

## SPEECH OF HENRY CLAY.

Delivered at the Mechanics' Collection in the Apollo Hall, Cincinnati, on the 3d Aug. 1830.

Eighty-third.—OUR VALUED GUEST.

His highest eulogium; that the name of HENRY CLAY is inseparably associated with the best interests of the country as its avowed and ablest advocate.

When the enthusiastic cheering which followed the reading of this toast had subsided, Mr. CLAY rose and addressed the company as follows:—

*Mr. President and Fellow Citizens:*

In rising to make the acknowledgments which are due from me, for the sentiment which has been just drunk, and for the honors which have been spontaneously rendered to me, on my approach and during my visit to this city, I feel more than ever, the incompetency of all language adequately to express the grateful feelings of my heart. Of these distinguished honors, crowned heads themselves might well be proud. They indeed possess a value far surpassing that of any similar testimonies which could be offered to the chief of an absolute government.—There they are, not unfrequently, tendered by reluctant subjects, avowed by a sense of terror, or impelled by a spirit of servility. Here in this land of equal laws and equal liberty, they are presented to a private fellow citizen, possessing neither office nor power, nor enjoying any rights or privileges, which are not common to every member of the community. Power could not buy nor deter them. And what confers an estimable value upon them to me—what makes them alone worthy of you or more acceptable to my object, is that they are offered, not to the man, but to the public principles and public interests which you are pleased to associate with his name. On this occasion too, they emanate from one of those great productive classes, which form the main pillars of public liberty and public prosperity. I thank you fellow-citizens, most cordially, for those endearing proofs of your friendly attention. They have made an impression of gratitude on my heart which can never be effaced, during the residue of my life. I avail myself of this last opportunity of being present at any large collection of my fellow citizens of Ohio, during my present visit, to express my respectful acknowledgments for the hospitality and kindness with which I have been every where received and entertained. Throughout my journey, undertaken solely for private purposes, there has been a constant effort on my side to repress, and on that of my fellow citizens of Ohio, to exhibit public manifestations of their affection and confidence. It has been marked by a succession of civic triumphs. I have been escorted from village to village, and have every where found myself surrounded by large concourses of my fellow-citizens, often of both sexes, greeting and welcoming me. Nor should I do justice to my feelings, if I confined the expression of my obligations to those only with whom I had the happiness to agree on a late public event. They are equally due to the candid and liberal of those from whom it was my misfortune to differ on that occasion, for their exercise towards me of all the rites of hospitality and neighborly courtesy. It is true, that in one or two of the towns through which I passed, I was informed attempts were made, by a few political zealots, to dissuade portions of my fellow citizens from visiting and saluting me. These zealots seemed to apprehend that an invading army was about to enter the town; that it was necessary to sound the bells, to beat the drums, to point the cannon, and to make all needful preparations for a resolute assault and a gallant defence. They were accordingly seen in the public streets and at public places beating up for recruits, and endeavoring to drill their men. But I believe there were only a few who were swayed by their threats or seduced by their bounty to enlist in such a cause. The great body of those who thought differently from me, in the instance referred to, remained firm and immovable. They could not comprehend that it was wrong to extend to a stranger from a neighboring State the civilities which belong to social life. They could not comprehend that it was right to transform political differences into deadly animosities. Seeing that varieties in the mode of worshipping the great Ruler of the Universe did not disturb the harmony of private intercourse, they could not comprehend the propriety of extending to mortal man a sacrifice, which is not offered to our immortal Father, of all the friendly and social feelings of our nature, because we could not all agree as to the particular exercise of the elective franchise.

As independent and intelligent freemen, they would not consent to submit to an arrogant usurpation which assumed the right to control their actions and to regulate the feelings of their hearts and they assented with indignation, to yield obedience to the mandates of would-be dictators. To quiet the apprehensions of these zealots, I assure them that I do not march at the head of any military force; that I have neither horse, foot, nor dragoon; and that I travel with my friend Charles (a black boy residing in my family, for whom I feel the same sort of attachment that I do for my own children) without sword, pistol or musket. Another species of attempted embarrassment has been practised by an individual of this city. About an hour before I left my lodgings for this spot, he caused a packet to be left in my room by a little boy, who soon made his exit.—Upon opening it I looked at the signature, and that was enough for me. It contained a long list of interrogatories which I was required publicly to answer. I read only one or two of them. There are some whose contact is pollution. I can recognize no right in the person in question to catechize me. I can have no intercourse with one, who is a disgrace to the gallant and generous nation from which he sprang. I cannot stoop to be thus interrogated by a man whose nomination to a paltry office was rejected nearly by the unanimous vote of the Senate; I must excuse him, when addressing my friends, the mechanics of Cincinnati, I will not speak from his notes. On the renewal of the charter of the present Bank of the United States, which I believe formed the subject of one or two of these interrogatories, I will say a few words for you, not his sake. I will observe in the first place, that I am not in favor of such a Bank as was recommended in the Message of the President of the U. S. at the commencement of the last session of Congress; that with the committee of the two Houses, I concur in thinking it would be an institution of a dangerous and alarming character; and that, fraught as it would be with the most corrupting temptations, it might be made powerfully instrumental in overturning our liberties. As to the existing bank, I think it has been generally administered, and particularly of late years, with great ability and integrity; that it has fulfilled all the reasonable expectations of those who constituted it; and, with the same committee, I think it has made an approximation towards the equalization of the currency, as great as is practicable. Whether the charter ought to be renewed or not, near six years hence, in my judgment, is a question of expediency to be decided by the then existing state of the country. It will be necessary at that time to look carefully at the condition both of the bank and of the Union. To ascertain if the public debt will in the mean time be paid off, what effect that will produce: what will be our then financial condition, what that of local banks, the state of our commerce, foreign and domestic, as well as the concerns of our currency generally. I am, therefore, not now prepared to say whether the charter ought or ought not to be renewed on the expiration of its present term. The bank may become insolvent, and may hereafter forfeit all pretensions to a renewal.—The question is premature. I may not be alive to form any opinion upon it. It belongs to posterity, and if they would have the goodness to decide for us some of the perplexing and practical questions of the present day, we might be disposed to decide that remote question for them. As it is, it ought to be indefinitely postponed.

With respect to the American System which demands your undivided approbation, and in regard to which you are pleased to estimate much too highly my service, its great object is to secure the independence of our country, to augment its wealth, and to diffuse the comforts of civilization throughout society. That object, it has been supposed, can be best accomplished by introducing, encouraging and protecting the arts among us. It may be called a system of real reciprocity, under the operation of which one citizen or one part of the country, can exchange one description of the produce of labor with another citizen, or another part of the country, for a different description of the produce of labor. It is a system which develops, improves and perfects the capabilities of our common country, and enables us to avail ourselves of all the resources with which Providence has blessed us. To the laboring classes, it is invaluable, since it increases and multiplies the demands for their industry, and gives them an option of employments. It adds power and strength to our Union by new ties of interest, blending and connecting together all its parts, and creating an interest with each in the prosperity of the whole. It secures to our own country, whose skill and enterprise, properly fostered and sustained, cannot be surpassed, those vast profits which are made in other countries, by the operation of converting the raw material into manufactured articles. It naturalizes and creates within the bosom of our country all the arts, and mixing the farmer, manufacturer, mechanic, artist, and those engaged in other vocations together, admits of those mutual exchanges, so conducive to the prosperity of all and every one, free from the perils of the sea and war. All this it effects, while it nourishes and leaves a fair scope to foreign trade. Suppose we were a nation that died ourselves and made all the implements necessary to civilization, but did not produce our own bread, which we brought from foreign countries, although our own was capable of producing it, under the influence of suitable laws of protection, ought not such laws to be enacted? The case supposed is not essentially different from the real state of things which led to the adoption of the American System.

That system has had a wonderful success. It has more than realized all the hopes of its founders. It has completely falsified all the predictions of its opponents. It has increased the wealth, and power, and population of the Nation. It has diminished the price of articles of consumption, and has placed them within the reach of a far greater number of our people than could have found means to command them, if they had been manufactured abroad instead of at home.

But it is useless to dwell on the argument in support of this beneficent system before this audience. It will be of more consequence here to examine some of the objections which are still urged against it, and the means which are proposed to subvert it. These objections are now principally confined to its operation upon the great staple of cotton wool, and they are urged with most vehemence in a particular State. If the objections are well founded, the system should be modified as far as it can consistently with interests in other parts of the Union. If they are not well founded, it is to be hoped they will be finally abandoned.

In approaching the subject, I have thought it of importance to inquire what was the profit made upon capital employed in the culture of Cotton at its present reduced price. The result has been information, that it nets from 17 to 13 per cent. per annum, varying according to the advantage of situation, and the degree of skill, judgment and industry applied to the production of the article. But the lowest rate of profit, in the scale, is more than the greatest amount which is made on capital employed in the farming portions of the Union.

If the cotton planter have any just complaint against the expediency of the American System, it must be founded on the fact, that he either sells *less* of his staple, or sells at *lower* prices, or purchases for consumption, articles at *dearer* rates, or of *worse* qualities, in consequence of that system, than he would do, if it did not exist. If he would neither sell more of his staple, nor sell it at better prices, nor could purchase better or cheaper articles for consumption, provided the system did not exist, then he has no cause on the score of its burthening operation, to complain of the system, but must look to other sources for the grievances which he supposes afflict him.

As respects the sale of his staple, it would be indifferently to the planter whether one portion of it was sold in Europe and the other in America, provided the aggregate of both were equal to all that he could sell in one market, if he had but one, and provided he could command the same prices in both cases. The double market would indeed be better for him, because of its greater security in time of war as well as peace, and because it would be attended with less perils and less charges. If there be an equal amount of the raw material manufactured, it must be immaterial to the cotton planter, in the sale of the article, whether there be two theatres of the manufacture, one in Europe and the other in America, or but one in Europe; or if there be a difference, it will be in favor of the two places of manufacture, instead of one, for reasons already assigned, and others that will be hereafter stated.

It could be of no advantage to the cotton planter, if all the cotton now manufactured both in Europe and America, was manufactured exclusively in Europe, and an amount of cotton fabrics should be brought back from Europe, equal to both what is now brought from there and what is manufactured in the United States together. Whilst he would gain nothing, the United States would lose the profit and employment resulting from the manufacture of that portion which is now wrought up by the manufacturers of the U. S. States.

Unless, therefore, it can be shown that by the reduction of import duties and the overthrow of the American System, and by limiting the manufacture of cotton to Europe, a greater amount of raw material would be consumed than at present, it is difficult to see what interest, so far as respects the sale of that staple, the cotton planter has in the subversion of that system. If a reduction of duties would admit of larger investments in British or European fabrics of cotton, and their subsequent importation into this country, this additional supply would take the place, if consumed, of an equal amount of American manufactures, and consequently would not augment the general consumption of the raw material. Additional importation does not necessarily imply increased consumption, especially when it is effected by a policy which would impair the ability to purchase and consume.

Upon the supposition, just made, of a restriction to Europe of the manufacture of cotton, would more or less of the article be consumed than now? More could not be, unless in consequence of such a monopoly of the manufacture, Europe could sell more than she now does. But to what countries could she sell more? She gets the raw material now unburthened by any duties except such moderate ones as her policy, not likely to be changed, imposes. She is enabled thereby to sell as much of the manufactured article as she can find markets for in the States, within her own limits, or in foreign countries. The destruction of the American manufacture, would not induce her to sell cheaper, but might enable her to sell dearer, than she now does. The ability of those foreign countries to purchase and consume, would not be increased, by the annihilation of our manufactures and the monopoly of European manufacture. The probability is that those foreign countries, by the fact of that monopoly, and some consequent increase of price would be worse and dearer supplied than they now are under the operation of a competition between America and Europe in their supply.

At most, the United States, after the transfer from their territory to Europe of the entire manufacture of the article, could not consume of European fabrics from cotton a greater amount than they now derive from Europe and from manufactures within their own limits.

But it is confidently believed that the consumption of cotton fabrics on the supposition which has been made, with the United States, would be much less than it is at present. It would be less, because the American consumer would not possess the means or ability to purchase as much of the European fabric, as he now does to buy the American. Europe purchases but little of the produce of the Northern, Middle and Western regions of the U. States. The entire

production of these regions are excluded from her consumption by her policy, or by her native supplies of similar productions.—The effect, therefore, of obviating the mischiefs of these regions to depend upon the cotton manufacture of Europe for necessary supplies of the article, would be a like injurious to them and to the cotton grower. They would suffer from their inability to supply their wants, and there would be a consequent diminution of the consumption of cotton. By the location of the manufacture in the United States, the quantity of cotton consumed is increased, and more numerous portions of their inhabitants, who would not be otherwise sufficiently supplied, are abundantly served. That this is the true state of things, I think cannot be doubted by any reflecting and unprejudiced man. The establishment of manufactures within the United States, enables the manufacturer to sell to the farmer, the mechanic, the physician, the lawyer, and all who are engaged in other pursuits of life, and these, in their turns, supply the manufacturer with subsistence, and whatever else his wants require. Under the influence of the protecting policy, many new towns have been built and old ones enlarged. The population of these places draw their subsistence from the farming interest of our country, their fuel from our forests and coal mines, and the raw materials from which they fashion and fabricate, from the cotton planter and the mines of our country. These mutual exchanges, so animating and invigorating to the industry of the people of the United States, could not possibly be affected between America and Europe, if the latter enjoyed the monopoly of manufacture.

It results, therefore, that, so far as the sale of the great southern staple is concerned, a greater quantity is sold and consumed, and consequently better prices are obtained, under the operation of the American System than would be without it. Does that system oblige the cotton planter to buy dearer or worse articles of consumption than he could purchase, if it did not exist?

The same cause of American and European competition, which enables him to sell more of the produce of his industry and at better prices, also enables him to buy cheaper and better articles for consumption. It cannot be doubted that the tendency of the competition between the European and American manufacturer is to reduce the price and improve the quality of their respective fabrics, whenever they come into collision. This is the immutable law of all competition. If the American manufacture were discontinued, Europe would then exclusively furnish those supplies which are now derived from the establishments in both Continents; and the first consequence would be an augmentation of the demand beyond the supply equal to what is now manufactured in the United States, but which, in the contingency supposed, would be wrought in Europe. If the destruction of the American manufactures were sudden, there would be a sudden and probably a considerable rise in the European fabrics. Although, in the end, they might be again reduced, it is not likely that the ultimate reduction of the prices would be to such rates as if both the work shops of America and Europe remained sources of supply. There would also be a sudden reduction in the price of the raw material in consequence of the cessation of the American demand. And this reduction would be permanent, if the supposition be correct, that there would be a diminution in the consumption of cotton fabrics arising out of the inability on the part of large portions of the people of the U. States to purchase those of Europe.

That the effect of competition between the European and American manufacture has been to supply the American consumer with cheaper and better articles, since the adoption of the American System, notwithstanding the existence of causes which have abstracted its fair operation, and retarded its full development, is incontestable. But the freeman and the slave are now better and cheaper supplied than they were prior to an existence of that system. Cotton fabrics have diminished in price, and been improved in their texture to an extent that it is difficult for the imagination to keep pace with. These partly of cotton and partly of wool are sold better and cheaper supplied. The same observation is applicable to those which are exclusively wrought of wool, iron or glass. In short, it is believed that there is not one item of the Tariff, inserted for the protection of native industry, which has not fallen in price. The American competition has tended to keep down the European rival fabric, and the European has tended to lower the American.

What then can the South Carolina planter justly complain in the operation of that system? What is there in it which justifies the harsh and stinging epithets which some of her politicians have applied to it? What is there in her condition which warrants their assertion that she is oppressed by a Government to which she stands in the mere relation of a Colony? She is oppressed by a great reduction in the price of manufactured articles of consumption. She is oppressed by the advantage of two markets for the sale of her valuable staple, and for the purchase of objects required by her wants. She is oppressed by better prices for that staple than she could command if the system to which they object did not exist.

She is oppressed by the option of purchasing cheaper and better articles, the produce of the hands of American freemen, instead of dearer and worse articles the produce of the hands of British subjects. She is oppressed by the measures of a Government in which she has had, for many years, a large proportion of power and influence, at home and abroad, than any state in the whole Union, in comparison with the population.

A glance at the composition of the Government of the Union will demonstrate the truth of this last proposition. In the Senate of the U. States, South Carolina having the presiding office, exercises nearly one sixth part of one twenty-fourth part of both its legislative and executive functions. In both branches of Congress some of her citizens now occupy, as Chairmen of Committees, the most important and influential positions. In the Supreme Court of the U. States, one of her citizens being a member, she has one seventh part, instead of about one twentieth, her equal proportion of the whole power vested in that tribunal. Until within a few months she had nearly one third of all the missions of the first grade, from this to foreign countries. In a contingency, which is far from impossible, a citizen of South Carolina, would instantly become charged with the Administration of the whole of the vast power and patronage of the Executive of the U. States.

Yet her situation has been compared to that of a Colony which has no voice in the laws enacted by the parent country for its subjection! And, to be relieved from this cruel state of vassalage, and to put down a system which has been established by the united voice of all America, some of her politicians have broached a doctrine as new as it would be alarming, if it were sustained by numbers in proportion to the zeal and fervid eloquence with which it is inculcated. I call it a novel doctrine. I am not aware that attempts have been made to support it on the authority of certain acts of my native and adopted States. Although many of their citizens are much more competent than I am to vindicate them from this imputation of purposes of disunion and rebellion, my veneration and affection for them both, urge me to bear my testimony of their innocence of such a charge.—At the epoch of 1793-9, I had just attained my majority, and although I was too young to share in the public councils of my country, I was acquainted with many of the actors of that memorable period; I knew their views, and formed and freely expressed my own opinions on passing events. The then Administration of the General Government was believed to entertain views (whether the belief was right or wrong is not material to this argument and is now an affair of history) hostile to the existence of the liberties of this country. The alien and sedition laws particularly, and other measures were thought to be the consequences and proofs of those views.—If the administration had such a purpose, it was feared that the extreme case, justifying forcible resist-

ance, might arise, but no one believed that in point of fact it had arrived. No one contended that a single state possessed the power to annul the deliberate acts of the whole. And the best evidence of those remarks is the fact that the most odious of those laws (the sedition act) was peaceably enforced in the capital of that great state, which took the lead in opposition to the existing administration. The doctrines of that day, and they are as true as these, were, that the Federal Government is a limited Government; that it has no powers but the granted powers; Virginia contended that in case of a palpable, deliberate and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by and compact, the States, who are parties thereto, have the right to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them. Kentucky declared that the "several States that framed that instrument, the Federal constitution, being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of its infraction, and a nullification by those sovereignties of all unauthorized acts, done under color of that instrument, is the rightful remedy."

Neither of those two Commonwealths ascertained the right of a single State to interpose and annul an act of the whole. This is an interference drawn from the doctrines then laid down, and it is a principle expressly asserted or fairly deducible from the language of either. I refer to the States collectively (and not individually) when they assert their right in case of Federal usurpation, to interpose, "for arresting the progress of the evil." Neither State ever did, no State yet ever has, by its separate legislation, undertaken to set aside an act of Congress.

That the States collectively may interpose their authority to check the evils of Federal usurpation is manifest. That they dissolve the Union. They may, at pleasure, the character of the constitution, by amendment, they may annul, any act may, by their elections, change the persons to whom the administration of its powers is confided. But no State, by itself, is competent to accomplish these objects. The power of a single State to annul an act of the whole has been reserved to the discretion of some politicians in South Carolina.

It is not my purpose upon an occasion so unfit, to discuss this pretension. Upon another, and a more suitable theme, I have been examined and refuted, with an ability and eloquence, which has never been surpassed on the floors of Congress. It is announced to be one of the means which is intended to be employed to break down the American System, I trust that I shall be excused for a few additional observations. On a late festive occasion, in the State where it appears to find most favor, it is said by a gentleman whom I once proudly called my friend, and towards whom I have done nothing to change that confidence of the Nation, that the tariff must be raised at hazards. Another gentleman, who is a candidate for the chief magistracy of that State, declares that the time and the case for resistance have arrived. And a third, a Senator of the United States, who enjoys unbounded confidence with the American people, and whose sound principles and urged arguments tending directly and inevitably to violate resistance, although he did not indicate that as his specific remedy.

The doctrine of some of the South Carolina politicians is, that it is competent to that State to annul, within its limits, the authority of an act deliberately passed by the Congress of the United States. They do not appear to have looked much beyond the simple act of nullification, into the consequences which would ensue, and have not distinctly announced whether one might not necessarily be led to light up a civil war. They seem, however, to suppose that the State might, after the act was performed, resume its separate power, absolute itself from the obligations of a law of Congress, and continue a part of the Union, it could hardly be expected that any other State would follow the sultry example, or Congress would feel itself constrained, by a sense of duty, to all parts of the Union, to repeal altogether the nullified law. Thus, the doctrine of South Carolina, although it nominally assumes to act for one State only, in effect, would be legislating for the whole Union.

Congress embodies the collective will of the whole Union, and that of South Carolina is among the other members. The legislation of Congress is, therefore, founded upon the basis of the representation of all. In the legislature, or a convention of South Carolina, the will of the people of that state is alone collected. They alone are represented, and the people of no other state have any voice in their proceedings. To set up for that state a separate and exclusive power, to legislate, in effect, for the whole Union, is to assert a pretension at war with the fundamental principles of all representative and free government. It would practically subject the unrepresented people of all other parts of the Union to the arbitrary and despotic power of one State, and would substantially convert them into colonies, bound by the parental authority of that state.

Nor can this enormous pretension derive any support from the consideration, that the power to annul is different from the power to originate laws. Both powers are, in their nature, legislative, and those which might accrue to the republic from the annulment of its wholesome laws, may be just as great as those which would flow from the origination of bad laws. There are three things to which, more than all others, mankind in all ages, have shown themselves to be attached, their religion, their laws, and their language.

But it has been argued, in the most solemn manner, "that the acknowledgment of the exclusive right of the federal government to determine the limits of its own powers, amounts to a recognition of its absolute supremacy over the states and the people, and involves the sacrifice not only of our dearest rights and interests, but of the very existence of the southern states." In cases where there are two systems of government, operating at the same time and place over the same people, the one general and the other local or particular, one system or the other must possess the right to decide upon the extent of the powers, in case of collision, which are claimed by the general government. No third party, of sufficient impartiality, weight, and responsibility, other than such a tribunal as a supreme court, has yet been devised, or perhaps can be created.

The doctrine of one side is, that the general government, though limited in its nature, must necessarily possess the power to ascertain what is within its powers, and, by consequence, the extent of that authority. And that, if its legislative or executive functions, by act, transcend that authority, the question may be brought before the supreme court, and, being affirmatively decided by that tribunal, their act must be obeyed until repealed or altered by competent power.

Against the tendency of this doctrine to absorb all power, those who maintain it, think there are reasonable and, they hope, sufficient securities. In the first place, all are represented in every legislative or executive act, and, of course, each state can exert its proper influence, to prevent the adoption of any measure which would be prejudicial or unconstitutional.—Then, there are sacred oaths, solemn public acts, and, in consequence, the power of impeachment, a common subject to both systems of those functionaries who act under either, the right of the states to interpose and amend the constitution, or to dissolve the union; and, finally, the right, in extreme cases, when all other remedies fail, to resort to insupportable oppression.

[To be continued.]

## Military Land Claims.

I Renew my offer to any or locate land warrants, granted by the United States, or by the State of Virginia, to the officers and soldiers of the Revolutionary Army, and also to the uniformed in obtaining their warrants. Supernumerary officers and all who were detained in captivity, and the heirs of those who have since died, are entitled to land bounties. I will also purchase or undertake to secure, lost or controverted claims to land in Kentucky and Ohio, located under military warrants, granted for Revolutionary services.

Being fully prepared to answer all interrogatories that may be put in relation to warrants located in Kentucky and Ohio, and also to refund all unsatisfied warrants, (many of which are presumed to be lost or destroyed,) letters of inquiry, postage paid, addressed to me here, or personal interviews will be promptly attended to. CADWALLADER WALLACE, Richmond, Sep 3

## Hamden Sydney College.

The Annual Examination of the Students of Hamden Sydney College will commence on Friday the 17th inst. and close on Tuesday the 21st. Parents and Guardians, and all who feel an interest in the advancement of literature and science are respectfully invited to attend.

The commencement will take place on Wednesday the 23d, when the candidates for Degrees will deliver their Orations, and receive their Diplomas. The Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees will be on the 23d.

J. P. CUSHING, President. The Anniversary of the Literary and Philosophical Society, will be held on Thursday the 23d, on which occasion an Oration and a Poem will be delivered.—On the same day the anniversary of the Union and Philanthropic Societies will take place and Orations will be delivered by their respective representatives. Sept 14—c 2t

NOTICE.—A petition will be presented to the next Assembly of Virginia, for leave to open a road from the head of the Brook turnpike, to Taylorsville in Hanover, from thence to Gainsville, Caroline, thence to Fredericksburg, the straightest and most practicable route. Sept 24—w 8t

NOTICE.—There will be a petition to the next General Assembly for the erection of a mill on Appomattox River, at or near the place, called Robinson's Mill—on the plan of Col. John Houghton of Georgia. Sept 10—w 1t

ance, might arise, but no one believed that in point of fact it had arrived. No one contended that a single state possessed the power to annul the deliberate acts of the whole. And the best evidence of those remarks is the fact that the most odious of those laws (the sedition act) was peaceably enforced in the capital of that great state, which took the lead in opposition to the existing administration.

The doctrines of that day, and they are as true as these, were, that the Federal Government is a limited Government; that it has no powers but the granted powers; Virginia contended that in case of a palpable, deliberate and dangerous exercise of other powers not granted by and compact, the States, who are parties thereto, have the right to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining within their respective limits the authorities, rights and liberties appertaining to them. Kentucky declared that the "several States that framed that instrument, the Federal constitution, being sovereign and independent, have the unquestionable right to judge of its infraction, and a nullification by those sovereignties of all unauthorized acts, done under color of that instrument, is the rightful remedy."

Neither of those two Commonwealths ascertained the right of a single State to interpose and annul an act of the whole. This is an interference drawn from the doctrines then laid down, and it is a principle expressly asserted or fairly deducible from the language of either. I refer to the States collectively (and not individually) when they assert their right in case of Federal usurpation, to interpose, "for arresting the progress of the evil." Neither State ever did, no State yet ever has, by its separate legislation, undertaken to set aside an act of Congress.

That the States collectively may interpose their authority to check the evils of Federal usurpation is manifest. That they dissolve the Union. They may, at pleasure, the character of the constitution, by amendment, they may annul, any act may, by their elections, change the persons to whom the administration of its powers is confided. But no State, by itself, is competent to accomplish these objects. The power of a single State to annul an act of the whole has been reserved to the discretion of some politicians in South Carolina.

It is not my purpose upon an occasion so unfit, to discuss this pretension. Upon another, and a more suitable theme, I have been examined and refuted, with an ability and eloquence, which has never been surpassed on the floors of Congress. It is announced to be one of the means which is intended to be employed to break down the American System, I trust that I shall be excused for a few additional observations. On a late festive occasion, in the State where it appears to find most favor, it is said by a gentleman whom I once proudly called my friend, and towards whom I have done nothing to change that confidence of the Nation, that the tariff must be raised at hazards. Another gentleman, who is a candidate for the chief magistracy of that State, declares that the time and the case for resistance have arrived. And a third, a Senator of the United States, who enjoys unbounded confidence with the American people, and whose sound principles and urged arguments tending directly and inevitably to violate resistance, although he did not indicate that as his specific remedy.

The doctrine of some of the South Carolina politicians is, that it is competent to that State to annul, within its limits, the authority of an act deliberately passed by the Congress of the United States. They do not appear to have looked much beyond the simple act of nullification, into the consequences which would ensue, and have not distinctly announced whether one might not necessarily be led to light up a civil war. They seem, however, to suppose that the State might, after the act was performed, resume its separate power, absolute itself from the obligations of a law of Congress, and continue a part of the Union, it could hardly be expected that any other State would follow the sultry example, or Congress would feel itself constrained, by a sense of duty, to all parts of the Union, to repeal altogether the nullified law. Thus, the doctrine of South Carolina, although it nominally assumes to act for one State only, in effect, would be legislating for the whole Union.

Congress embodies the collective will of the whole Union, and that of South Carolina is among the other members. The legislation of Congress is, therefore, founded upon the basis of the representation of all. In the legislature, or a convention of South Carolina, the will of the people of that state is alone collected. They alone are represented, and the people of no other state have any voice in their proceedings. To set up for that state a separate and exclusive power, to legislate, in effect, for the whole Union, is to assert a pretension at war with the fundamental principles of all representative and free government. It would practically subject the unrepresented people of all other parts of the Union to the arbitrary and despotic power of one State, and would substantially convert them into colonies, bound by the parental authority of that state.

Nor can this enormous pretension derive any support from the consideration, that the power to annul is different from the power to originate laws. Both powers are, in their nature, legislative, and those which might accrue to the republic from the annulment of its wholesome laws, may be just as great as those which would flow from the origination of bad laws. There are three things to which, more than all others, mankind in all ages, have shown themselves to be attached, their religion, their laws, and their language.

But it has been argued, in the most solemn manner, "that the acknowledgment of the exclusive right of the federal government to determine the limits of its own powers, amounts to a recognition of its absolute supremacy over the states and the people, and involves the sacrifice not only of our dearest rights and interests, but of the very existence of the southern states." In cases where there are two systems of government, operating at the same time and place over the same people, the one general and the other local or particular, one system or the other must possess the right to decide upon the extent of the powers, in case of collision, which are claimed by the general government. No third party, of sufficient impartiality, weight, and responsibility, other than such a tribunal as a supreme court, has yet been devised, or perhaps can be created.

The doctrine of one side is, that the general government, though limited in its nature, must necessarily possess the power to ascertain what is within its powers, and, by consequence, the extent of that authority. And that, if its legislative or executive functions, by act, transcend that authority, the question may be brought before the supreme court, and, being affirmatively decided by that tribunal, their act must be obeyed until repealed or altered by competent power.

Against the tendency of this doctrine to absorb all power, those who maintain it, think there are reasonable and, they hope, sufficient securities. In the first place, all are represented in every legislative or executive act, and, of course, each state can exert its proper influence, to prevent the adoption of any measure which would be prejudicial or unconstitutional.—Then, there are sacred oaths, solemn public acts, and, in consequence, the power of impeachment, a common subject to both systems of those functionaries who act under either, the right of the states to interpose and amend the constitution, or to dissolve the union; and, finally, the right, in extreme cases, when all other remedies fail, to resort to insupportable oppression.

[To be continued.]

## Military Land Claims.

I Renew my offer to any or locate land warrants, granted by the United States, or by the State of Virginia, to the officers and soldiers of the Revolutionary Army, and also to the uniformed in obtaining their warrants. Supernumerary officers and all who were detained in captivity, and the heirs of those who have since died, are entitled to land bounties. I will also purchase or undertake to secure, lost or controverted claims to land in Kentucky and Ohio, located under military warrants, granted for Revolutionary services.

Being fully prepared to answer all interrogatories that may be put in relation to warrants located in Kentucky and Ohio, and also to refund all unsatisfied warrants, (many of which are presumed to be lost or destroyed,) letters of inquiry, postage paid, addressed to me here, or personal interviews will be promptly attended to. CADWALLADER WALLACE, Richmond, Sep 3

## Hamden Sydney College.

The Annual Examination of the Students of Hamden Sydney College will commence on Friday the 17th inst. and close on Tuesday the 21st. Parents and Guardians, and all who feel an interest in the advancement of literature and science are respectfully invited to attend.

The commencement will take place on Wednesday the 23d, when the candidates for Degrees will deliver their Orations, and receive their Diplomas. The Annual Meeting of the Board of Trustees will be on the 23d.

J. P. CUSHING, President. The Anniversary of the Literary and Philosophical Society, will be held on Thursday the 23d, on which occasion an Oration and a Poem will be delivered.—On the same day the anniversary of the Union and Philanthropic Societies will take place and Orations will be delivered by their respective representatives. Sept 14—c 2t

NOTICE.—A petition will be presented to the next Assembly of Virginia, for leave to open a road from the head of the Brook turnpike, to Taylorsville in Hanover, from thence to Gainsville, Caroline, thence to Fredericksburg, the straightest and most practicable route. Sept 24—w 8t

NOTICE.—There will be a petition to the next General Assembly for the erection of a mill on Appomattox River, at or near the place, called Robinson's Mill—on the plan of Col. John Houghton of Georgia. Sept 10—w 1t

## RE-LETTING

OF THE Eastern Section of the Extension of the Kanawha Road, will take place on the first day of October next, at the house of Mr. Daniel Ruffner, near Charleston, Kanawha.

Messrs. Robert Brooks & Co. the contractors, for executing the work upon the above section, having failed to comply with the requisitions of their contract, will, upon the completion of the Winchester's Creek Bridge and embankment, be permitted to withdraw from the public employment; and the line is now a second time offered to persons disposed to contract for road making, and the building of the bridges. The conditions of the letting and manner of executing the work, will be made known to the bidders on the 1st day of October next, at the house of Mr. D. Ruffner, near Charleston, in Kanawha county, where the bids for the execution of the work are invited. It is expected that persons proposing to become undertakers will make themselves acquainted with the location of the road and the several Bridge sites previously to the day of re-letting. The distance of Road now offered to bidders is near 30 miles, and as no part thereof has been delivered, the whole will be offered and contracted for, in sections to suit the wishes of the bidders, subject to such deduction for the work done by R. Brooks & Co. as shall be hereafter estimated in obedience to the provisions of their contract.

P. SCALES, Superintendent.

Extension of K. T. R.

Sept. 14, 1830—6

THE Editors of the Richmond Enquirer, Constitutional Whig, Winchester Virginian, Charleston Free Press, Staunton Spectator and Lynchburg Jeffersonian Republican, will insert the above once a week till the 25th inst. and forward the account to this office for payment.

THE PRESS will be speedily published, by G. C. & H. Carvill, of New York, THE REGENT ANIMAL, &c. or the Animal Kingdom, arranged in conformity with its organization, by the Baron Cuvier, &c. translated from the Paris edition of 1820-30, with notes, plates, and a Catalogue of American Mammalia and Birds, by H. M. Murtrie, M. D. &c. Also, an abridgment of that work, with notes, plates, &c. in 1 vol. for the use of schools, by the same gentleman.

The name of Cuvier is in itself sufficient evidence of the great value of the work alluded to, which exhibits the arrangement of the whole animal creation, from Man down to the last of the radiated tribes that slumber in the ocean. In the abridgement,