

...that it arrested the attention of several of the copyists, and among others the Kentuckian. He stopped short, and unfolding his arms, said to the last speaker—'stranger, do you know that you are violating the rules of the house?'
The Jackson man professed his intentions to violate no regulation—and asked to know what rule he had infringed.
'There is one which you have violated,' said the Kentuckian, pointing to the tin sign, and reading—'Gentlemen are not permitted to lie down in this cabin.'—*Phil. U. S. Ges.*

From the New York Spectator and Enquirer.

THE FANATICS.

These indefatigable incendiaries, whose perseverance in a rational and good cause would entitle them to great credit, are still at work laying the foundation for a servile war, or a dissolution of this Union. We say a dissolution of this Union, for in all our conversations and intercourse with the gentlemen of the South, whether Nullifiers or Unionists, Whigs or Tories, we never met with one who did not pronounce, emphatically and without reserve, that any attempt, on the part of the General or State Governments, to interfere with the relations between master and slave in the South, would lead to inevitable separations. With us slavery is one of those abstract questions which affect no man's personal or political welfare; but to the South, it is a subject of such vital, such universal interest, that it will not bear to be tampered with. Life and property are on the issue.

One principal object of these mischievous and malignant incendiaries seems to be the destruction of the Colonization Society, which holds out the only rational and practical mode of bringing about the emancipation of the blacks, namely, with the consent of their masters. Unless this indispensable preliminary is obtained, such a measure cannot be accomplished without being followed or preceded by consequences which no rational, humane white man can anticipate without shuddering. The objects of this war against a society numbering among its prominent members many of the first and best men of this country, are not difficult to be detected. The fanatics, in the first place, perceive, in the existence of that Society, a rational ground for attaining an object which they themselves seek to accomplish by outraging every principle of reason and humanity; and in the second, they seek to divert the funds and contributions destined to the rational and humane purpose, to themselves. They cannot bear to see a dollar bestowed on the Colonization Society; their aim is to divert the whole current of public sympathy and public munificence into the polluted channel of their own selfish and malignant objects. Hence their denunciations and calumnies, and hence their bitter opposition to the only rational and practicable plan ever devised for the emancipation of the slaves of independent States, who, unlike the colonies of England, cannot be relieved out of their guaranteed rights, by any power under heaven.

It may not be generally known to our readers, that there is now existing in the State of Ohio a college, instituted solely for educating young missionaries to go about like roaring lions, full of fury and fanaticism, preaching the doctrines of the Immediate Abolitionists. The first article in the constitution of this Society is as follows:

'I. *Object.* Our object is the immediate emancipation of the whole colored race in the United States; the emancipation of the slave from the oppression of his master; the emancipation of the free colored man from the oppression of public sentiment, and the elevation of both to a moral and political equality with the whites.'

...the repeated and increasing interference with our domestic institutions, by our Northern brethren, has greatly added to the difficulties of Christians in discharging the duties which they owe their domestics. As Christians, we are solemnly bound to promote both their spiritual and temporal interests, by every means compatible with our own peace and happiness. How to discharge our duty in this respect, to our God, our country, ourselves, and our servants, presents a difficulty known only to those upon whom devolves the inquiry. Surely our Northern brethren are not aware of the extent to which they are injuring us. But the wound, as might have been expected, is inflicted upon the negro instead of the master. His civil and religious privileges have been necessarily curtailed. Suspicions have been awakened, and prejudices excited, perhaps to an unreasonable extent in many, against the attempts of Christians to impart religious instruction to the blacks. Yet with the Christian, the command of God, 'Go teach all nations,' is paramount to all others. It is not knowledge that would render our negroes worse servants; and least of all, is it a knowledge of religion that would injure either the servant or the master. But it is the fact that they would no sooner obtain knowledge than it would be made, by others, the means of rendering them discontented and insubordinate.

We regret the necessity of having to expostulate with our Northern brethren on account of their interference with our domestic institutions. But situated as we are, and possessing irresistible evidence of the fact, we feel it our duty both to prove those who interfere, and to inform the people of the South, that such is the case. While we hold it to be unjust as well as unchristian, to contribute unnecessarily to the existence of animosities between different sections of our great confederacy, we must believe it to be a Christian duty to raise a warning voice against any course of conduct which may ultimately not only destroy the peace of the church, but sever the bonds of this great confederacy, and result in the ruin of thousands. Believing that such may be the result, is it not our duty, may dare we neglect to raise a warning voice? May there not be some who will listen to our just complaints; and who will unite with us in staying the current (that is swelling and widening in its course) as it rolls on to desolate the habitations of thousands? But we shall be told by some that these are idle apprehensions; that the number of those who are interfering with the interests of the South, are comparatively few; that they are contemptible, and no less reprobated by the great body of the Northern, than by the Southern people. We shall be told of the defeat of the abolitionists in New York, last winter, and perhaps many other face-facts. If any one thinks these considerations sufficient to remove all apprehensions, we earnestly beg that he will give a satisfactory answer to the following questions: Is it not a fact that many influential men are actively

and perseveringly engaged in the cause of abolition? Is it not a fact that there are large anti-slavery societies formed that regularly meet and publish reports of their proceedings? Is it not a fact that law and contemptible and reprobated, as they may be, professors of colleges, and clergymen, are numbered amongst them, and their proceedings published in many of the most respectable and widely circulated papers of the North? Is it not a fact that papers are established having for their avowed object abolition or emancipation? Is it not a fact that a majority of the political and miscellaneous papers, and the religious papers, with few exceptions, publish accounts of outrages committed by masters in the South, upon their slaves? Could there be any mode more effectual in misrepresenting the character of slavery in the South, or in exciting the indignation of the Northern people against the Southern? Suppose we should glean all the instances of cruelty practised by individuals in the North, upon their families, upon their laborers and operatives, and publish them as characteristic of the Northern people, would it not be most unjust?—Suppose, in this way, we should endeavor to get up an excitement among the Southern people against the Northern, would it not be wicked? Where is the country in which many examples may not be collected of inferiors being cruelly treated by their superiors,—even of wives and children, being barbarously treated by the head of the family? But would it not be grossly dishonest to select such cases, to represent the character of the people, with a view to render them odious, and to excite against them the indignation of others? Yet is not this the course pursued by a large majority of the most influential religious papers published in the North? Is it not a fact that in many of the literary institutions of the North, anti-slavery societies are formed? Is it not a fact that at Andover, one of the most respectable theological seminaries in the North, there is one which has its regular anniversary celebration for the purpose of denouncing the institutions of the South? Is it not a fact that the members of this institution, who are annually dispersing through the United States, stand pledged to one another? Is it not a fact that letters from the South, describing the horrors of slavery, and denouncing the injustice of the system, are published in the North? By whom? By natives! Or by some of the missionaries sent to enlighten and convert the heathen of the South? Who, with all the most positive evidence, could believe that men, living upon the beauties of the South, enjoying the good things of the land, giving and receiving the right hand of fellowship, should in the meantime be representing us as masters of iniquity, and exciting against us the prejudices and indignation of our brethren? Well may we say with the inspired penman, 'Faithful are the wounds of a friend; but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful.' Is not the Colonization Society a very powerful and influential body? Do not its members make the same representations of slavery as is made by the abolitionists? Do they not denounce it in the same terms? Do they differ from the abolitionists in any other respect than as to the means most suitable for the accomplishment of their object? Shall we be told that all the presses prostituted to the unholy cause of producing an excitement among the people of the North against those of the South, are patronized by people disapproving of their conduct? Shall we be told, in view of all these facts, that our apprehensions are unfounded? We challenge a denial of them. We hold in our hands documents containing ample evidence to substantiate them. He who, after reflecting upon all the movements relative to this subject, can see no cause of apprehension, may well be compared to the idols of the heathen, which have ears but hear not, and eyes but see not. Can efforts so great and so perseveringly made, fail to produce an excitement which may prove incapable of being checked, even by those most active in creating it? When can any to what length men will go when impelled by mistaken notions of religion and philanthropy? Have not efforts already been made in the Presbyterian Church to exclude slaveholders from its communion? Has not this point been carried in two other churches?

—Since then the slavery of the South is viewed by the people of the North as a most odious crime, and our negroes as innocent sufferers, exposed to all the cruelties which capricious and inhuman masters may inflict; since it is viewed as a national sin and disgrace, since so many presses are portraying the sufferings of the innocent negro and the barbarity of the master, is it not to be feared that the time may soon come when some political *Expos* shall give vent to the struggling passions of the multitude, and the fair fabric of the Union be demolished by the storm? All this is not only probable, but will inevitably be the result, if the present course of things continue. Permit us then to ask those who are interfering with our domestic concerns, a few questions. Has your interference, instead of doing good, not been productive of evil? Has it not added necessarily to the rigors of slavery? Has it not compelled the Southern people to curtail the privileges of their domestics? Is it not embittering the people of the North against those of the South; and exasperating the latter against the former? A few years back, and Southern men were the advocates of colonization. A few years ago, and many of our negroes were taught to render without any apprehensions that they would be rendered worse instead of better. A few years ago, and many of them could write, and were employed as clerks. A few years past, and those who desired it, set their servants free. But you have been whispering it in the chimney corners, in the by-paths, and in the midnight assemblies, that freedom is a glorious boon which feeds and clothes man, a glorious state, free from labor and toil, from care and sorrow, which consists in being always happy. You have been teaching them that domestic servitude is a violation of the laws of God and man, a state of oppression, insult, and degradation. Where are the laboring classes, that may not be repeated misrepresentation, be rendered discontented, and dangerous to the peace and happiness of society?—How long has it been since the laboring classes in New York, by being persuaded that they were cruelly and unjustly treated, had almost uprooted the foundations of government, and commenced a system of robbery and outrage? Had the South been instrumental in producing this excitement, would we not have justly merited the indignation of every friend to good order and happiness? Should you succeed in producing sufficient excitement in the North to induce the multitude to overlook the barriers of the Constitution and laws of the country, what would be the result? Have you who form peace societies, and who desire to appear foremost in Christian virtues, and acts of philanthropy, considered this? When the false and

delusive hopes you have held up have sent forth the midnight assassin with the club and the dagger, rest assured that you will then accomplish emancipation by annihilating the objects of your sympathies. Is your course, then, one which is calculated to produce 'on earth peace and good will toward men?' If not, can it be consistent with the doctrines of Christianity? And if not, can you expect a blessing to rest upon your efforts?

We copy the following as a specimen of some of the articles published for the purpose of exciting the people of the North against those of the South. Our paper might be filled every week with pieces of a similar character. Our language on this subject has, perhaps, been too strong. But it is impossible for any man, unless utterly destitute of feeling, to peruse what is written on this subject, at the North, and consider the consequences to which it must lead, without being both grieved and displeased.

'Mrs. *Wentworth*—Moses Brown, convicted of the charge of inveigling, stealing, and carrying away a negro slave, the property of the estate of Col. Taylor, of South Carolina, has been sentenced to be hung on the 6th of July next. The jury have recommended him to Executive clemency.

—Is this the testimony of our Southern lawgivers to the righteousness of the Jewish statute, Exod. 21: 10, 'He that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death?' Or is it for stealing the 'property of the estate of Col. Taylor,' that the man is sentenced to be hung? How came Col. Taylor by a 'property' of his fellow countrymen? We should be glad to know what constitutes slave-stealing, by the laws of South Carolina? If a father should take his child away from an abuser, and carry it away in a carriage to a place of safety and freedom, would he have to be hung for stealing?'—*New York Evangelist.*

Was it the father of the child who stole it?

ROYAL PREROGATIVE.

Extracts from a Speech made in the British Parliament, on the motion for agreeing to an Address to the King.

'Mr. Henry Grattan' said, it was impossible to agree to the address, not only on account of what it said, but what it had omitted to say. There is no relief proposed—there is a very indistinct and unintelligible statement as to tithes—and there are portentous threats, angry language, and ominous expressions of renewed coercion. It might be supposed that the act of last year would have been sufficient; its violence in the outset—its failure in the operation. We told the House it would fail; we told the ministers that, in order to put down a few disturbers of the peace in the Queen's County and the adjacent ones, it was not necessary to suspend the constitution. The measure had nothing on which to operate; the people became quiet from other causes. The repetition of a title war, and the million bill—these, and not the coercive bill, appeased the people. Still, there was much disquiet, much agitation; and the minister comes forward again, and in another speech fulminates from the throne denunciations against the people. (Hear.) I ask, what minister dictated the words His Majesty has just used?—Who was audacious enough to suggest them, and who weak enough to advise their adoption? Who is the junior minister, who, in the excess of his imprudence, spredered the senior and wiser members—invaded the office of prime minister, and forces the introduction of the expressions that have fallen from the King? Are they aware of what is said when they make the King declare that his Irish subjects have drawn down upon themselves his 'just indignation'—that our royal master is indignant with his people, and that his anger is not only great but 'just'? His faithful subjects in Ireland have now to dread the consequences that are attendant upon his just indignation, and this from the father of his people. (Loud cries of 'Hear, hear, hear,') Sir, in all the royal speeches I have read, no such expressions as these occur.

—When His Majesty is made to speak of his just indignation, may I ask, with due submission, whether the crying distress of his Irish subjects has excited his just indignation? (Cries of hear, hear.)—Has the emigration of his principal nobility and gentry, and increased absenteeism—has the abandonment of the relations and moral ties that ought to exist between the upper and lower classes—have these refugees, termed, as they have been, by high authority, as the 'base betrayers and deserters of their native land'—have they excited his Majesty's just indignation—(hear)—or has the complaint of want of employment, want of trade, want of manufactures—a state which an Irish Chancellor of the Exchequer declared was that of a 'beggarly gentry and a ruined peasantry'—has this state of things excited the just indignation of his Majesty? Is the King never angry but when the Irish seek for liberty, and for employment? and is he to be satisfied or silent when they starve for want of bread? And this, too, from the father of his people.

'The committee state that their fellow creatures are reduced to the lowest ebb of human suffering, and driven by misery to the very edge of despair'—that during the last year they had relieved about 10,500 families, amounting to 37,000 persons.—This is not confined to Dublin alone. The resolutions of the meetings in various parts of Ireland speak the same. 'In the west of Ireland, at a meeting where the Bishop of Maronia presided, the resolutions were of the same report. The law does not allow me to call him Bishop, but Dr. MacHale does not want that title here, for whether he writes, or speaks, or acts, he displays a spirit of philanthropy and piety, and charity, united to ancient love and the lights of modern times, that at once captivate and enlighten, and do honor alike to the individual and to his sacred calling; he too describes the deplorable state of the west of Ireland, and the destitution of the people. The resolutions say that 80,000 persons in his dioceses eat meat but twice a year, and have scarcely potatoes enough to subsist on.'

'Their resolutions are mostly couched in proper and decorous terms.—They seek by petition and statement to bring the case before the House; and are they to be prevented? Do Ministers mean to declare it high treason to meet and speak upon the Report? The prime minister of the country stood by the throne, holding in his hand the sword of state. The speech almost tells us that it is to be drawn from the scabbard.—(Hear, hear.)' But Sir, there is another statement in that speech, of a most unconstitutional nature. His Majesty is made to say, that it is 'his fixed and unalterable resolution to maintain inviolate the act of Union!'

and can be altered. They equally know that the King has no right or prerogative whereby he can at the outset declare his fixed determination for or against any measure. It is contrary to the first principles of the constitution, and amounts to its complete infringement. If the King can thus invade our functions, the labors of this body are at an end. (Hear, hear.) We are here, only to approve of laws as he may in the first instance propose; and should his Majesty signify his displeasure, the representatives of the people must remain passive spectators, and merge their quality of legislators. They are not to prostrate the law, but to receive it from his Majesty. If so, we may at once go back to our constituents, and resign the trust committed to our care. (Hear, hear.)'



FIAT JUSTITIA
QUI PROBATA
THE CAROLINIAN.
SALISBURY:
SATURDAY, JUNE 14, 1834.

FANATICISM.

Not infrequently, since the present Editor of the Carolinian took charge of it, has he been unjustly accused of attempting to protract discord between the North and the South.

He has been charged with hostility to the Northern People, and his occasional animadversions upon the fanatics have been strongly and unfairly perverted into evidence of such hostile feelings.

Nothing can be less just. If the Editor entertains any prejudices at all in relation to the People of the North, they are certainly not unfavorable. Though a native of the South, he spent among the Yankees some years of that period of life which is most susceptible of generous and permanent impressions; and contracted not only a strong and enduring partiality for many individuals, but likewise, in the main, a favorable opinion of the great mass of society there.

Nevertheless, although he sees in their habits, their manners and customs, their institutions, and their traits of character, much that is worthy of praise and of imitation, still he cannot shut his eyes to some obvious circumstances. They are the descendants of a race of men remarkable, at once, for their devotion to civil liberty, and for their fanaticism and religious intolerance.

But it may be said that there is something, at the present day, to be apprehended from that sort of fanaticism which threw a dark tint upon the otherwise bright character of the 'Pilgrim Fathers' of New England, and their immediate descendants.

We admit that there is less danger now than there was two centuries ago. There has been a mighty progress since then in moral and intellectual improvement. But, notwithstanding all this, human nature is the same, and therefore it is not entirely safe to be sure from the operations of causes which have heretofore produced so much disorder in society.

All history teaches us that, as the simplest constitution or organization of the natural body is not proof against disease, so the most healthy and perfect state of society, as a political, or even as a religious community, is subject to moral disorders, which, though they may continue for a time within a limited sphere, are not unapt to become epidemic.

From whatever cause it originated, it ought not and it cannot be conceived that such a disorder has already become, in some degree, epidemic at the North. To borrow a phrase which seems peculiarly applicable, the 'premonitory symptoms' are too strong to be mistaken—and it is the part of patriotism and of true Christian benevolence to take such precautionary measures as may prevent the extension of a plague that would be unconceivably more terrible than the Asiatic Cholera.

The press, the newspapers, may do much towards checking the progress of this plague; and is it not the duty of all, who have those means, to use them prudently, but with energy, in order to arrest the progress of fanaticism, which threatens to whirl our Constitution and our country in 'hideous ruin'? It is a subject of vastly more importance than many suppose, and it is growing more and more momentous.

In this paper will be found an extract from a New York paper, giving a short sketch of the present state of the disease; and immediately after it will be seen an 'Expostulation' taken from a Southern paper, which is conducted by an able Minister of the Presbyterian Church.

Hitherto a most culpable apathy on this subject has pervaded the whole Southern press, with few exceptions. And, because those few happened to be, in general, opposed to aggressions of another kind, it was ungenerously asserted that they were intent upon producing an unnecessary excitement for a most unwarrantable purpose.

But it is time for such illiberal surmises to give place to prudent counsel; and the wise and the virtuous of the land, without regard to local divisions, or political parties, or religious sects, must unite, specially unto their energies against the impending danger—or the days of this happy Republic are numbered.

From the N. Y. American, edited by Chas. King, Esq.
The 'Richmond Enquirer' would, we presume, fail to pass for a journal devoted to the laws, and willing to adhere to and abide by their decision. Yet see the language used by that print in reference to the highest law tribunals of this land. Speaking of a rumor that the President would cause a *sevis facias* to be sued out against the Bank of the United States, the Enquirer says—

'We doubt much the efficacy of a *Sevis Facias*. It would give the Bank a handle for new clamor and additional pressure on the People; but of what avail would this process? The *sevis facias* would be sued out of the Circuit Court for the District of Pennsylvania, and the final judgment would be examinable into by the Supreme Court of the U. States. But, if any one expects strict justice, in such a case, from these tribunals, he has a more sanguine temperament than we happen to possess. The case ought to be transferred to the great tribunal of the People; and there let it be decided.'

And if justice is not to be expected from such a Court as that in which *John Marshall* presides, does the Richmond Enquirer honestly believe that it can be had from heated partisan appeals to the people? If a Court, combining so thoroughly as that of the Supreme Court—whose Judges are permanent, with salaries that cannot be diminished, and without any connection with politics—cannot be trusted in a case where strict legal rights are in controversy—where a penal clause in the charter of a great and rich, and therefore popu-

larly obvious, corporation is to be, if found needed, applied—what is to be hoped from a discussion in which ignorance, passion, prejudice, and self-interest, will combine to pervert the truth, and when the Judges are thirteen millions instead of seven persons, as we are under a solemn oath? We ask the Richmond Enquirer to answer these questions, not as a partisan editor, but as an honest man; and to reconcile his answers as such, with the overt expression of distrust in said contempt for the Supreme Court of the United States, exhibited in the paragraph we have quoted.

Do you think, Mr. King, that old Mr. Constantine Ritchie will give you a plain honest answer to your hard questions? If you do, you will be disappointed. Mr. Ritchie would not give such an answer if his answers were as 'plenty as blackberries,' unless it might be for the interest of his party.

This short paragraph from the Richmond Enquirer opens a new chapter in the history of the times. It is worthy of a little more comment than the Editor of the American has bestowed on it.

Be it remembered, that Mr. Ritchie not only professes—or did until lately—a great respect for every department of Government, but pretended to be an advocate even of State Rights.

Some twelve months ago, while he was denouncing the friends of State Rights, and at the same time praising the doctrine, Judge Upham, the writer of the elegant letters signed 'Locke,' called upon Mr. Ritchie to tell him what he meant by State Rights, and what were the remedies for violations of them.

Mr. Ritchie did not think it prudent at that time to venture upon an exposition of his views; but we have it now in plain terms.

The State Rights men contend that in all questions of jurisdiction between a State and the General Government, the proper tribunal to decide, in the last resort, would be a Convention of the States. The Nullifiers contend that the Supreme Court is the proper tribunal. But it seems now that they are both wrong;—the case ought to be transferred to the great tribunal of the People; so says Mr. Ritchie, and so, of course, will all the party say, until they discover that a majority of the great tribunal of the People are opposed to the President; and then we suppose he will stretch his arm for the 300,000 men from the West 'to calm and decide the dispute.'

But really Mr. Ritchie seems to have run entirely mad since the elections in Virginia turned out against his party. He has now abandoned the rights of the States, and among the rest, even those of the disreputable Old Dominion, which seemed to be peculiarly dear to him, and given them up to the tender mercies of a majority of the People of the United States.—He has given up all the checks upon the absolute majority—the Senate and the Supreme Court, which are the only departments wherein the equality of the States is preserved; and has thus confidently entrusted all the rights—yes, and powers too—to the President, backed by the 'great tribunal!'

This Mr. Ritchie at last came out plainly in favor of the Consolidation doctrine of the Emancipator. Despair has forced him to confess his political error, and now we hope that he will be no longer troubled to lead those who followed him in his insidious and venous political course.

CONGRESSIONAL SUMMARY.

On Monday, the 2nd instant, the Hon. John Bell, of Tennessee, was elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, to supply the vacancy caused by the resignation of Mr. Stevenson.

There were ten ballottings before a choice was made. The contest was between Mr. Bell and Mr. Polk, both from Tennessee; and on the tenth balloting, Bell had 114, and Polk 78—scattering 26.

Messrs. Bell and Polk are both friendly to the Administration, but the latter is likewise a friend of Mr. Van Buren. Mr. Bell therefore owes his success to the mass of that portion of the Jackson men opposed to Van Buren, with those who are opposed to the Administration generally.

Mr. Bell is not entirely for the whole swing—he can go the present head—but, wonderful to relate, cannot swallow the tail! This would seem paradoxical if we did not know what a powerful effect the imagination has upon the faculties of both body and mind.

In the Senate, some propositions of Mr. Bibb, to amend the Constitution in the part relative to the election of President and Vice-President, have been referred to a Select Committee composed of Messrs. Bibb, Benton, Webster, Calhoun, and Forsyth.

The resolutions of Mr. Clay, (which we published last week,) in relation to the Deposites, have passed the Senate.

Mr. McKean, of Pennsylvania, presented a memorial, which he accompanied with the following remarks:

Mr. McKean said, a committee of thirty citizens, of the first respectability, from various sections of Pennsylvania, all of whom he believed, were now in the Lobby of the Senate, had honored him by putting into his charge a memorial to be presented to the Senate, signed by more than 900 Delegates from the different counties of that State, who assembled at Harrisburg, the Seat of Government, on the 27th ultimo, to consult as to the causes of public distress and mode of relief. And though he said, a difference of political opinion, as well as on questions of abstract expediency, existed between a portion of the memorialists and himself, it was nevertheless his desire to represent them, fairly, and it was no less his pride than his duty to say, that this Convention comprised so much of respectability, talent, and weight of public and private character, its any Convention of men that had assembled any where within his knowledge; and whose experience entitled their opinions to the most respectful consideration.

He had been furnished with a statement showing the general as well as political complexion of the Convention, and he took occasion to say, that the latter was corroborated by his own knowledge of the facts stated. The whole number of Delegates present was 300; of this number, 75 were original Jackson men, about 30 of whom supported General Jackson in 1822. Delegates were appointed from 48 counties, and Delegates were in actual attendance from 44 counties, including the City of Philadelphia, accidents having prevented the attendance from the other 4. He had been particularly instructed to say, that the entire proceedings had been distinguished by harmony, unanimity, and zeal, and that the whole character of the Convention furnished the strongest evidence of a great political change in Pennsylvania, and a growing opposition to the recent measures of the present Administration of the General Government. The memorial was written with great force and ability, and condemns, in both the conduct of the Executive branch of the Government in reference to the Bank; to which cause they ascribe all the present distresses of the country, and ask Congress for relief.

KING WILLIAM AND KING ANDREW.

In the British Parliament, lately, Mr. Shiel introduced a petition from many distressed people in Ireland, praying for a repeal of the Legislative Union between England and Ireland; and for the abolition of the oppressive system of tithes.

It is the custom, in Great Britain, for the Parliament