

tingly from the country, deposed the destruction of the Holy Bible and expropriated it from the land. It is a known fact, when the British and Foreign Bible Society, at the close of the French Revolution, sought to restore the sacred volume to France by printing in London an edition in the French language, after a diligent search, not a single copy of the Bible could be found in all Paris. We also read that the National Convention at one time, was composed wholly of *Atheists*, who, to convince the world that they were such, passed a decree "that death is an *eternal sleep*." The learned gentleman from Halifax (Judge Daniel) says, however, that they were not *Atheists*, but *Sadducees*. Mr. F. said, he should not dispute about names, though, he would say, that this is the first time he had ever heard of *French Sadducees*. Of this, he was confident, that the doctrines held by these French Sadducees, were what we now call *Atheism*. The fact is, *Atheism* was openly professed and taught in France at that era. Lectures were delivered by the learned to prove the non-existence of God. We are told, that on a certain occasion, one of the celebrated Philosophers of that day, mounted the public stage with the red cap of liberty on his head, and delivered an oration before a large Assembly, to prove that there is no God. In the progress of his Address, he challenged *Deity* itself, if he did exist, to manifest his power by striking the speaker dead on the spot. He was not stricken dead, and this was hailed as proof conclusive that there was no God. But, said Mr. F. we need not go to France to find *Atheists*—they exist in our own country. If newspaper accounts are to be credited, even at this day, public lectures are delivered in the City of New York to prove that there is no God. They are as yet few in number in our country, but we know not how soon they may become numerous. We have seen them overrun France, a country where science and civilization flourished; and though there may be no danger of their overrunning our country, still, said Mr. F. I am for giving such wretches no encouragement, by permitting them to hold office or trust in a Christian community. If this be bigotry, I again say, that I am willing to be called a bigot. The next clause of the 32d section that I shall notice, said Mr. F. is that, which excludes *Deists* from civil office. The celebrated Doctor Johnson, sometimes called the Giant of English literature, had a great aversion to *Deists*. He had no faith in their honesty. He once remarked, if he should know of a *Deist* being at the same table with himself, he would caution the landlady to take care of her silver spoons. I do not think as badly of *Deists* as Doctor Johnson did, said Mr. F. for I believe there may be highly honorable and honest men of that description, but at the present time, he was not disposed to encourage *Deism* by expunging from the Constitution the limited disability imposed on its professors. We live in a Christian country—our Laws and Institutions in general, are based on the maxims and principles of the Christian Religion, and why should we encourage those who ridicule and deny the truth of this Religion? What other system of Religion ever yet received by man, can compare with ours? Where has civil liberty, human happiness, the arts and sciences of civilization flourished as in *Christendom*? In a temporal point of view alone, if we judge from its fruits, it is the best of all Religions; and, is it bigotry, then to discountenance that class of men who deny this Religion, and would deprive the world of its manifold blessings? The wise and good of all civilized countries, since the commencement of the Christian era, have borne testimony to this Religion, and to him it appeared the height of folly and presumption for any one now, after lapse of eighteen centuries to deny "the divine authority" of the Holy Scriptures. Justly indeed do such sceptics merit the sarcasm of a celebrated British Poet on an analogous subject:—

"Shall little haughty ignorance pronounce HIS works unwise, of which the smallest part Exceeds the narrow vision of her mind? As if upon a full proportion'd dome, On a spilling column base, the pride of art! An arch of a dome, with blind presumption bold, Should dare to tax the structure of the whole!"

It is true, there have been some learned men who professed *Deism*, but generally *Deists* are of a different description. Dr. Halley was an Astronomer of some note, and a *Deist*. He once commenced ridiculing the Christian Religion in the presence of Sir Isaac Newton, the greatest of all Astronomers, and one of the best of men, when he was promptly checked by the latter. Doctor Halley, said Sir Isaac Newton, when you speak of Astronomy, I hear you with pleasure, for you have studied that science and understand it; but it gives me pain to hear you speak of the Christian system, which you never have studied; you know nothing about it. I have studied it, and know it to be true. "Shall we," said Mr. F. go out of our way to expunge from the Constitution an Article which imposes a small disability on a class of men who would willingly subvert that Religion, pronounced to be true by the good and great of every land? That religion, on which all our civil institutions rest—the source of our blessings in this life and our happiness hereafter? If

we were now adopting a Constitution in the first instance, then it might be a question whether this Article ought to be inserted. But such is not the case. We have a Constitution before us, and are merely amending it. To strike out this Article about *Deists*, would be a sort of declaration in favor of *Deism*. For one, therefore, he should vote against striking out.

The next clause of the 32d Section, is that which excludes from Civil Office, such as "hold Religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State." Certainly there cannot be much objection to this clause. No one can wish to see the enemies of civil liberty in possession of the offices of the State. The only objection that can possibly be raised to this clause is, that it is not sufficiently definite; he thought however, it never would be abused, and perhaps never be called into action. As no inconvenience has been felt from it, and as the prejudices of the people are in favor of retaining it, he saw no necessity for expunging it.

The only remaining clause in the 32d Section, is that which excludes from Civil Office all who deny the truth of the *Pro's an' Religion*. This clause, it is contended by some, was intended to exclude Roman Catholics from civil appointments, while others believe that it does not exclude that class of men. One thing is certain, from the commencement of the Government to this day, it never has been brought to bear against the Catholics—for we have seen every grade of office in the State, from Governor down to Constable, at one time or other, filled by men of the Catholic persuasion. As, however, a difference of opinion seems now to exist on the subject, creating some doubt as to the true construction, we ought so to amend the Article as to make it more explicit. This, he thought, would be accomplished by striking out the word *Protestant*, and in place thereof, insert the word *Christian*. He believed that the people would be generally satisfied with this alteration, but any further change would be going beyond what they expected, and would insure the rejection of all the Amendments. Some gentlemen consider this clause as a defect in the Constitution; nay, they say, a disgrace; but they cannot show where it has ever injured or disgraced any individual. Yet, because they do not like its phrasing, they are willing to jeopard all our labors in this Convention and for years past in bringing it about, by striking out the whole clause and section. For himself, he was not willing to give up *practical good* through fears of *ideal evils*. If any evil exists, it will be remedied by the proposed change, and thus far he was willing to go; but he was not willing to hazard all the Amendments, by expunging the whole Section.

Mr. OUTLAW hoped he should be permitted to make a few remarks.—The gentleman who had just taken his seat seemed to address this Convention, as if he were the Defender of the Faith of the Christian Religion; and that without his protecting arm, it would be trodden under foot. For his part, he considered this a labor of supererogation: The Christian Religion is the work of God, and is therefore in no danger of giving way.

The argument brought forward by the gentleman from Rowan (Mr. Fisher) and others, that there is no difference between annexing qualifications for office, and declarations that men entertaining certain religious opinions shall not be capable of holding office, is mere sophistry. For, in the one case, it is in the power of any man by industry and application, to attain office; but in the other, you render it impossible for a conscientious man, who refuses to give up his religious opinions, to enjoy the common right of others; for you require him either to believe what his conscience abhors and condemns, or to become a hypocrite and deny his faith. Is there, then, no difference between the two cases?

It is said, this 32d section was intended to restrain men of improper character from becoming officers of the Government, but is there no danger from it, of excluding the most pure and conscientious men? There certainly is danger, from the different expositions which have been given of the section by men learned in the law. Even if the word *Christian* be substituted for *Protestant*, he doubted whether the danger would be removed; for he said there was a numerous sect in some sections of this country called *Unitarians*, to whom a portion of the Calvinists deny the right of bearing the Christian name. Might not there possibly be an union formed of different sects for the purpose of persecuting their brethren who might differ in opinion from them in certain particulars? It is, for instance, the opinion of some, that the Quakers hold "religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State," as they restrain them from bearing arms even in time of war. What security have we, if this clause remains, that this inoffensive sect may not hereafter become objects of persecution? He thought we had none, and therefore moved to strike from the section, the words, "or who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State."

This motion being put, was negatively 57 votes to 39.

Governor BRANCH assured the gentleman from Buncombe that it would give him pleasure to travel in the same path with him in relation to this subject; but he could not conscientiously do so.

It is true that this 32d Article has lain dormant hitherto; but we have seen from the excitement that has been made upon it in different sections of our country, that it is not dead, but sleepeth; and if we now enact it afresh, by refusing to rescind it, it may hereafter rise up in great strength.

The gentlemen from Cumberland and Rowan seem to think it was not intended to apply to Roman Catholics. He was of an entirely different opinion. He had no doubt it was intended to operate against that class of Christians. Nor did he think that one thousand men in this State could be found who entertained a different opinion.

He had voted for every proposition calculated to repeal this section, or to amend it so as to render it less objectionable; but for the present proposition to strike out one word, to insert another, which did not, in his view, remove the great objection to it, he could not vote.

Mr. CARSON, from Burke, believed that no man was more honest in his course than the gentleman from Halifax. He, with that gentleman, had gone for the most liberal amendments to this section. We were in favor of complete religious toleration. We have been defeated. But because we cannot obtain all the alterations we desire in this objectionable Article, shall we refuse that which is in our power to get? If we cannot make room for the Jew, if he be thought worthy for office, let us not refuse the privilege for Christians of every denomination. His friend from Halifax believes that the Article in its present form excludes the Catholics. So he himself once thought, but he had changed his opinion. It would be well, however, to settle that opinion, by agreeing to the report of the Committee of the whole.

The gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Toomer) has said this question, in relation to Catholics, is settled. But, said Mr. C. this Convention, by its action on the subject, has unsettled it. It is no longer a question at rest. The learned gentlemen from Halifax and Wake (Judges Daniel and Sewell) had both given it as their opinion that it was meant to exclude the Catholics. Though the section therefore, might heretofore have been considered as a dead letter, it is now alive again, and must be treated as a living thing. He was willing, therefore, to take the proposed amendment to strike out the word *Catholic* and insert the word *Christian* in its place.

Mr. C. was surprised to hear gentlemen speak of throwing an *Aegis* about the Religion of the country.—Does the Religion of our Saviour (asked Mr. C.) need any aid of man to protect it? No; it stands on the broad basis of Eternal Truth—on the Rock of Ages, and needs from us *belief* only. Why should the Protestants think ill of the Catholics because they differ from them in opinion? For when the Disciples of Jesus saw one casting out Devils in his name, they forbade him; but Jesus said, "forbid him not, for he that is not against us is for us." Again: when Peter asked our Saviour "what should be done with this man?" [John] he replied, "if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me?"

Mr. COLLINS said, having been engaged in attending to the business of a committee this morning, he did not come into the Convention till late. He was surprised to hear the gentleman from Halifax (Gov. Branch) say, that because he could not obtain any amendment to the objectionable section before the Convention, that would open the door of office to every worthy man, whatever might be his Religious opinions, he would not vote for expunging the word *Catholic*, and inserting in its place that of *Christian*. Mr. C. said that he had all along voted with the gentleman from Halifax for the most liberal amendments to this section; but having been hitherto defeated, he would be willing to adopt the one now before the Convention, as it would at all events put the question to rest, as to *Catholics* and all other Christians.

Mr. MOREHEAD said, he should have remained silent on this subject, had it not been for the severe censures cast upon all who were in favor of retaining this 32d section in the Constitution. His feelings had been much excited, but he had endeavored to keep them down. He would, however, venture to make a few remarks on the subject.

Because we are in favor of retaining in the Constitution something like a Test for office, we are charged with bigotry and illiberality. In every Constitution, said he, certain qualifications are made necessary for office. In the amendments proposed by this Convention to the Constitution, certain qualifications are provided for the members of both Houses, and why not place some guard against intruders on the Religion of our country? We, the other day, refused to a class of freemen the right of voting, because the colour of their skin happened to differ from ours. Why was that done? Not be-

cause it was just, but because it was expedient. But when we prefer keeping a guard upon our Religious rights in the Constitution, we are called illiberal, bigoted, fanatics, &c. Mr. M. could not say that he was a Christian, because he had made no profession to be such; but he was as free from bigotry or fanaticism as any one.

If no care is to be taken to preserve the sanctity of Religion in our country, why keep up the custom of administering oaths? Why administer an oath to an *Atheist*? He would not be bound by it. It had been said that there were no such beings in the country. He believed there were many such. He was therefore in favor of retaining the section in question.—If any amendment were to be made to it, he should prefer that offered by the gentleman from Wilkes, and now under consideration. He agreed with the gentleman from Cumberland (Mr. Toomer) that it had been settled by the highest authority, that the 32d Article did not exclude Roman Catholics from office, since the General Assembly had recently selected a distinguished gentleman of that profession to fill one of the highest offices on our Judicial Bench. He had been admitted to his seat without a single whisper of objection from any quarter, but on the contrary, with the general approbation of the whole country. Mr. M. added that he wished every man in North Carolina could have heard the able defence and explanation which the gentleman from Craven (Judge Gaston) had given to the Convention, of the Roman Catholic Religion.—He wished it, because he was satisfied that it had been greatly misrepresented and misunderstood. He knew that it was generally believed in the part of the country, in which he was best acquainted, that the Catholics here owed allegiance to the Pope. He was glad to hear this positively contradicted by the gentleman from Craven.

He would add another remark in relation to what had fallen from the gentleman from Buncombe some days ago, in relation to the late Rev. Dr. David Caldwell, of his county. Mr. M. said, there never was a truer man than Dr. Caldwell, nor one that had the good of his country more at heart. He mentioned several striking instances of his ardent zeal during the Revolutionary struggle, in evidence of this fact.

Governor SWAIN said, he was far from saying anything derogatory to the character of Dr. Caldwell. He believed him to have been every thing that the gentleman from Guilford had represented him to be. All that he had said referred to his zeal for propagating the Presbyterian doctrines in preference to any other.

The question was then taken on a agreeing to the Resolution reported by the Committee of the whole, and carried 74 votes to 51.

Mr. Van Buren's Letter.
The Augusta (Georgia) Courier, of the 28th ultimo, contains the following letter from Mr. Van Buren, intended, it would seem, as an explanation of his views and opinions on "the Slave question."
Owasso, Sept. 10, 1835.
MY DEAR SIR:—Your letter of the 23d ult. met me at this place, on my return from the Falls, and I lose no time in replying to that part of it which relates to the continued attempts to prejudice my friends, as well as myself, in the estimation of the South in respect to the Slave Question. It is deeply to be regretted that there should be found, on the part of any, individuals sufficiently strong to create an excitement, already so alarming, by a resort to imputations, in the truth of which no ingenious mind can place the slightest confidence. The allegations which attribute to me views and opinions that are as justly obnoxious to the slave holding States, are made in the face of the most explicit declarations on my part, denying all authority on the part of the Federal Government to interfere in the matter—against the propriety of agitating the question in the District of Columbia, and in the absence of a single fact, giving the least countenance to the unfounded imputations. I should probably require the candor with which I have hitherto been treated by the great mass of my fellow citizens of the South, were I to allow myself to approach that those who would otherwise be disposed to give me their confidence, and to acquiesce in my opinions, suffer me to be prejudiced in their opinion, by the unsupported assertions of my enemies, however reckless or maliciously persisted in. Were these fabrications, therefore, designed to affect me only, I should not hesitate to leave the matter as it stands, to the spontaneous action of my countrymen. But when it is intended to reach, in this way, those who honor me with their friendship, and to create, by such means, a prejudice in their opinion, by the unsupported assertions of my enemies, it is incumbent upon me to do all in my power to remove all ungrounded impressions, and to put an end to every feeling and prejudice inconsistent with the principles upon which the Union was founded. Earnestly cherishing this pleasing anticipation, I am, dear Sir, very truly,
Your friend and ob't servant,
M. VAN BUREN.

We doubt whether the above letter will do ought to aid the cause of Mr. Van Buren. We can see nothing in its language or general import, to encourage his Southern friends. It does not meet the true issue—it gives no satisfactory explanation of Mr. V. B.'s views in relation to the asserted power of Congress, now generally advocated and supported at the North, to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia. This question, the Richmond Enquirer, whose loyal zeal in behalf of "the appointed successor" can scarcely be doubted, affirms, with its usual felicity in classical quotation, will be "the Achilles' heel of the party."—We presume that our Richmond Contemporary speaks as a Southern man, having reference to Southern interests. If, therefore, the South be so vulnerable in this particular point—so liable to attack, and not armed with proof against the weapons with which she will be assailed; it is, (according even to the declaration and argument of the Richmond Enquirer) all important that it (the South) should bestow its suffrages on no individual who would either prompt or remain a calm spectator of the conflict. Now what says Mr. Van Buren in relation to this interesting and deeply important subject? Why, forsooth, he is not disposed to recognize "the propriety of agitating the question in the District of Columbia!" "The propriety" of this question is not the subject on which the South require his opinion. They did not expect that Mr. Van Buren, at this time, when his claims and pretensions are argued with all the zeal of party, would give a direct and authorized support to Arthur Tappan and his followers; but they did expect that if he were forced to give an open and decided expression of his opinions on the Slavery question he would do violence to their rights, their principles and their interests. They have not been disappointed.

Mr. V. Buren in the letter above referred to, declares that he is not in favor of immediate emancipation. We believe him. We have never sought and do not now endeavor to create among the Southern people the belief that Mr. Van Buren was in favor of Arthur Tappan and the immediate application of his doctrines. We need not the aid of any impassioned appeal to the feelings of the Southern people to put them on their guard against the insidious and ulterior attacks on their rights. This is a question which each individual can settle for himself. We believe that Mr. Van Buren is wrong in making any appeal to party feeling. He is now confessedly an open advocate of the power of Congress to interfere with the "Slave question." He seems to protest against "the propriety" of agitating the question of slavery in the District of Columbia, but he does not utter one word or publish one sentence in denial of the right or the power of Congress to control the entire subject. This single fact should be sufficient for the Southern States. No candidate, especially one who has, in former times, taken an active part on the Missouri Question, should receive the suffrages and the cordial support of the South, unless, in frank and explicit terms, he protests against the right or the power of Congress to abolish Slavery in the District of Columbia.

But we do not confine our objections to the tone of Mr. Van Buren's remarks in relation to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. He refers to the proceedings of the Albany meeting, and authorizes the gentleman to whom his letter is addressed, to say that he concurs fully in the sentiments they advance. Now, however flattering the resolutions adopted at that meeting may prove to Southern pride, we cannot forget the fact that there is no recommendation of legislative action. On this subject the resolutions are silent. They recognise the rights of the South, profess to be indignant at their violation, and yet propose no remedy. The leaders of the party, it seems, doubted "the propriety" of calling for legislative interference. Mr. Van Buren must write another letter, and of a far different character, before he can expect the support of a Slaveholding State.

Petersburg Intelligence.
FOREIGN.
LATE FROM FRANCE.
By the ship Sully, Capt. Forbes, from Havre, we have Paris dates to Sept. 1st, and Havre to Sept. 2d.

The odious law against the press, has passed the Chambers, by a vote of 226 to 155. The modifications in respect to the theatres, are somewhat favorable.

The Municipal Corporation Bill was still under discussion in the House of Lords.

M. Dupin, the President of the Chamber, has refused, according to the usage, to carry the law of the press to the King.

The municipal bill mutilated by the house of Lords of England, has been sent to the Commons. The decision of the latter, will, says the Chancellor of the Exchequer, be firm, calm, and resolute. The Commons, says the Chronicle, ought to speak in a high tone, and revenge the despised sentiments of the people, unless they wish to see those sentiments exasperated to a point of extreme danger. The Tories anxiously desire a new dissolution. The ministerial party of the Commons hold frequent conferences at Lord John Russell's, to devise the proper course to be pursued.

Spain.—It is stated in the Constitutionnel of the 30th, on the authority of the London Glob, that negotiations have been commenced between the queen's government, and the authorities of the three Basque provinces,

which, if successful, will put an end to the civil war.

THE STAR
Raleigh, October 13, 1835.

Great Whig triumph.—Maryland has been held in Maryland, for members of Congress and the State Legislature has resulted in the choice of Whigs and three Van Buren men, Congress, viz. John N. Steele, James A. Pearce, James Turner, George Washington and Dan'l Jenifer, Messrs. C. Howard, Isaac McKim, Francis Thomas, Van Buren, Baltimore district, the Van Buren candidates succeeded, in consequence is said, of the great number of Catholics in the city, who buckled his standard. The State Senate, consisting of 15 members, are all Whigs in the House of Delegates the Whigs will stand, Whigs 57, Van Buren 10, so that on joint ballot, there will be the Legislature a Whig majority of votes. The Whigs have truly given a most signal and triumphant victory over the combined forces of the party." Maryland has done well. She has now a Whig Governor, a Whig Executive Council, a Whig State, a Whig House of Delegates, a Whig majority in Congress, "holds fast" her Democratic principles, and the sacred devices of the Van Buren party never gain foothold within her doors." Let her sister States "go do likewise."

In 1832, Maryland elected 6 Administration, and 2 opposition members Congress.

Pennsylvania.—The election of assessors and Inspectors of the General Election took place throughout the State on the 2nd instant, and in the City of Philadelphia, the Whig Ticket prevailed in the whole fifteen wards by an aggregate majority of 247. Moyamensing, the friends of Mollenburg prevailed, and in Southwark those of Gov. Wolf. We have heard from only 26 districts; in 19 which the Ritner Ticket has prevailed. The General Election took place Tuesday last. Of course, we have yet received no returns.

As the Nashville papers of the 10th ultimo, take no notice of an attempt to rescue Murrel, we have now no doubt that the report published in our last issue on that subject, is untrue.

Dinner to Col. MacLeod.—A full account of the proceedings of the dinner given to Col. MacLeod, in Loudon county, on the 17th ult. shall appear in our next.

The United States Telegraph announces that Gen. GREEN having made arrangements to remove from Washington City, for the purpose of engaging in other pursuits, that paper hereafter be under the editorial charge of Dr. EDWARD R. GIBSON, who has been for several years connected with the paper as an associate Editor. The proprietary interest as yet remains in Gen. Green.

Editorial Change.—Mr. R. Y. TERRY, jr. has retired from the editorship of the Oxford Examiner, preparatory to removing to the West. His place, by the very respectable and courteous manner in which he has conducted that paper, established him in the high regard of his editorial brethren and the public generally, and we carry with him into retirement the warmest wishes for his future happiness and prosperity. He will be succeeded by Mr. Wm. M. SUTTON, formerly of this city, who has become proprietor and Editor of the Examiner. From our knowledge of the qualifications, industry and enterprise of our new editor, we have no doubt that he will publish a valuable and interesting journal. He is making preparations for its improvement, and will shortly lay before the public a sheet which will vie with any paper in the State in appearance, usefulness and entertainment." He has our best wishes for his success. The following is his address to his patrons:

The Patrons of the Examiner having manifested a disposition to sustain the same, the proprietor has, on the retirement of its former and spirited editor, Mr. R. Y. Terry, been induced to purchase his interest in the establishment, and hopes by perseverance and attention to the conducting of the paper to fill, in a measure, the vacuum occasioned by the withdrawal of Mr. Terry from public life in this State. Of his private character as a citizen we may not speak, but we can confidently assert, he leaves universally respected and regretted. After a connection of nearly years, he leaves at a time when, as the clouds are bursting away, and the glorious Constitution, so long shackled by tyranny and perversion, is bursting forth in a new and splendid day, and for which he has