Terms of the Watchman.

For Subscription, per year, Two Dollars—payable in advance. But if not paid in advance, Two dollars and fifty cts. will be charged.

Advertisements inserted at $1 for the first, and 25 cts. for each subsequent insertion. Court orders charged 25 per ct. higher than these rates. A liberal deduction to those who advertise by the year.

Letters to the Editors must be post paid.

OUR GOVERNOR.

We are sorry to observe, from the tone of the Raleigh papers, a determination to press, by the "irresistible force of precedent," Gov. Manly upon the Whig party as a candidate for re election. We had hoped that his friends had been taught wisdom by the narrow escape he had made from a defeat at the last election. It is, and has been, for a long time perfectly notorious, that his vote in the West, in another election will fall short of his last vote by thousands, and we waited patiently to see it intimated from head quarters that he would not be again before a convention. We were at length compelled to speak, but we did it in mild language and in such a manner, as not needlessly to wound his feelings. The last *Raleigh Register* appeals to the party not to thrust him aside and thus mortify his pride, but let him be again the candidate and "walk over the track," for that democrats are in favor of him. If he is to walk over the track, we have nothing to say. But who believes such will be the case? And if he runs, no sane man, west of Raleigh (of the East we know nothing) doubts but that the democrats will run a candidate who will beat him. We do not desire to mortify Gov Manly's feelings, but we regard the interests of the Whig party more, and it is certainly a singular move on the part of his friends to plead his feelings in the scale against the interests of his party.

We do not propose now to discuss the reason why Gov Manly cannot get the support of the Whigs of the West. We are prepared to do it however at any time the Raleigh papers desire it, but we simply now call the attention of the *Editor of the Register* to allusions put forth by his *locum tenens*" in behalf of Gov. Manly which strikes us as decidedly rich. He is recomended as a great friend of the "Central Rail Road." How has he shown his friendship? What convention has he attended? What speech has he made?—When did he lend the weight of his name to that great scheme? We shall be glad to be onlightened on these matters.

A correspondent of the "*Hornets' Nest.*" and the Editors of the *Carolina Watchman* have taken the right view of this matter. It is important that we should succeed in the next campaign, and our complaisance must not be carried so far as to select a man, who we know will be defeated.

We owe Gov. Manly no personal ill will. We *know* from *personal* knowledge that his *friends* here in the West, admit that he cannot be elected, and we call upon his friends in Raleigh, not to sacrifice the Whig party, for fear of wounding the pride of one man.—*M. Banner.*

SIGNIFICANT.

So far as our observation extends, we remember no paper in the State out of Raleigh, which advocates the nomination of Gov. Manly. This is not according to "precedents." It is never been so before. Why is it? Can the *Register* tell? He has not even been nominated unconditionally. Even the Burke meeting, which has been seized upon with such avidity, as indicative of public feeling in the West, says he will be supported "should he be nominated." Even then, where, in the language of one of the speakers, they owe him so *peculiar* a debt of gratitude his weakness is felt.—*M. Banner.*

Mr. Cobb of Alabama, in the House of Representatives on Monday the 4th inst. introduced a resolution proposing the appointment of a joint committee of six Senators, three Northern men and three Southern men—also twenty-five by the House divided geographically, to take charge of the territorial and slavery questions, with full power to devise a plan of compromise and submit it in the form of a bill, to the consideration of the two houses.

Mr. Meade intimated a wish to debate the resolution, and it therefore lies over under the rule.

Mr. Inge also introduced a resolution declaring that the President had committed a gross and flagrant violation of duty and of the Constitution by sending Thomas Butler King to California and inducing the organization of a State Government there before action by Congress authorizing the steps. The resolution also asserts that the authority of Congress is necessary before any government can be organised in the territories.

The resolutions lie under the rule—notice being given by a member that he desired to debate them.

HIGHLY IMPORTANT FROM CANADA.

Montreal, Feb. 7, 1850.

The Annexation Association have published a protest against Earl Gray's late dispatch to Lord Elgin.

The language used is not of menace or sedition. They do not conceive the sentiments of Earl Gray to be those of the people of England, and think that even the Parliament of England connot pronounce, until the subject submitted, in regular course, by the people of Canada. Free discussion is the right of all men, and the safeguard against despotism and rebellion.

They ask the people to decide whether the dispatch is in accordance with the constitution, and whether Earl Gray's opinion should affect the right to bring any subject before the legislature of the country.

They will not be diverted from a legal course, and are thus defending the greatest bulwark of the country's liberties.

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES, *Editors & Proprietors.*

"Keep a check upon all your Rulers.

"Do this, and Liberty is safe." *Gen'l Harrison.*

NEW SERIES. VOLUME VI—NUMBER 41.

SALISBURY, N. C., THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1850.

From the National Intelligencer.

THE EVIL OF THE DAY.

(Concluded.)

Perplexed as we may have found ourselves by some things which have occurred within the last few months, this revelation, to our apprehension, of the actual state of things, is so recent, that we are yet stunned and confused by it. We can *think* of nothing that has occurred since the Presidential canvass of 1848 to change in any respect the condition or relations of the General Government to the geographical divisions comprised within the United States; and during that contest, in the heat of which every diversity of political sentiment might have been expected to manifest itself, certainly we saw no signs or portents of the storm which is now growling in the horizon, and threatening presently to burst over our heads. Nay, from the very infancy of our Government, as we have shown above, precisely the same grounds of discontent upon which it is now threatened to disturb the peace of the Union, excited the same sensibilities, and provoked the same excitement, with hardly any thing to discriminate between the circumstances of that period and those of the present day. There is not, therefore, that we know of, any *new* ground of alarm for the South. Things in that respect stand now on precisely the same footing as when the helm of Government passed from the hands of President Polk into those of President Taylor. During the Administration of the former we heard not a whisper about "a dissolution of the Union." If there was such a whisper, it was in the midnight consultations at the Capitol, and in so low a tone as never to have reached our ears. What, then, has come over the South? What, especially, has come over the State of Georgia, the State of North Carolina, the State of Maryland? What is the secret of all this note of preparation, of all this solemnity, and all this mystery?

Was this country, in all the extent of its latitude and longitude, ever so prosperous, so tranquil in all its borders, or so entirely in amity with all the foreign world, as it now is?

Is it this very prosperity—the absence of pressure either from within or without, the need of excitement, the lassitude which follows the termination of a sanguinary though successful war—is it this, or all these, that has brought about a state of disaffection, which Heaven forbid that we should speak or think lightly of—for we know it to be of too serious a character to be sported with—but which we are not the less incapable of comprehending? Or is it to be accounted for upon the principle, which some writers maintain to be a law of nature, that a certain degree of turbulence and restlessness is inseparable from the existence of Liberty in any People?

"There must," says Montesquieu, for example, "of necessity have been factions in Rome: for how was it possible 'that those who abroad subdued all, by 'their undaunted bravery and by the terror of their arms, should live in peace 'and moderation at home? To look for 'a People in a free State who are intrepid 'in war, and, at the same time, timid in 'peace, is to look for an impossibility; 'and we may hold it as a general rule 'that in a State which possesses a Republican form of Government, if the 'people are quiet and peaceable, there is 'no real liberty." Were this the rule by which the present unusual state of disquiet in this Republic is to be interpreted, it would be, at least so far as it points out a *cause* for it, consoling, but far otherwise when it equally proves that the disquiet is to have no end, or, if ever ending, is to be ever again beginning. But the framers of the Constitution, who were among the wisest of men in that wisdom which experience can alone teach, trusted that they had guarded against the tumultuous character of the ancient Republics by the establishment of frequent elections, in which the most obscure of the people has an equal voice with the most potential or the most eminent individual of the community. It remains to be seen, in the issue of the pending question, whether the framers of the Constitution, in this calculation, relied too much upon the virtue and constancy of the people.

It is enough, however, for the present purpose, that the excitement exists, and to an extent, if it lead to no worse conclusion, to produce embarrassment in the legislative action of the General Government, as well as of several of the State Governments.

Desiring it to be distinctly understood that the Editors of this paper are now, as they ever have been, ready to uphold all the constitutional rights of the South—that, in their opinion, those rights have been invaded in every instance of legislation, by whatever State Government, which interposes obstacles to the execution within its limits of the third clause of the second section of Art. IV. of the Constitution of the United States—the Editors do not doubt that the States whose rights have been invaded have a right to complain of those acts as aggressions, not upon the States in which they reside, but upon their individual rights; and that they are further aggrieved when taunts and insult and a denial of justice are returned to those complaints, in the form of Legislative Resolutions of the States which have thus impeded their Constitutional rights. They believe, in a word, that the several States have no more right to pass laws to prevent or obstruct the recovery of fugitives from States in which, according to the fundamental law of those States, they are held to service or labor, than they have to enter into foreign alliances or treaties, to engage in war, to grant titles of nobility, or to exercise any other power expressly denied to them by the Constitution. But the Editors believe also, that much of the annoyance which the People of the Southern States suffer, as well by the Legislative action of the States as by the interference of individuals with the slave population, is owing to the passion and vehemence with which they have assailed, without discrimination, the whole Northern population for offences which are those of individuals merely, and for which, in general, that population is not all chargeable or responsible. And they believe, finally, that, for the punishment of all offences against their rights or peace and tranquility within their limits, the States of the South are as competent now as they can become by any process of a revolutionary or extra-constitutional nature, and that for all of fences within other States against their constitutional rights, the Courts of the United States afford them the same power to assert their rights in the States of the North, as the People of the North have, within the States of the South, to compel the execution of contracts and recover debts due to them. To complete their profession of faith on this subject, the Editors hold it to be the perfect right of the People of the North to entertain and express, within their own States, or wherever else such expression may be made without danger to the public peace, any sentiment which they entertain of the Institution of Slavery as it exists amongst us, or of slavery in the abstract, and also their regret that it does exist on any part of the soil of the United States. The embodiment of these sentiments in Legislative Resolutions, and the transmission of them to the Governments of other States, is another affair; and the communication of such resolutions on this vexed subject by the Non slaveholding States to the Slaveholding States appears to the Editors to be consistent neither with the comity which ought to govern the intercourse between the State Governments, nor with that regard to the peace and tranquility of their neighbors which is due from every portion of the population of this country to every other portion.

Our opinion is, therefore, that the proposed *Southern Convention* cannot in any manner add to the security of Southern property and rights, already guarantied by the Constitution of the United States, sustained and enforced, as its provisions undoubtedly will be, both in the first and in the last resort, by the Judiciary of the United States.

This resort to the mode prescribed by the Constitution for asserting rights guarantied by that instrument, and for redressing the wrongs inflicted by the action of the General Government or of the State Governments, is, however, disdained by those who are disposed to foment and exasperate rather than to abate the evil of the day. They cannot consent to trust their rights and liberties to any established tribunal: they must have one which is more sure to answer their purposes.

It is in our power to point them to a case, in the history of this Republic, in which inalienable rights of the entire population of a number of the original States of this Union were not only endangered, but indefinitely suspended by the legislation of the General Government: and, as it is a case which to perhaps four-fifths of our readers will be almost entirely new, and cannot be without interest to any of them, we will briefly relate its principal points. It was on the 22d day of December, 1807, that the whole country was astounded by the publication of an Act of Congress, passed in secret session, laying an unlimited Embargo, in effect a writ of *ne exeat*, upon all vessels of all sorts in the ports and harbors of the United States, whether engaged in commerce or in the fisheries, whether laden or unladen, and whether in the Northern ports in which they were owned, or in the Southern ports to which they had gone for cargoes. A more withering blast upon all the occupations connected with commerce, in the first instance, but necessarily upon all other branches of industry—upon property, the right of access to the sea, and the means of subsistence—is not on record, unless in cases of devastation by fire and sword, or by earthquake, pestilence, or famine, through which whole generations of the sons of men have perished. This measure was preceded by no notice or preparation: no war was depending to require or justify it: it was not an embargo, in the just sense of the term, which implies a stoppage of trade for *a limited time* only. No; it was, on the contrary, a system deliberately intended to withdraw all our trading vessels from the ocean, on the plea of keeping them safe from the cross fire of the British and French denunciations of neutrality in the war between them—but in the delusive calculation, also, that by withholding our agricultural products from those belligerents, we could force them to respect the outraged neutral rights of this country.—The influence of President Jefferson over the two Houses of Congress was then so irresistible that the bill passed both Houses almost *instanter*, although no reasons were given for the measure in Congress, nor in the Official paper at the seat of government, except, by this last, that it would be a dignified retirement within ourselves—a withdrawal of our commerce from the ocean, which presented a field on which no harvest could be reaped but that of danger, spoliation, and disgrace—the best thing that could be done under the circumstances; and, finally, that "it had been *recommended by the President*, who had the best means of knowing the policy of foreign nations." This last argument was a clincher: there was, in those days, no resisting it, unless in the case of some sturdy impracticable, new at Court, like Wm. H. Crawford, of Ga., who had but just come into the Senate, who was not content with arguments found upon mere blind confidence, and refused to vote for the bill, because no reasons had been given to Congress for it but the President's will. He, in the Senate, and three of the four Representatives of Georgia in the other House, voted therefore against the bill: but, with these exceptions, nearly the whole South voted *for* the bill: all six of the Representatives from South Carolina voted for it, and all but three out of the seventeen from Virginia. This act had hardly been made public before it became necessary to pass supplements and amendments to it, adding penalty to penalty, and exacting bonds upon bonds, until this measure, patriotic unquestionably in its origin, but based upon false theories and unphilosophical inductions, became in its operation one of the most oppressive and tyrannical ever devised by the wit of man. It had been in existence nearly a year, without the least apparent prospect of its termination, when the Legislature of Massachusetts passed resolutions, which were presented to Congress on the 25th of November, 1808, instructing the Senators and requesting the Representatives from that State to endeavor to procure its repeal. We are able readily to quote from that document (as published in the American State Papers) the description of the effects of the Embargo as felt in Massachusetts (then including what is now the State of Maine) and her sister States of New England—not more for the purpose of giving the reader some idea of the cruelty and oppression of that measure, than to show how a State like Massachusetts—then a great State in the Confederacy—instead of resorting to her "reserved rights," could, though crippled and heart-stricken by it, subdue her feelings, come before Congress with composure, and in language at once touching and respectful, thus present the common grievance of herself and her sister States to its consideration:

"The produce of our agriculture, of our 'forests, and of our fisheries, [says the 'Preamble to the Resolutions,] is excluded 'altogether from every foreign market; 'our merchants and mechanics are de'prived of employment; our coasting 'trade interrupted and harassed by griev'ous embarrassments; and our foreign 'trade is becoming diverted into channels 'which there is no prospect of its return. 'The sources of our revenue are dried up, 'and Government must soon resort to di'rect taxation. Our sailors are forced to 'expatriate themselves. In fact, the evils 'which are menaced by the continuance 'of this policy are so enormous and de'plorable—the suspension of commerce is 'so contrary to the habits of our people, 'and so repugnant to their feelings and 'interests—that they must soon become 'intolerable, and endanger our domestic 'peace and the Union of these States. As 'the Embargo laws have been the cause 'of the public distress, your committee 'are of opinion that no equal, permanent, 'or effectual relief can be afforded to the 'citizens of this Commonwealth but by 'the repeal of these laws."

Did this earnest and moving appeal from a suffering people have the effect upon the ruling power in Congress, which it cannot but have, even at this distant day, upon the minds of the generality of readers? Not at all. The only answer that they got from Congress was the passage, a few weeks afterwards, (January 9, 1809.) of an act *further to enforce* the Embargo Laws, a few of the provisions of which it is worth while to cite to give to the present generation some idea of the character of the system, now happily exploded, which was, forty years and more ago, generally designated by the term "Restrictive."

Thus, in this *Supplement*, added to preceding Supplements to the Embargo Law, passed after the Embargo had been more than a year in operation, among a volume of enactments, each more stringent than the other, were the following:

"That if any person shall put, place, or load on board any ship, vessel, boat, or water craft, or *into any cart, wagon, sled, or other carriage or vehicle*, any specie, goods, wares, or merchandise, with intent to export, transport, or convey the same without the United States, &c., he shall be adjudged *guilty of a misdemeanor*, and fined in a sum equal to *four times the value* of such specie, goods, wares, or merchandise." Collectors of all the districts of the United States were further authorized *to seize upon specie or any articles of domestic growth*, produce, or manufacture found on board of any ship or vessel, *boat or other craft*, &c., or "*when in carts, wagons, sleighs*, &c. or in any manner *apparently on their way towards* the territories of a foreign nation, or *the vicinity thereof*, or *towards* a place wherein such articles are intended to be exported, and not to permit such articles to be *removed* until *bond, with sufficient security*, shall have been given," &c. And to enforce such stringent and oppressive prohibitions and injunctions as these, it was made lawful for the President of the United States, or *such other person as he should have empowered for that purpose*, "to employ *such part of the land and naval forces of the United States, or of the militia, as may be judged necessary.*"

Well: stung to the quick by this double turn of the screws upon them, did these Yankess betake themselves to *dissolving the Union*, because things in the General Government did not work altogether to their liking! Did they even determine to "secede" from the partnership—to tear off their names from the bond to which they were join signers with Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia? Not at all. No: *they* took their case up to the Supreme Court. They firmly believed the Embargo Laws to be unconstitutional, and they stood suit upon their bonds given under the requirements of those laws, in order to bring the case before the Court. The Court decided the case against them; and they *paid* the bonds, as many of them as could—the rest of them were sold out of house and home, and not a few of them, who by lives of steady industry had acquired competencies, when the iron grip of the Restrictive System overtook them, were left, at the close of it, dependant upon their Children or the Poor-house for their daily dread.

But, argue those who are foremost in urging the Southern States onward to a precipice from which, once reached, there can be no retreat, nor any advance unless it be to topple headlong over it, "A great wrong [the admission of Cal'ifornia with her State Government] is threat'ened, and great wrongs *demand violent reme'dies*. The decision of the great questions 'now presented to the country will influence 'forever her future destiny." Such is the language held by the Richmond Enquirer not more than a week ago. *Constitutional* remedies are not what these gentlemen seek.—They do not even condescend to specify or define the "great wrongs" which require the "violent remedies" they speak of. A civil, or legal, resistance of their indefinite wrongs, is beneath their dignity. Of the extreme medicine of the Constitution, they would make its daily bread. They will have nothing to do with the Supreme Court; it is nothing to them. They will have Revolution, and nothing else. Such is the tenor and spirit of the whole of the deliberate and carefully-wrought article in the Richmond Enquirer, from which we quote the following further passage:

"In the issue between the North and South are in'volved the great principles of the equality or inequali'ty, the sovereignty or vassalage, of fifteen States of 'the American Union. If these fifteen States wish 'not to become dependencies, or mere appendage of a 'combination (no longer a Union) of States hostile to 'these Institutions—if they would escape this doom, to 'which Northern fanaticism would consign them, they 'must arouse their energies—prepare, consult, com'bine, unite, for prompt and decisive action."

This is the programme of those who are ready for Revolution rather than resort to Law, and who are, as we shall show, garbling and misrepresenting the opinions of Mr. Madison, in order to avail themselves of his great name—not to sustain any laubable purpose, but to favor purposes *avowed* to be violent and extra-constitutional. Deprive them of the support of his name, and they come to the ground: they have nothing left to stand upon. We evoke from the Shades the Spirit of that great man to confront them in their wicked designs. To do no injustice to the Enquirer, we quote at large so much of the article in that paper as we propose to refute:

"In this care for the present and preparation for the future, it becomes Virginia to act among the foremost. Not because she is the largest slaveholder among the States, but because great constitutional questions are involved in the issue. Heretofore, it has been her province to lead; and she will not shrink from the high responsibility.

"When, in 1798, 'the purity of the Constitution was violated by the madness of party,' and 'the liberty of speech and of the press were invaded,' the voice of Virginia called her sister States to the rescue; and the hand of usurpation and power was stayed. She did not then stop *to count the cost*; she did not then hesitate to follow the line of duty to herself and the Constitution.

"Upon that occasion, when her immortal Resolutions interpreting the Constitution and defining the powers of the Federal Government, were given to the world, her course was condemned as 'unwarrantable and dangerous. Her action was declared to be 'a very unjustifiable interference with the General Government and constituted authorities of the United States.' In the Resolutions of '98, Virginia 'solemnly appealed to the like disposition in the other States,' and asked for their co-operation. This appeal for united action in that emergency encountered the strenuous opposition of the Federal advocates of the odious Alien and Sedition Laws. Kentucky had united with her Republican sister, and their concurrent action was declared an unlawful combination against the Federal Government.

"The charge has come down to the present day.—The Southern States propose to unite, to co-operate, to prevent a palpable & ruinous infraction of the Constitution—a Southern Convention is proposed for that purpose, *and the objections and the arguments urged against the course of the patriots of '98-9 are used to defeat the measure.*

"Mr. Madison, in his report upon the Virginia resolutions, proves such concert of action between the States to be a means of redress both necessary and proper.—In this connexion, he says:

"'And if there be no impropriety in declaring the unconstitutionality of proceedings in the Federal Government, where can be the impropriety of communicating the declaration to other States and inviting their concurrence in a like declaration? What is allowable for one must be allowable for all; and a free communication among the States, where the Constitution imposes no restraint, *is as allowable among the State Governments as among other public bodies or private citizens.*"

"He further adds, (and the people of the South may be forced, in the effort to escape oppression, to rely exclusively upon the means here suggested:)

"'It cannot be forgotten, that, among the arguments addressed to those who apprehended danger to liberty from the establishment of the General Government over so great a country, the appeal was emphatically made to *the intermediate existence of the State Governments between the people and that Government*, to the vigilance with which they would descry the first symptoms of usurpation, and to the promptitude with which they would sound the alarm to the public. This argument was probably not without its effect; and, if it was a proper one then to recommend the establishment of the Constitution, it must be a proper one now *to assist in its interpretation.*'"

It is a mistake that Mr. Madison approved any "united action" among particular States, by means of a Convention, Southern or any other, or any combination between them, for the purpose of administering "violent remedies," or of resisting acts of Congress by any other means (besides the Judiciary) than those of argument, persuation, and the ballot box.—It is a libel upon the fame of Mr. Madison, from which we feel it to be our duty to rescue it, to attempt to fasten upon his character such anti-constitutional and disorganizing doctrines. He never could, as a statesman or a patriot, have committed himself in such a manner.—Most fortunately for his reputation—most fortunately, as the things have turned out, for the country—he has left upon record his own interpretation of his Report upon the Virginia Resolutions of 1798, in which he scatters to the winds the whole fabric of false construction which designing men have erected upon it.—As a sufficient vindication of his common sense as well as of his unwavering devotion *to the Union as it is*, we turn to a Letter addressed by him to the Editor of the North American Review, dated at Montpelier, August, 1830, in reply to a Letter written to him, referring to the proceedings of the Virginia Legislature of 1798–'99, as appealed to in behalf of the Nullifying doctrine which had then just bloomed into existence. Without a word of comment (because it would be both presumptuous and superfluous) we extract from the Letter the following passages touching the points embraced in the Enquirer's argument:

"Between these different Constitutional Go'vernments, the one operating in all the States, 'the others operating separately in each, with 'the aggregate powers of Government divi'ded between them, it could not escape atten'tion that controversies would arise concerning 'the boundaries of jurisdiction, and that some 'provision ought to be made for such occurren'ces. *A political system that does not provide 'for a peaceable and authoritative termination 'of occurring controversies, would not be more 'than the shadow of a Government*, the object 'and end of a real Government being the sub'stitution of law and order for uncertainty, con'fusion, and violence."

"The Constitution has expressly declared—'1, 'That the Constitution, and the laws made 'in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made un'der the authority of the United States, shall be 'the supreme law of the land; 2, that the 'Judges of every State shall be bound thereby, 'any thing in the constitution and laws of any 'State to the contrary notwithstanding; 3, that 'the Judicial power of the United States shall 'extend to all cases in law and equity arising 'under the Constitution, the laws of the United 'States, and treaties made under their authori'ty,' &c."

"Should the provisions of the Consitution be 'found not to secure the government and rights 'of the States against usurpations and abuses 'on the part of the United States, *the final re'sort within the purview of the Constitution lies* 'IN AN AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION, 'according to a process applicable by the States.

"And in the event of the failure of every 'constitutional resort, and an accumulation of 'usurpations and abuses rendering passive obe'dience and non-resistance and revolution, there 'can remain but one resort, the last of all—an 'appeal from the cancelled obligations of 'the compact to original rights and the law 'of self-preservation. This is the *ultima ratio* 'under all Governments, whether consolidated 'confederated, or a compound of both; and it 'cannot be doubted that *a single member of the 'Union*, [not a Confederacy of States.—*Edi'tors*] in the extremity supposed, BUT IN THAT 'ONLY, would have a right, as an extra and ul'tra constitutional right, to make the appeal."

"The Constitution is a compact; its text is 'to be expounded *according to the provisions for 'expounding it—making a part of the compact; 'and none of the parties can rightfully renounce 'the expounding provision more than any other 'part.*"

"That the Legislature [of Virginia] could 'not have intended to sanction such a doctrine, 'is to be inferred from the debates in the House 'of Delegates, and from the address of the two 'houses to their constituents on the subject of 'the resolutions. The tenor of the debates, 'which were ably conducted, and are under'stood to have been revised for the press by 'most, if not all of the speakers, *discloses no 'reference whatever to a constitutional right of 'an individual State to arrest by force the ope'ration of the law of the United States.*" Concert among the States for redress against the 'alien and sedition laws, the acts of usurped 'power, was a leading sentiment; and the at'tainment of a concert the immediate object of 'the course adopted by the Legislature, which 'was that of inviting the other States 'to *con'cur* in declaring the acts to be unconstitution'al, and to *co-operate*, by the necessary and 'proper measures, in maintaining unimpaired 'the authorities, rights, and liberties reserved 'to the States respectively and to the People.' 'That, by the necessary and proper measures, 'to be *concurrently* and *cooperatively* taken, '*were meant measures* KNOWN TO THE CONSTI'TUTION, particularly the ordinary control of 'the People and Legislatures of the States over 'the Government of the United States, CANNOT 'BE DOUBTED."

"It is worthy of remark, and explanatory of 'the intentions of the Legislature, that the 'words 'not law, but utterly null, void, and of 'no force or effect,' which had followed, in one 'of the resolutions, the word 'unconstitutional,' 'were struck out *by common consent.* Though 'the words were, in fact, but synonymous with 'unconstitutional,' yet, *to guard against a mis'understanding of this phrase as more than 'declaratory of opinion*, the word 'unconstitu'tional' alone was retained, as not liable to that 'danger.

"The published Address of the Legislature 'to the people, their constituents, affords anoth'er conclusive evidence of its views. The ad'dress warns them against the encroaching spir'it of the General Government; argues the un'constitutionality of the alien and sedition acts; 'points to other instances in which the consti'tutional limits had been overleaped; dwells up'on the dangerous mode of deriving power by 'implication; and, in general, presses the ne'cessity of watching over the consolidating ten'dency of the Federal policy. *But nothing is 'said that can be understood to look to means 'of maintaining the rights of the States beyond 'the regular ones*, WITHIN THE FORMS OF THE 'CONSTITUTION.