention, have ordained and established "this Constitution for the United States of America;" and, in conformity with their declared purposes, they have distributed the powers granted by it among three co-ordinate branches of the Government thereby established by it, viz. the Legislative, the Executive, and the Judicial—expressly defining those granted to each; and as far as they have granted, they have declared that their powers are paramount to the State authorities established under their several Constitutions, and that "This Constitution, and "the laws of the United States which shall be made in "pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which "shall be made under the authority of the U. States, "shall be the supreme law of the land; and the Judges "of every State shall be bound thereby, any thing in "Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

This party never have claimed any more power for the General Government than what is plainly granted to it by the Constitution, to attain the objects for which it was ordained and established: and, among the powers granted to Congress, in the 8th section of the 1st article is the power "to make all laws which shall be "necessary and proper for carrying into execution the "foregoing powers and all other powers vested by this "Constitution in the Government of the United States, "or in any department or officer thereof." And in the 10th section of said 1st article, it lays restrictions on the powers of the individual States.

The question has been asked, by some, why was the Constitution of the U. States submitted to the People of each State separately, if the States are not the Sovereign constituent parties! I answer, the reason is very plain: The People of each State, before the adoption of this Constitution, constituted a distinct and separate Sovereignty within their territorial limits, and they alone had the power of altering their State Constitutions. It was therefore necessary for the People of every State, in their Sovereign capacity, to adopt any alteration which would affect their State Governments and lay restrictions upon their State Legislatures, such as are laid in the instrument. The origin of all power is inherent in the People in their original state of nature, as individuals, who have the right to form themselves into societies, communities, or governments, and to give up a part of their natural rights in order to secure the rest and acquire others in their social state.—Before our Revolution, each of our then thirteen States or Colonies had, under the authority of the mother country, established a Government for themselves; and, after the Declaration of Independence, adopted State Constitutions; and, at the close of the war, when Gt. Britain acknowledged their independence, they were thirteen Sovereign Independent States, which sovereignty was vested in the People, who had a power over the Constitutions which they had adopted for their own government, to alter them from time to time as they might see fit; and when the People of the several States appointed Delegates to consider of the Constitution of the United States, and either to reject or adopt it, (and who did adopt it,) they, by doing so, abridged some of the powers they had granted to their State Governments, and vested them in the General Government, to attain the objects for which it was adopted, as therein stated.

When we speak of Sovereignty, we attach to it the idea that there is no superior: therefore, to speak of the several States as being absolute Sovereignties, is absurd, when we recur to the before-recited clause in the Constitution of the United States, viz. "this Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, &c., shall be the supreme law of the land," &c. It is admitted, by this party, that the powers not granted by the Constitution of the United States to the General Government, are reserved to the States or to the People,...among which is the right to regulate the internal affairs of each State, by adopting such laws for the security of life, liberty, and property, as they may see fit to make, which may be consistent with the Constitution of the United States.

It is unfair to attribute opinions to any party of politicians, which they disavow, and always have done—The Federal Party have always admitted that any Act passed by Congress, not authorized by the Constitution, is void and of no force, and that any citizen has a right to refuse obedience to it; but that no one citizen or individual State has a right to be the final judge in such case; but the Judicial power established by the People, in the Constitution of the United States, one of the co-ordinate branches of the Government, is to be the judge in the last resort, whether the law is constitutional or not; and if decided, by that tribunal, to be unconstitutional, it is no crime to disobey it.

March 18, 1834. A NORTH CAROLINIAN.

LETTER FROM WASHINGTON.

To the Editor of the Western Carolinian.

WASHINGTON, MARCH 24, 1834.

Dear Sir: The Deposite Question is still before both Houses of Congress. On Wednesday, the House took up the Report of the Committee of Ways and Means. Many speeches have already been delivered; many more will follow. You see there is a strong disposition, on the part of those who are sustaining the removal of the deposites from the place where the law had placed them, to make it a party question. It is to be hoped the country will not so consider it. Its importance is too vast, and the principles involved in it too sacred, to make it a party question. Its effects must go down to posterity, and the principles upon which the measure has been bottomed, must incorporate themselves into our institutions, and endure as long as they shall endure. Is it not, therefore, monstrous that such a question should be made a party question? And yet, a distinguished Senator from Georgia declared, in his place, that two-thirds of both Houses would have voted a restoration of the Deposites, but for party considerations! And will the people allow their Representatives thus to sport with their most sacred rights, and to destroy their happiness and prosperity for party considerations! Is the New York organization of party, so much boasted of by Mr. Vanderpool, to prevail over a sense of duty to the people, a regard for the Constitution and Laws, for public faith and national honor! I hope not. But how can this be considered a party question! General Jackson is not a candidate for re-election, and, decide this question as you will, it can neither extend or curtail the period of his public service. If, therefore, any man, or set of men, have advised this measure, or now support it, from party considerations, without regard to the public good, and merely to secure their own election to office, the people ought to frown with indignation upon that party. The old and sincere friends of Genl. Jackson are the men who ought, and many of whom do, most sincerely regret this measure. It has done much to injure the public character of the President. The men who have advised, or now sustain the measure, for their own selfish views, are doing it at the expense of Genl. Jackson's popularity, and by the sacrifice of his future fame. But I have wandered from my object, which was merely to tell you what is doing in the Capital of the Union.