

From the Charleston Courier.

KINGSTREE, S. C., July 4.

Messrs. Editors.—The manner in which the Anniversary of American Independence has been passed, in the various sections of the State, is usually a matter of interest, particularly, when any exciting topic agitates the public mind; for from the reported proceedings of the numerous meetings held, we generally learn the prevailing sentiments of the people.

At this time the question is not, whether the election of a President of the United States shall be held directly by the people; nor, whether the gubernatorial chair shall be transmitted directly by the people or not; but whether South Carolina, as a Sovereign State, shall resume her reserved rights and suspended powers, and move alone, and unaided, among the nations of the earth in separate and independent existence.

For this reason a narrative of the proceedings had on the Fourth of July, at Kingstree, in Williamsburg District, may be not entirely devoid of interest, and therefore, I will endeavor to give you as faithful a representation of them as I can.

At an early hour the people from different parts of the District assembled in the Village, and although the representation may have been diminished by the attendance of numbers at several other celebrations held throughout the District, still, a large and respectable number attended. The Court House contained many more than it conveniently accommodated. The ladies too were there, in all the charms and fascinations of beauty, and seemed to calm down the benignant smiles of Providence on passing events. After prayer by the Rev. James A. Wallace, the Declaration of Independence was read in a clear impressive manner by Dr. H. Thorne, and then Dr. James S. Brockington, the orator of the day, enchaind the hushed audience for about half an hour, during the delivery of a chaste, glowing, and eloquent address, replete with bold patriotism, which was received with general applause.

The company then proceeded to the residence of Mr. J. P. McElveen, where, having enjoyed a substantial dinner prepared for the occasion, they drank the following regular and voluntary toasts:

REGULAR TOASTS.

1. The 4th of July, 1776.—The memory of the past—the type of the future.
2. The Federal Government.—An engine of oppression; to its aggressions South Carolina cannot submit.
3. The State of South Carolina.—The time has come when she should resume the powers delegated to the General Government, throw herself on her sovereignty, and organize an independent Republic.
4. The Southern Rights Association.—A noble band of freemen battling for their rights.
5. Secession.—One of the reserved rights of the States; its denial by the General Government would be to any injured State sufficient cause for its exercise.
6. The State Convention.—If its hands are willing to trust the destinies of the State.
7. The memory of John C. Calhoun.
8. The Governor of the State.—An able and efficient Chief Magistrate.
9. The Secession Press of S. C.—They are nobly doing their duty.
10. The "Southern Press."—The standard-bearer of Southern Rights, as a faithful sentinel worthy of the confidence and support of the whole South.
11. The Hon. R. B. Rhett.—The Joshua of the States Rights party of South Carolina; may he lead us gallantly over the Jordan of our present difficulties, and land us safely on the shores of secession and independence.
12. Our Southern Sister States.—Co-operation with them if we can get it, separate action if we cannot.
13. Woman.—God's last best gift to man.

VOLUNTEER TOASTS.

- By J. W. McCutchen, President of the day.—The State of South Carolina: May she not be wheedled from her present purpose by what John Randolph of Roanoke called the seven small arguments, namely, five loaves and two fishes.
- By Dr. D. M. Mason, Vice President of the day.—The right of Secession: A right inestimable to freemen, formidable to tyrants only.
- By Col. N. G. Rich.—Co-operation: When the people of the Southern States are disposed to fraternize with us, we are prepared to give them a hearty welcome; but their refusal will not stop us in our onward course.
- By W. C. Barr.—The lovers of the Union of 1851, and the adherents of King George of '76: If there be any difference between them, I cannot see it.
- By Capt. J. F. D. Britton.—South Carolina: May she be the Rock of Gibraltar, immovable in her secession march, let abolitionists rave, submissionists frown, or watch and wait men oppose.
- By Col. S. Y. Cooper.—Secession: A rightful remedy, reserved to us by the Constitution, against a usurping and tyrannical majority.
- By S. J. Montgomery.—South Carolina: Steadily advancing, she takes no steps backwards, her motto, equality or annihilation.
- By J. J. Howard.—South Carolina: May her sons stand up shoulder to shoulder against Northern aggression, and say that "our rights must and shall be respected."
- By Col. Wm. Cooper.—The United States and Union of the States: What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.
- By Dr. D. M. Mason.—The North and the South: Those whom God hath put asunder, let no man join together.
- By W. S. Brockington.—May the State Convention provide and set apart a day for the final secession of South Carolina from this tyrannical and abolition Government.
- By J. S. N. Smith.—The Tories of '76, and the Submissionists of '51: The same difference exists between them as does between an alligator and a crocodile.

The phenomenon of rain without clouds, which the Philadelphia North American, notices as having occurred in that city on Wednesday of last week, was noticed at Norristown by the editor of the Free Press, who says: "Precisely the same phenomenon was observed at this place about a quarter past 10 o'clock on the same evening. On the north and northeast horizon dark clouds were resting, from which lightning issued at repeated intervals.—These clouds did not rise from the horizon more than thirty degrees. Over head it was perfectly clear, and the stars shone forth with remarkable brightness. In this state of the heavens, the rain commenced falling quite smartly, increasing in volume as it fell, and lasting some four or five minutes."

Twenty one Plain Reasons why we oppose Mr. Clingman's Election.

1st. Because, while a member of Congress, he quit his post at Washington, visited Raleigh, and there labored to divide his party, and to be United States Senator, contrary to the wishes of a majority of the State, both Whigs and Democrats.

2d. Because, failing to be elected Senator, he attempted to create sectional disturbances in the State—to array one division against the other upon an immaterial issue—his defeat or success.

3d. Because he opposed in the last Congress, the passage, separately, of all but one of the compromise measures, and now (denounce that with the others, saying they are bills of surrender,) having for their object the restoration of peace and quiet to the country.

4th. Because, after the Compromise had passed both Houses of Congress and become a law he returned to the District, and labored to dissatisfy the people with the Compromise, which had settled the difficulty likely to ruin the country, and had saved the Union for the present, at least.

5th. Because he said in a speech, delivered by him in Congress, in opposition to the Compromise, "that when we asked for justice, and to be let alone, we are met by the senseless and insane cry of Union! Union!"

6th. Because he said in the same speech, that he was disgusted with it, (meaning the cry of "Union.")

7th. Because he boasted in Congress, that the people were fast losing their veneration and respect for the Union.

8th. Because he entered into a calculation of dollars and cents, to prove the South would be better off out of the Union than in it.

9th. Because he boasted of our capacity to wage war against our brethren of other States who might oppose our going out of the Union, or otherwise interfere with us.

10. Because, in voting against the compromise measures of Congress, he voted against Clay, Cass, Douglass, Dickinson, Foote, Bell, Badger, Mangum, and a host of others, Whigs and Democrats, alike distinguished for their talents and their patriotism, and voted with Rhett, & Co., South Carolina disunionists, and with Hale, Seward, Giddings, & Co., Northern Abolitionists, who have made common cause to destroy the Union.

11. Because his votes and speeches in Congress, have placed him on the platform of the Syracuse Convention, and the South Carolina Convention, which are one and identical for the dissolution of the Union.

12. That every Disunionist in the District and the State are for him—that every secession or disunion paper in this State and South Carolina, are advocating his re-election, from which we infer that there is a feeling of sympathy, a community of interest, and a concurrence of sentiment among them.

13. Because, we regard disunion, secession, and nullification, as one heresy with three titles, and his votes and speeches identify him with that heresy.

14. Because, if he were elected, a shout would go up from the swamps of South Carolina; he re-echoed by the disunionists of Alabama, and Mississippi, that would encourage the doctrine of secession, disunion, and nullification.

15. Because his election would place "the Western Reserve" in a false position, creating the impression that she favors the doctrines so steadily opposed since the days of nullification in 1832.

16. Because he refuses to answer what course he would take, if South Carolina attempts to resist the law.

17. Because he withholds his opinions as to whether the General Government has the right to coerce a State into obedience.

18. Because, from his evasion of those questions, and his popularity with those who are threatening resistance, we do not believe he would aid in enforcing the law if in Congress when South Carolina resisted.

19. Because we go for enforcing the law in the North, and the South, the East and the West, and differ with Mr. Clingman in what we understand to be his positions.

20. Because we believe that the General Government has the power to coerce a sovereign State, or half a dozen sovereign States, in matters wherein they surrendered their sovereignty at the formation of the Government, and.

21. Because we do not understand Mr. Clingman as holding these opinions.

We could give divers other good and sufficient reasons for opposing his election, but we regard the foregoing as sufficient to deter, not only us, but the whole District, from supporting him, and we have no doubt of his defeat in the District by a large majority, notwithstanding the efforts that are making to re-elect him.—South Carolina influence and patronage will all signally fail, to identify our hardy, intelligent, Union loving, law abiding citizens, of this free and happy country, with a Southern Confederacy, forming an alliance with, and soon to become a dependency of Great Britain.

Ask Mess.

Federalism.—The stereotyped cant of Old Ritchie about Federalism, the Virginia Resolutions of '98, Thomas Jefferson, &c. &c. upon which he rung the charges for thirty years, and until he wore it so thread-bare that the most dim eyed could see through it, has recently been revived throughout the State, and all those who oppose the reckless and ruinous doctrines of nullification secession, and disunion, (one heresy with three titles) are called federalists. The time was, in the palmy days of Father Ritchie, that some men could be caught up with that sort of chaff but thanks to the intelligence of the country, those days have long since passed.—North Carolinians can not be gulled into the belief, that a doctrine, advocated and acted upon by General Jackson, smacks of Federalism, and it is worthy of notice, that the principles now advocated by those who are called Federalists, are identical with those laid down by Gen. Jackson in his Proclamation: the Proclamation is our text book on the subject of nullification and secession. Can democrats who sustained him, oppose others for adopting his sentiments?—*Asheville Messenger.*

Just Received and For Sale

HARRISON'S Celebrated Columbian black, blue, and red Inks, at the Book Store.

J. H. COFFMAN.

Salisbury, July 24, 1851.

Capt. Green W. Caldwell in 1842 and in 1851.—Among those who voted against laying on the table, and in effect voted for the resolutions to censure Mr. Adams, were Green W. Caldwell, John R. J. Daniel, and we believe Robt. Barnwell Rhett! The preamble for which these gentlemen thus voted, is as follows:

"Whereas the Federal Constitution is a permanent form of government and of perpetual obligation, until altered or modified in the mode pointed out by that instrument, and the members of this House deriving their political character and powers from the same, are sworn to support it, and the dissolution of the Union necessarily implies the destruction of that instrument, the overthrow of the American Republic, and the extinction of our National existence: A proposition, therefore, to the Representatives of the people to dissolve the organic law framed by their constituents and to support which they are commanded by those constituents to be sworn, before they can enter upon the execution of the political powers enacted by it, and entrusted to them, is a high breach of privilege, a contempt offered to the House, a direct proposition to the Legislature and each member to commit perjury; and involves necessarily, in its execution and consequences, the destruction of our country and the crime of high treason."

Mr. Caldwell then in 1842, thought that there was a government of the United States, and also that it was of perpetual obligation. He thought that Mr. Adams for only presenting a petition to destroy it was guilty of perjury and high treason. Now, Mr. Caldwell is a candidate for Congress and advocates the right of peaceable disunion, or secession, which is the same thing. A State cannot secede and be in the Union at the same time. Suppose he is elected and takes his seat. What can he do? He cannot propose secession, he cannot speak of a desire to dissolve the Union, because if he does, according to his own vote he will be guilty of perjury and high treason.

Where is the difference between the petition of Mr. Adams and the views of Messrs. Caldwell and Daniel? We can see none. Both look to a peaceable dissolution of the Union, and if the presentation of the petition makes Mr. Adams a perjurer and a traitor, in what position are his revilers? If Mr. Adams merited expulsion and infamy, what do his assailants deserve? What can they expect from the people, whose intelligence they insult, at one time vilifying a man as a traitor and a perjurer, and a few years after advocating the very doctrines which they had condemned.

People of North Carolina, we call upon you to put down this spirit of disunion.—Put down the men who advocate it. Let it never be said that North Carolina aided in the destruction of the Union and the Constitution by sending disunionists to Congress. If this Union is to be dissolved let it never be said that Whig neglect of duty caused it.—*Fay Observer.*

SHARP SAYINGS.

The Southern Standard, Charleston, of Tuesday last, informs, that Edmund Belinger, Esq., engaged in a discussion at Clinton, on the 4th inst., said that "if the commercial interests of the city of Charleston were a clog to the State, then he agreed with Capt. Allen, that we had better make a second Moscow of the city." Such expressions show how utterly unfit some of the leaders in South Carolina are, to manage the grave affairs of the times. We would as soon put ourselves under the lead of the veriest madman or idiot, as under the direction of men so callous to the claims of humanity; so profoundly ignorant of the character of mankind.—These are, indeed, evil days, when a public man can be even permitted to utter such sentiments in a civilized community. These are they who are destroying the future hopes of the South, by driving from the southern ranks all prudent and just men; men who would shrink from no honorable peril, but who would turn with disgust from the side of phrenzied zealots. We trust the good people of South Carolina will become sensible of the deep injury such things are doing them everywhere, and institute a reform, and get such men out of the lead in the State.—History teaches us that these "Furiosos" are not to be depended upon in the hour of danger. Should they ever be brought to the test, we venture to predict that the gentlemen here named will be very careful to call in the aid of wisdom at the last pinch, and keep as much as possible out of the range of those mischievous things, called shots and shells. Their tongues wag bravely at the festive meeting, but this is not a circumstance to the showing off they will do, when the "vile guns" shall become clamorous. "Oh, how they'll make their trotters play!"—*Wil. Com.*

Liquor Seizures in Maine.—The authorities in the different cities and towns in Maine are carrying out the provisions of the liquor law recently put in force in that State with great alacrity. Last week the premises of T. Wall & Co., in Bangor, were visited by the Marshal of that city, and thirty-seven barrels of liquor were found ready for shipment to Boston. The Marshal took them in charge, and would facilitate their departure. Five barrels, half-barrels, jugs, &c. condemned by the Police Court of the same place, were also destroyed. At Portland, on Friday, Charles W. Childs was examined charged with selling two quarts of brandy and was fined ten dollars and costs. On Saturday he was brought up on a second complaint, and pleaded *nol. con.* and was fined twenty dollars and costs. Further prosecution was stayed on condition that he would sell no more.

There has been no rain at Davidson College to wet the ground since May.

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

Salisbury, N. C.

THURSDAY EVENING, JULY 24, 1851.

We are authorized to announce Hon. JOSEPH P. CALDWELL, for re-election as Representative of this District in Congress.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

We invite the reader's attention to the proceedings on the 4th July at Kingstree, S. C. (published in this paper,) as exhibiting the present prevailing sentiment of her people. We have not selected this account because of any peculiarity or difference between it and accounts of proceedings in other parts of the State: there is no material difference. All that we have seen correspond with this; and it is truly astonishing that whilst all the neighboring States, as much concerned as S. Carolina is, and not less intelligent and brave, are comparatively satisfied on the subject which is agitating her, she is as rampant as a bully at a muster, with sleeves rolled up, shirt collar open, and hat off, cavorting around, flourishing weapons, and swearing dark oaths. We have never seen a very clever or intelligent man "carrying on" in that way; but we have often seen such men three days afterwards wearing a very sorrowful, submissive face, and a red bandana over one eye. The fact is, such conduct is not the thing to gain the good esteem of neighbors, nor has it been found to pay well at any time, or in any way. A man thus behaving, often mourns over his rashness and folly when it is too late to avoid the sure consequences. If South Carolina has been wronged to the extent her public demonstrations indicate, she might find it more economical and safe to seek redress in some other way than by assuming such a pugilistic attitude.

Home Mades.—The Fayetteville Observer and Greensboro' Patriot have each, of late, spoken in terms of praise of the workmanship of certain carriage builders in their several towns. We are glad to see this, for it is very evident that there is more fancy than reality in the idea of getting better work of this description at the North than can be obtained at home. If any one doubts this let them call at the shop of Mr. Wm. Overman, and examine a close carriage which he has just completed for our fellow citizen A. Henderson, Esq. In point of workmanship it is unexceptionable. The material is of the best quality, and the taste displayed mature; and the general effect of the job, taken as a whole, is decidedly fine.

Mr. William C. Randolph is now constructing, at Smith & Barker's shop, one of his Plank Road Trucks on a working scale. He proposes, as soon as he shall get it ready, to make a trip to Fayetteville, carrying down, with four horses, six thousand pounds, and loading back with eight thousand.

The weather is extremely dry in this and the surrounding counties. The Corn crop is suffering greatly. In many places it is utterly ruined, and no quantity of rain could bring it out; and should it not rain soon, the crop must prove almost a general failure.

THE MARKET.

Apples, green, selling pretty freely at fair prices according to quality. Best quality thirty cents per bushel, and from that down to 20 cents.

Peaches, green, from 40 to 80 cents, according to quality.

Bacon, scarce, goes off freely at from 11 to 12½, the hog round.

Corn, in good demand, with an advance on prices. Sales have been made here this week, at rates ranging from 70 to 75 cents. But little offering.

Flour, \$2 50 per hundred pounds.

Wheat, 75 cents per bushel.

Mutton, 5 cents per pound.

Beef, from the country, 3 to 3½; at the Market House, (retail) 4½ to 5.

Eggs, 6½ per dozen.

Chickens, \$1 00 per dozen.

Butter, 10 to 12½.

Oats, in the sheaf, \$1 25 to \$1 50, per hundred.

Hay, \$4 to \$5 per four horse load.

The Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, delivered a speech in Faneuil Hall, Boston, on the 4th, at the conclusion of which he offered the following excellent sentiment. We trust his influence in New England will not be wanting to secure there "a faithful fulfillment of the constitutional compact by all who are parties to it."

"Permanent Peace with our countries; fixed boundaries for our own country; perpetuity to the Union of the States; and a faithful fulfillment of the Constitutional Compact by all who are parties to it."

Good Ink.—Harrison's Columbian Ink, advertised in this paper, is a good article—clear of drugs, and flows freely from the pen.

Secession—the "Standard."

At the close of a long article in the last 'Standard,' in which the Editor thought he had argued most profoundly in defence of the doctrine of Secession, the question is asked, "Has the Register any thing to say?"

Yes! We have much to say, and we have some few "sayings" from the leaders of the Democracy in reference to this once (in their estimation) hated and abominable heresy, but now favorite principle, which will scatter to the winds the puerile logic of the "Standard."

In the first place, so far as the "Standard's" comments on the Speech of Mr. Webster, at the Capon Springs, go, we have only to say, the general impression is, that Speech has not been correctly reported. But a meagre sketch of it has appeared, and the construction placed on it by the "Standard" is directly at war with the uniform sentiments of Mr. W. as therefore expressed. In his first Speech at the Capon Springs he denounced secession—at Washington City, on the 4th of July, in his speech on laying the corner stone of the Capitol he did the same thing. In his great speech on Foot's Resolution in reply to Hayne, he literally demolished this treasonable heresy. So he did in his speech in reply to Mr. Calhoun on the Force Bill. Lest the Editor might not have time to look up these speeches and examine for himself, we will give him a few extracts. In the first, he says—

"Direct coercion, therefore, between force and force, is the unavoidable result of that remedy for the revision of unconstitutional laws, which the gentleman contends for. It must happen in the very first case to which it is applied. Is not this the plain result? To resist by force the execution of the law is treason.—Can the Courts of the United States take notice of the indulgence of a State to commit treason? The common saying that a State cannot commit treason herself is nothing to the purpose. Can she authorize others to do it? If John Fries had produced an act of Pennsylvania annulling the law of Congress, would it have helped his case? Talk about it as we will, these doctrines go to the length of revolution. They are incompatible with any peaceable administration of the government. They lead directly to Disunion and civil commotion, and therefore it is that at their commencement, when they are first found to be maintained by respectable men, and in a tangible form, I enter my public protest against them all."

It is true Mr. Webster was here referring more particularly to nullification, but the argument of his speech applies with equal force to secession, and is as complete a refutation of the latter as it is of the former doctrine.

In the discussion of the Force Bill, the doctrine of secession came directly under consideration. Mr. W.'s position in that debate cannot be mistaken. In his Speech delivered in the Senate on the 16th February 1833, he denounced the doctrine of Secession in the strongest and most unequivocal terms. "The doctrine now contended for," said he, "is that by nullification and secession the obligations and authority of the government may be set aside or rejected without revolution. But that is what I deny."

Again: after enumerating many consequences, ruinous in their character, to which secession would lead, he proceeds, "The Constitution does not provide for events which must be preceded by its own destruction. SECESSION, therefore, since it must bring these consequences with it, is REVOLUTIONARY, and Nullification is equally revolutionary."

We wish we had the space to quote more at length from this able Speech, replete as it is with the most irrefutable arguments against the doctrine of Secession. Before the "Standard" can drag Mr. Webster in, between its party and that abominable doctrine, it will have to answer successfully this speech. Then and not till then need it rely on "the great defender of the Constitution" to aid it and its party leaders in their reasonable designs against the Union. We consider this a sufficient reply to the effort of the "Standard," to place Mr. W. in the false position of approving its odious heresies. Let us proceed more immediately to the consideration of the positions assumed by that Disunion print.

The "Standard" has repeatedly asked with an air of arrogance, "Would you put down a Sovereign State by force?" We would have the Government execute its laws. Without the power and will to do this, it would not be worth preserving. It would be a curse instead of a blessing. It would lull to sleep, under a false security, the orderly, only to become, more certainly, the victims of the lawless. Nor are we singular in this opinion, as a few historical facts will show.

In November 1832, South Carolina, in solemn Convention, passed her celebrated Ordinance, nullifying the Tariff laws. This Ordinance declared as follows, viz:

"And we the People of South Carolina, to the end that it be fully understood by the Government of the States, and the People of the Co-States, that we are determined to maintain, this our Ordinance and declaration, at every hazard, do further declare that we will not submit to the application of force on the part of the Federal Government, to reduce this State to obedience, but that we consider the passage by Congress, of any act authorizing the employment of a military or naval force, against the State of South Carolina, her constitutional authorities or citizens, or any act abolishing or closing the ports of this State, &c. as inconsistent with the longer continuance of South Carolina in the Union, and that the people of this State will henceforth hold themselves absolved from all further obligation to maintain and preserve their political connection with the people of the other States, and will forthwith proceed to organize a separate government, and do all other acts and things which sovereign and independent States may of right do."

Here there was an open and bold declaration on the part of South Carolina of her determination to secede, if Congress attempted to enforce the Revenue Law within her borders. This ordinance was promptly met by the Proclamation of Gen. Jackson, of date Dec. 11, 1832, which nullification and secession were pronounced treasonable. Then succeeded what was termed the Nullification Message of Gen. Jackson to Congress, of date January 16, 1833, which, after disapproving in the strongest terms the doctrines of the Ordinance, both secession and nullification, he declares his determination to execute the laws, in fulfillment of the obligations of his oath, and the requirements of the Constitution. What followed? We ask the very wise and consistent Editor of the "Standard," what followed? How a brief statement of facts can put to shame the demagogues of the Democratic Party, who now profess to be horrified at the very idea of "using force" against a sovereign State. We beg attention to the facts.

A Bill was introduced in the Senate placing the whole Military and Naval force of the Country at the disposition of the President, to execute the laws; in other words, to be used against South Carolina; should she attempt to carry out her Ordinance either under the claim of right to nullify or secede. It was denominated "the Force Bill." It was discussed much length, the leading political friends of the Administration advocating it with much zeal. It passed that body by a vote of 32 to 17. Amongst the Democrats who voted for it were DALLAS (Vice President during Mr. Polk's administration, and a great favorite of the "Standard.") FORSYTH (Secretary of State under Gen. Jackson,) WRIGHT, of New York, a very embodiment of Democracy, their very (to whom they delighted to honor,) GIBBS (Attorney General under Van Buren's administration,) DICKINSON, (Secretary of the Navy under Jackson's administration,) WILKINS, HILL, WHITE, and others. The only vote given against this Bill, which the "Standard" now regards as a tyrannical and bloody edict, was poor, despised, forsaken JOHN TYLER. He was the only friend of "State Rights and Sovereignty" then to be found, in the Senate, with nerve enough to stand up boldly against the mandates of the Hero of New Orleans. Let it be borne in mind also that Van Buren was then Vice President. Edward Livingston was Secretary of State. Louis McLane was Secretary of the Treasury. Lewis Cass, (a very identical one who was voted for by the same seceding Democrats at the last election,) was Secretary of War. Levi Woodbury, one of the favorites of the "Standard" for the Presidency) was Secretary of the Navy, at the very time this Bill was introduced, and was it approved and signed by President Jackson! Order after order was issued by the Cabinet Officers, all tending towards a preparation to apply force, should S. Carolina resist the execution of the laws, or attempt to secede. They must then have approved the measure. It was to all intents and purposes a measure of the Administration! Two of these men have been supported for the Presidency, (Van Buren and Cass,) by the entire Democracy and the would readily have voted for either of the others! Did we hear any expressions then of horror at their aiding and abetting to "put down by force a sovereign State?" Oh, no! It was all right! "Old Hickory" had pronounced it so, and whatever he put forth was the real true Democratic faith!

But we have not yet reached the end of the chapter of wrongs and insults to the "sovereignty" of South Carolina. The Force Bill passed the Senate and went to the House of Representatives. After much discussion, passed the House by a vote of 149 to 48.—The Democrats had an overwhelming majority in that body. Amongst those who voted in the affirmative were Richard M. Johnson, (Vice President under Van Buren;) (James K. Polk (the "model President" who was counted a staunch friend of "State Rights"); Wayne (one of the Judges of the Supreme Court, and appointed by a Democratic Administration); Cass (belonging at one period the leader of the party of the House of Representatives), and a number of others whom they have delighted to honor. Of the North Carolina Delegation, Messrs. Belinger, (Whig;) Hawkins, (Dem.); McKim (Dem.); Wm. B. Shepard, (Whig;) Shepard (Whig;) Speight, (Dem.) voted in the affirmative, and Messrs. Carson, Hall, Conner, and Rencher in the negative.

Yes, indeed, McKay, whom the Democrats were willing to send to the Senate, and Hon. William B. Shepard, the secession leader in this State, in whose walk the "Standard" was willing to follow, actually voted for the "bloody Bill," intended to crush a sovereign State! Nor have we yet recorded the most interesting part of the history of this measure. So soon as it had passed the House, by a large majority, we have stated, Mr. McDuffie of South Carolina, said

"MR. SPEAKER: I rise to perform an solemn duty. The House is about to destroy the rights of the States—is about to bury the Constitution—I ask the poor privilege of writing an epitaph. I move to amend the title of the Bill by striking out its present title and inserting the following in lieu thereof:—"An act to convert the sovereignty of the States of this Union to establish a consolidated Government with limitation of powers, and to make the citizens subordinate to the military power."

Mr. Wayne moved to lay the amendment on the table. The chair decided the motion of order.

Mr. Speight then demanded the previous question, which was ordered by a vote of 154 to 35—so Mr. McDuffie's resolution was rejected only 35 members signify their readiness to vote for it.

So this Bill, which, in the language of McDuffie, "subverted the sovereignty of the States," passed by one hundred and one majority, and was signed by Gen. Jackson, who declared thereby, his readiness, if it became necessary, to execute its provisions!

This act of President Jackson and his friends was approved by an overwhelming majority