Judicial department, also, may exercise or sanction dangerous powers beyond the grant of the Constitution; and, consequently, that the ultimate right of the parties to the Constitution, to judge whether the compact has been dangerously violated, must extend to violations by one delegated authority, as well as by another; by the Judiciary, as well as by the Executive, or the Legislature.

However true, therefore, it may be that the Judicial department is, in all questions submitted to it by the forms of the Constitution, to decide in the last resort, this resort must necessarily be deemed the last in relation to the authorities of the other departments of the Government; not in relation to the rights of the parties to the Constitutional compact, from which the Judicial as well as the other departments hold their delegated trusts. On any other hypothesis, the delegation of Judicial power would annul the authority delegating it, and the concurrence of this department with the others in usurped powers, might subvert forever, and beyond the possible reach of any rightful remedy, the very Constitution, which all were instituted to preserve.

The truth declared in the resolution being established, the expediency of making the declaration at the present day, may safely be left to the temperate consideration and candid judgment of the American public. It will be remembered, that a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles, is solemnly enjoined by most of the State Constitutions, and particularly by our own, as a necessary safeguard against the danger of degeneracy to which Republics are liable, as well as other Governments, though in a less degree than others.—And a fair comparison of the political doctrines not unfrequent at the present day, with those which characterized the epoch of our Revolution, and which from the basis of our Republican Constitutions, will best determine whether the declaratory recurrence here made to those principles, ought to be viewed as unseasonable and improper, or as a vigilant discharge of an important duty. The authority of Constitutions over Governments, and of the sovereignty of the people over Constitutions, are truths which are at all times necessary to be kept in mind; and at no time, perhaps, more necessary than at present.

[The remainder of Mr. Madison's Report, we are compelled to omit for want of room; but, although the part omitted is of great importance, as enumerating many indications of the tendency of the Federal Government to an enlargement of its own powers, even at that early day, the part published will be found sufficient to show clearly the views of that enlightened statesman in regard to the just powers of the general and state governments.]

MR. JEFFERSON'S OPINIONS.

Extract of a letter from Mr. Jefferson, to Major Cartwright, dated

MONTICELLO, June 5, 1824.

With respect to our state and federal governments, I do not think their relations correctly understood by foreigners. They generally suppose the former *subordinate* to the latter. But *this is not the case.* They are co-ordinate departments of one simple and integral whole. To the *state governments*, are reserved *all legislation* and administration, in affairs which *concern their own citizens* only, and to the *federal government* is given whatever concerns foreigners, or the citizens of other states; these functions alone being made federal.—The one is *domestic* the other *the foreign branch* of the same government; neither having control over the other, but within its own department. There are one or two exceptions only to this partition of power. But, you may ask, if the two departments should claim each the same subject of power, where is the common umpire to decide ultimately between them?—In cases of little importance or urgency, the prudence of both parties will keep them aloof from the questionable ground; but if it can neither be avoided nor compromised, a convention of the States must be called, to ascribe the doubtful power to that department which they may think best.

Extract of a Letter from Thomas Jefferson, to William B. Giles, dated 26th December, 1826.*

"Dear Sir—I see as you do, with the deepest affliction, the rapid strides with which the Federal branch of our Government is advancing towards the usurpation of all rights reserved to the States, and the consolidation in itself of all powers foreign and domestic, and that too, by the constructions which if legitimate, leave no limits to their power. Take together the decisions of the Federal Court, the doctrines of the President, and the misconstructions of the Constitutional compact acted on by the Legislature of the Federal branch; and it is but too evident that the three ruling branches of that department, are in combination to strip their colleagues, the State authorities, of the powers reserved by them, and to exercise themselves, all functions foreign and domestic. Under the power to regulate commerce, to assume, indefinitely, that also over Agriculture and Manufactures; and call it *regulation* too, to take the earnings of one of these branches of industry, and that too, the most depressed, and put them into the pockets of the other, the most flourishing of all. Under the authority to *establish Post Roads*, they claim that of cutting down mountains for the construction of Roads, or digging Canals; and aided by a little sophistry on the words 'general welfare,' a right to do, not only the acts (to effect that) which are specifically enumerated or permitted; but whatsoever they *shall think or pretend* will be for the general welfare. And what is our resource for the preservation of the Constitution? Reason and argument!—You might as well reason and argue with the marble columns encircling them.—The Representatives chosen by ourselves?—They are joined in the combination, some from incorrect views of Government, some from corrupt ones, sufficient voting together, to outnumber the sound parts, and with majorities of only 1, 2 or 3, bold enough to go forward in defiance."

[*This must be an error of print. It should most likely be either 1824 or 1825.]

From the Floridian

SIR:—I enclose for publication in your paper a copy of a letter written in the year 1789, from Samuel Adams, of Massachusetts, to Richard H. Lee, of Virginia. It speaks with an almost prophetic tongue, of events have subsequently transpired, and goes far to demonstrate, that the "federal powers of Congress," in contradiction "to the sovereign authority of the States,' the palladium, as Mr. Adams terms it, "of the private and personal rights of the citizens," and the sovereignty of the several States, "as necessary to the support of the confederated commonwealth," were opinions not then sneered at as southern notions, but were held in common, by most of the patriots of an age—when patriotism meant *love of country*, and not *thirst for office*. What could have produced a change, and thus limited to a single section the maintainance of political principles, and doctrines, which were recognized as sound, in all parts of this confederation, it may not be important, at present, to inquire. The period, however, seems propitious for historical research and candid investigation of all those subjects, which may shed light on the true character of our federal frame of government. Can we draw from some sources more profitable than those afforded by the admonitions, the example, the devotion, and disinterested patriotism of men, who, having periled "their fortunes, their lives, and their sacred honors," for the liberties of their country, have, from the earliest existence of our Union, been solicitous for its perpetuation under a frame of government intended "to establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity?"

TROUP.

BOSTON, Aug. 23, 1789.

MY DEAR SIR: You flatter me very much when you tell me, that any sentiment of mine can please you. I have always been apprehensive, that through the weakness of the human mind, often discovered in the wisest and best of men, or the perverseness of the interested, and designing, in as well as out of Government, misconstructions would be given to the Federal Constitution, which would disappoint the views and expectations of the honest among those who had acceded to it, and against the happiness of the people. I was particularly afraid, that unless great care should be taken to prevent it, the Constitution, in the administration of it, would gradually, but swiftly and imperceptibly, run into a consolidated government, pervading and legislating through all the States, not for federal purposes *only*, as it professes, but in all cases whatsoever; such a government would soon annihilate the *sovereignty of the federal States*, so necessary to the support of the confederated commonwealth, and sink both in despotism. I know these have been called vulgar opinions and prejudices; be it so. I think it is Lord Shaftsbury who tells us that it is folly to despise the opinions of the vulgar; this aphorism, if indeed it is his I eagerly caught from a nobleman, many years ago, whose writings on some accounts I never much admired. Should a strong *federalist*, as some call themselves, see what has now dropt from my pen, he would say that I am an anti-fed, an amendment monger, &c. Those are truly vulgar terms, invented and used by some, whose feelings would be sorely wounded to be ranked among such kind of men, and invented and used for the mean purposes of deceiving and trapping others, whom they call the vulgar; but in this *"enlightened"* age, one should think there was no such vulgar to be amused and ensnared. I mean my friend to let you know how deeply I am impressed with the sense of the importance of amendments; that the good people may clearly see the distinction, for there is a distinction between the *federal* powers vested in Congress, and the sovereign authority belonging to the several States; which is the palladium of the private and personal rights of the citizens. I freely protest to you, that I earnestly wish some amendments may be judiciously and deliberately made, without partial or local considerations; that there may be no uncomfortable jarrings among the several powers, that the whole people may in every State contemplate their own safety on solid grounds, and the union of the States be perpetual. Your letter requires a further consideration; I will at present only express my astonishment, at the strange and absurd opinion of our former *Republican Connecticut friend: Tempora mutantur, et hic mutatur in illis.*

Your friend, SAMUEL ADAMS.

RICHARD H. LEE, Esq.

DEMOCRACY.

The following from the Muskingum Messenger, we hail as a sign, that the true democratic principles of '98, are not dead in Ohio. They only slumber, to rise with renovated vigour.

We publish below the address of Dr. Wishart,—now a candidate for the Senate of Ohio, in Belmont County. He has been a firm democrat and friend of Jackson, and gives his views on politics boldly and honestly, as every candidate should do. He is of the school of '98, that saved the country by putting down old John Adams with his alien and sedition laws, and his standing army to support him against the people.

Sirs.—To your readers an apology is due, for coming before them apparently uncalled, although an ample reason for doing so, may be found in the fact that I am a candidate to represent the county in the State Legislature; still it is proper, and a duty I owe to my friends, to lay before the people, the motive by which I am influenced. It has been represented to me by many persons in whose statement I can confide, that certain individuals are industriously circulating tales prejudicial to my interest, representing my political opinions, and giving a cast to their import, that truth will not justify. This has induced me to lay before the people an epitome of my political creed. I shall do this in as explicit terms as my vocabulary contains, and the limited space, to which I am necessarily confined, will permit.

A latitudinarian construction of the constitution of the United States being dangerous, and tending to a usurpation of the reserved rights of the States, and to erect a consolidated form of government on the ruins of our present happy form, I am decidedly in favor of a rigid construction of that instrument, and hold that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." The federal union of the States being necessary to the interests of all, it would be to me a source of deep distress, should its perpetuity be menaced from any quarter whatever. Our confederative union, having its origin in the volition of the people of the States respectively, prompted by self preservation and self interest, can be preserved only by

"The silver cord, the silken tie,
When heart to heart, and mind to mind,
In body and in soul can bind;"

but never by the adamantine chain of martial law, and civil war. This government being dependent for its origin and continuation, on the *spontaneous* support of the people of the States, the application of force to compel them to submit to it, would prove conclusively, that it was no longer a government of choice, but a government of compulsion. And consequently, that they were the subjects, and not the constituents of those by whom they were subdued. This, of itself, would change its character, although the form in other respects, might remain unaltered, the people being no longer the rulers but the ruled.

And the very idea of the application of force, annihilates at once the supposition of a republic. The United States has no more constitutional authority, or moral right, to usurp the reserved rights of the States, than the States have to resume the rights expressly delegated. In either case, it is a violation of moral obligation.

Suppose, for instance, the general government should cede to Great Britain, for an equivalent in money, or wild land, that part of the territory of the State of Maine claimed by both, without her consent, she would not be constitutionally or morally bound to abide by such cession of her citizens and territory to a foreign power, because the constitution declares the boundaries of the States shall not be altered "without the consent of the Legislature of the States, as well as of the Congress." On the other hand, the States are prohibited from entering into foreign alliances, granting letters of marque and reprisal, declaring war, &c. but attaches no penalty to a violation of these rights on either side. Now, if the United States has a constitutional right to punish a State for a breach of her constitutional stipulations, has not a single State the same right against the United States. But a single State has not the physical force, and this constitutes the entire difference between them.

The idea I wish distinctly to convey is, that the obligation on the part of the States and the United States are reciprocal, and the rights on the one side are as sacredly inviolable as on the other. That to inculcate the opinion, that an infraction of constitutional stipulation by either party towards the other, is to be settled by the sword, is a suicidal policy, and presupposes that the members of the same great republican family, stand in the same relation towards each other as foreign nations.

With regard to the present federal executive, I have a word to say. To all the principles set forth in his two inaugural addresses, and the annual and special messages of Gen. Jackson, I cheerfully respond, and likewise, to the proclamation of the President, provided it is so construed as not to be inconsistent with republican principles, "nor with the President's former messages and opinions."

In 1830 an abortive attempt was made to show that my principles were aristocratic,—Now a secret effort is made to impress the public mind that my principles are ultra republican, or republican overmuch—that I am too much on the side of the people and maintain their rights in opposition to their representatives and delegates. This effort, like the former, will be a failure. If, however, I err at all, it is in being too warmly devoted to republican principles; but I am greatly mistaken if the people in this land of freemen, will view this as a radical error. These are my sentiments on these leading points, and I trust the time is yet far distant, when the people of this country will prefer as their representative, a man holding aristocratic principles to a devoted republican.

JAMES WISHART.

August 28, 1833.

From the Baltimore Gazette.

REV. J. N. MAFFIT.

Being but a stranger in your beautiful city, and gazing around with admiration at its monuments, classical structures, and striving to catch glimpses of the spirit and manners of your far famed inhabitants, I heard the tongue of rumor busy with the name of the Rev. Mr. Maffit. By the way, I have become acquainted with this gentleman's history both before and since he left the land of his nativity and education. It is an extraordinary one and has attracted much of my philosophic speculations. I am enabled to approach the task of analyzing the talents of this distinguished speaker with the peculiar advantage of perfect disinterestedness—as I cannot claim the honor of being a disciple, having been early sheltered under the fostering and maternal care of a different denomination of christians from that in whose cause he exerts his strenuous labors.

I learned that he had been successfully laboring six or seven weeks in your city, and that on last Thursday evening he would preach his valedictory sermon, previous to a short journey from the city. I was directed by a friend to Eutaw-street church, where I found an audience crowded almost to suffocation. By the unerring symptoms of dress and fashionable air, I should presume that no small proportion of the audience had not been previous worshippers in the denomination to which Rev. Mr. Maffit belongs. They had been drawn out from other communions as well as his own to pay a tribute to his genius and soul touching eloquence. They were seated in hushed silence awaiting the entrance of the speaker, a silence only broken at intervals by fragments of hymns commenced by some one sitting near the walls; and tardily murmuring in broken, hesitating harmony for a moment—and then dying away as if the heart was not in it, but was impatiently waiting for a more spirit stirring exercise.

At length the light step of the orator was heard in the aisles; and his well known figure was seen ascending the stairs of the desk.—Every eye was arrested to his movements, and many rose from their seats to gain a fairer view. He is small, but of good proportions; easy in his movements, with that nameless grace in his action which can only spring from well proportioned limbs and perfect symmetry. His countenance is an intellectual picture, lighted by eyes of that peculiar formation which Spurzheim has defined in his system of phrenology as the organic indication of language or eloquence. His manner has changed of late years in some respects for the better, his vivacity of temperament indeed still remains, and the ardent delight with which he enters upon the duties of his station still throws a brightness over his features—yet in these lightnings up of joy there is now much solemnity.

He reads a hymn the best of any man in the United States. His voice is low in this exercise, yet distinct,—audible to the remote parts of the house, finely modulated like the tones of low-breathing music, echoing the finest touches of the poetry and developing its beauty and searching out its pathos. His prayers are chaste performances, pronounced with a subdued, hushed voice and manner, and a remarkable appropriateness of expression and phraseology. His enunciation is beyond the reach of criticism. Every vowel is sounded, and the classical and most fashionable pronunciation given to every word. His text on this occasion, as it always is, was introduced in an impressive measured manner with this remarkably phrase—"The word of God," as found in Proverbs 29: 1. *He, that being often reproved hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed and that without remedy.*

His introduction presented the idea that although his labours for some weeks past had been crowned with much encouragement and demanded his fervent ascriptions of praise to God, yet he had rather have the tones of warning associated with his reminiscences in the minds of many who might never hear his voice again. Whether in life, death, or at the judgment, he would rather have this parting scene come up to the view with images of warning clustering around it than encircled with the rainbow illusions of hope.

It would be hardly suitable in a newspaper to give a synopsis of his sermon. He considered the reproofs of the word of God, of conscience, and of providential occurrences. He explained the process of hardening the mind, and the nature and remedilessness of the destruction. His whole sermon was a succession of vivid, impressive, soul-harrowing pictures. It was the shifting of a series of terrible moral paintings, through which the weary, unsatisfied, mourning soul of impenitence was wandering to an undefinable and nameless ruin.

He ran through the different styles of oratory. Those who have listened to the great masters of the passions could detect or fancy that they detected in his touching exclamations the bitter and hopeles accents of Kean. At times his words were flung out in the tempestuousness, chopping, vehement manner of Forrest—again they rolled along in a level rapidity finely illustrating the flight of time which he compared to the flow of a stream that had been gazed upon by our fathers, and hurried on under their gaze—had been gazed upon them by their children, and still rolled on—on—on—on, and onward to the returnless ocean of eternity.

Were we to select any part of his sermon for its superior power, it would be his account of the reproofs of conscience.

Of such a speaker and such a man we care not what bigotry and prejudice say—we look at facts—we look at the absorbed and enraptured audiences—we look at the tears of penitence—the proud knee bowed—the heart of hatred changed to love—the dim countenance lightened up with celestial hope that is equally a denizen of this and the world of immortality. The number of converts gathered in during his sojourn of a few weeks here, I understand, amounts to between two and three hundred—a number sufficient to constitute a church of themselves in addition to the churches already in Baltimore belonging to the highly respectable denomination in which Mr. Maffit labors.

It is grateful to the classical scholar to detect the sources from which Mr. Maffit enriches and ornaments his eloquence; it is from the higher and purer effusions of poetry. On this occasion, speaking of the unspeakable love of God, he said,—"When I think of the love of God 'the thoughts that crowd into my mind are strange.'" This is a line from Brainard's sublime invocation to Niagara. Shakspeare, Byron, Cowper, and Bryant had come into his readings, which was oftener manifested by a single word, or turn of thought than from a line or phrase.

With regard to the prosperity of that portion of the church which is blessed with his energetic and faithful labors, we will, in a Christian spirit, apply to him the Mahommedan benediction—*May he live a thousand years.*

VIATOR.

To a looker on in politics, it is amusing sometimes and sometimes melancholy, to see the inconsistency and injustice to which feelings engendered by party associations are carried out in matters with which they have no natural connexion. With the personal merits of individuals as politicans, we, in this paper, have nothing to do, but we must be permitted to express our dissent from the eagerness with which the opinions and notions of foreigners—especially the tourists and chroniclers,—who write travels and criticisms, are quoted with glee, where they may be made by him who uses them to bear against persons on the other side of party. The very writer,—Hall, Trollope, or Hamilton, De Roos, Fidler or Coke,—whose general character for capacity to understand our country and country-men is peremptorily denied by all parties, and whose means of acquiring accurate information on either are ridiculed, in welcomed as a good ally, if in his random blows at us, undiscriminately, he happens to hit an individual adversary. He is denounced as fiercely as though Sterne's vocabulary contained no other words of strength, when he pours in a broadside of abuse, by the same men who will jump with exultation if one of his chance shots strikes down others who stand on the side of some imaginary line which they prefer for themselves. This is discreditable to the good taste as well as the patriotic feeling of those who suffer themselves to be thus enlisted in the cause of error. It is to take sides with foreign falsehood, in order to wound the feelings of domestic opponents, and to sacrifice national credit to the vulgar ambition of provoking or degrading a rival. It affords, too, a ground of defence to the foreign libeller for the bitterness of political feelings which enters into his description of our own country and its institutions. He may urge with some show of reason that one portion of our citizens endorses as true the views he expresses of another, although by the persons animadverted upon they are repelled with no less indignation than the entire work, in its general conclusions, is repelled by the community at large. The question then seems specious, if not proper, that, if shades of difference in the opinion among us are sufficient here to sustain him to each, in the opinion he expresses of the other, why may not the inference be reasonably drawn, that he, who differs radically with us all, has just grounds for the estimate he gives of us in every respect? Party feelings, by thus indulging their eagerness to humble an opponent at home, furnish a plausible apology for the common enemy abroad, and encourage him by the appearance of a sympathy of feeling and similarity of judgment which does not in fact exist. They who act so, are, we doubt not, no less lovers of American honor and enemies of the libellers of their country, than we who protest against this mistaken policy, springing out of excited feelings and the thoughtless haste of political zeal.

It is not our purpose to point out specifically any of these breaches of what we consider a duty, though some strong examples, on both sides, are before us. The book of Maj Hamilton furnish numerous instances which, essentially unjust and liberal, might be bandied about for his gratification and our scandal.

To Ascertain the Height of a Steple, Tower, &c.—Take two sticks of any, but equal length, and holding one perpendicular, place one end of the other against its centre, so as to form a right angle with it; having done this place your eye, at the other end, and advance towards, or recede from, the object, the height of which you wish to ascertain, until the upper and lower ends of the perpendicular stick shall appear to touch its top and bottom at the same time; then from the spot on which you stand, measure the distance to the foot of the object, and this will be its exact height.

The editor of the Charleston Courier has been shown the bottom part of a broken glass bottle, very pointed and jagged, which was taken out of the stomach of an alligator, recently caught near that place. The points and edges of the glass were worn quite smooth, while the polish of the outer surface had entirely disappeared.

New Orleans, Sept. 2.

It is with pain we notice that the epidemic increases; cases which occur are of a most malignant and desperate character, and baffle oftener than otherwise, the skill of the healing art. Strangers in our city, should take refuge on the other side of the Lake, and absentees should by no means hasten their return this season.

MAINE ELECTION.

SMITH elected to Congress from Cumberland District—DUNLAP chosen Governor by a great majority, and the Democratic party, triumphant throughout the State!

The following are the returns of the votes for Representatives to Congress from Cumberland, as far as heard from:

	Smith.	*Cutter.*	*Sturdevant.*
Portland,	874	894	99
C. Elizabeth,	147	23	0
Scarboro'	289	24	2
Westbrook,	364	102	4
Gorham,	266	259	1
Standish,	224	79	2
Falmouth,	119	118	23
N. Yarmouth,	58	287	17
Freeport,	149	119	00
Brunswick,	204	131	00
Harpwell,	65	69	0
Windham,	154	84	8
	2914	2207	156

The vote for Governor in the above towns is about in the same proportion as that for Representative. "A Noble Triumph of Democracy all round," says our correspondent.

"Lincoln looks well—Kavanagh is elected, and the State Representatives stand better than last year. In Portland three Democratic members of the Legislature have been chosen, and there is one vacancy."—*Boston Morning Post.*

MAINE ELECTION.—The votes in Kittery were as follows—For Governor, Robert P. Dunlap, 162, Daniel Goodenow 17, Samuel E. Smith, 12. For Senators, Charles N. Coggswell 175, Jabez Bradbury 182, Simeon Pease 176. The Federal candidates had 17 each. For Member to Congress, Rufus M' Intire, 175, Moses Emery 17. Joshua T. Chase was elected Representative to the General Court.—*N. H. Gazette*

Indiana.—The election for member of Congress in the Vincennes district, seems to have been a very close one. The last Gazette states, that Judge Davis is elected by a majority of one vote over Mr. Ewing. For Davis, 1922 votes; for Ewing 1921. There were four other candidates. Other accounts state that the result is still uncertain.

Missouri.—The election for Congress is very ardently contested. The last statement of votes gives Bull, 3507, Shannon, 3311; Strother, 3307. There are few counties to be heard from.

Vermont Election.—In 75 towns, the votes for Governor as follows:—Palmer 9200, Meech 7354, and 1143 scattering. In the same towns, at the last year's election, the votes were for Crafts 7283, Palmer 7418, Meech 3189.

SOUTH CAROLINA.—*Warren R. Davis* has been re-elected to Congress, from the district of Pendleton and Greenville, by a majority of 69 votes over Col. *Grisham*, the Union candidate.

Mr. M'DUFFIE has been re-elected by an overwhelming majority. The vote stood: For *M'Duffie* 1627; *J. S. Pressley* 329.

Col. *W. R. Clowney*, the State Rights candidate, has been elected by a majority of 226 votes over Col. *Thomas Williams*, the Union candidate. The vote was for Clowney 4564; Williams 4338.

From the Richmond Whig, Sept. 12.

THE AMERICAN STROLL [illegible]

The Baltimoreans are, to day, celebrating the anniversary of the battle of North Point and bombardment of Fort McHenry, with great spirit, and in a splendid manner, as we infer from the programme of the celebration and proceedings of the associations as published

Yesterday was the anniversary of the battles of Lake Champlain and Plattsburg, and the day before, that of Lake Erie—so that we have our glorious *Three Days* to boast of as well as the French.

The battle of Lake Erie was fought Sept. 10, 1813, between the British squadron commanded by Captain Barclay, and that of the U. States by Captain Perry, which, after an action of three hours and a half, terminated in the capture of the whole of the British force: the British had 41 killed, and 94 wounded; the Americans 27 killed, and 96 wounded.

British Force.	Guns.	American Force.	Guns.
Ship Detroit	19	Brig Lawrence	20
" Q. Charlotte	17	" Niagara	20
Shr. Lady Prevost	13	" Caledonia	3
" Chippewa	1	Schr. Ariel	4
Brig Hunter	10	" Scorpion	2
Sloop Little Belt	3	" Samus	2
		" Tigress	1
Total guns	63	" Porcupine	1
		Sloop Trippe	1
		Total guns	54

On the 11th Sept. 1814, the Champlain British squadron under the command of Commodore Downie, attacked the Americans, under the command of Commodore McDonough, in the harbor of Plattsburg, and after a sanguinary conflict of two hours were, except the gallies, all captured. The Americans had 52 killed and 58 wounded; the British 84 killed and 110 wounded; among the former Captain Downie.

American Force.	Guns.	British Force.	Guns.
Saratoga	26	La Confiance	39
Eagle	20	Linnet	16
Ticonderoga	17	Chub	11
Preble	7	Finch	11
13 row gallies	16	13 row gallies	18
Total guns	86	Total guns	95

Sir George Prevost, with 14,000 men, was, at the same time, repulsed in an assault upon the forts at Plattsburg, by Gen. Macomb, with 1500 regulars, and about 3000 militia. The British retreated under cover of the night, leaving their sick and wounded to the mercy of their opponents, and destroying stores and provisions to a large amount.

On the 12th Sept. 1814, the British made their 'demonstration'—they attacked Fort McHenry with five bomb ships and a number of frigates, and landed from a powerful fleet of men of war 5,000 troops at North Point, led by Gen. Ross, to attack the city. The British were repulsed by the Americans, chiefly militia, with a loss of 46 killed, including General Ross, and 295 wounded—the Americans had 40 killed and 200 wounded.

FREDERICK, Sept. 14.

RAPID TRAVELLING.—Messrs. Stockton and Stokes' fast United States Mail left Wheeling, Virginia, on Monday the 9th inst. at 3 o'clock, P. M. and arrived in this city on Wednesday morning at 11 o'clock; thus performing the whole journey, two hundred and twenty four miles in forty four hours. This is the most rapid trip which has been made by these enterprizing proprietors, for [illegible] time past, and in the present condition of the roads, unprecedented.

EASTON, MD.

TUESDAY MORNING, Sept. 24, 1833.

Having been called on by a writer in the Centreville Times, who signs himself "Principles," for an expose of our political faith, in a manner which evinces much candour, as well as respect for the opinions of others and believing too that the present crisis is one of much interest; one which calls on every man to think and act for himself on the great principles of our federal Constitution; one which involves, in all probability, the permanency of the Union, the peace and prosperity of the nation, we should feel ourselves unworthy of the confidence and respect both of the individual thus calling on us, and of the public, were we to decline or refuse to give it.

Since we first assumed the Editorial character, we have professed and claimed to be the advocate and supporter of the principles of Democracy, as set forth in the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of '98 and supported by the report of Mr. Madison to the Virginia Legislature in '99. We have looked upon these documents as comprising the Democratic faith, and giving the only construction to the Federal compact, which is compatible with the *rights of the States*, the permanency of the Union and the liberties of the people.

We propose to give, as briefly as possible, our understanding of these documents; and for the better examination of the subject by such of our readers as may not have the resolutions at hand, we have given them at length on another page of this morning's paper. They may be fresh in the recollection of many, but in the present dearth of news we think the space not unaptly appropriated.

The resolutions above alluded to, it will be recollected, grew out of the Acts of Congress, passed during the administration of Mr. Adams the elder, commonly known as the *alien* and *sedition laws;* and alledged that these laws were violations of the Federal constitution, or usurpations, by the General Government, of the reserved rights of the States.—The supporters of these resolutions, (at the head of whom stood Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Madison,) contended that the Government of the United States, was one of strictly limited powers: that it was the creature of the states, as independent sovereignties, and not of the people; that it possessed no other powers than were specifically enumerated, and granted in the Federal constitution, and such other powers as were necessary to carry into operation the granted powers. That all other powers than those specifically granted to the Federal Government, and those prohibited to the States, were reserved to the states respectively or to the people. That, in the passage of [illegible] had assumed powers not granted in the Constitution; they were therefore encroachments on the reserved rights of the states, unconstitutional and void.

The friends of the administration of Mr. Adams (commonly known as the Federal party) contended on the other hand, that the Constitution of the United States was the work of the People and not of the States; that Congress should give to it a *liberal* construction; that certain powers, not expressly granted, should be inferred from the objects enumerated in the first clause of the instrument, viz; "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare," &c, and that on fair principles of construction the alien and sedition laws were both constitutional and necessary.

Here then we have the distinguishing features of the two parties, as they originated under the administration of the elder Adams.—The Democratic party asserting that the Federal constitution was a compact between the states acting in their sovereign capacities, and limited to the plain and obvious meaning of the instrument; the Federal party contending, that it was a compact of the people of the United States, and that its powers were open to a liberal construction.

In addition to the above points a further difference of opinion between the two parties grew out of the contention between them in relation to the formation of the Federal compact. The Democratic party asserting, that, in *political* controversies between the states and General Government, in reference to the relative powers of either, the States, being the parties to that compact, were the judges in the *last resort* of all infractions of the Constitution, or encroachments on the rights of the States. The Federal party contended, that, the Government being the government of the people of the United States, the states possessed no such right of final judgment. That the Supreme Court was the only arbiter known under the Constitution, and beyond that, it rested with the people of the United States, and not in the sovereign power of the states respectively.

The resolutions of the Virginia and Kentucky legislatures, however, together with the report of Mr. Madison, having of late received from Mr. Calhoun and other distinguished men of the South, a different construction from that which had been given to them by a very large portion of the Democratic party, we shall endeavor, in as clear a manner as possible, to give our understanding of them.

We have ever considered these resolutions as merely asserting the sovereignty of the states, and the *natural inherent and unalienable rights* of all sovereignties; rights paramount to all laws, all constitutions; the right of judging of, and resisting oppression, whether arising from the infraction of a league, a constitution-

©Maryland State Archives, msa_sc4925_scm13073-0694.jpg