

OGLETHORPE MEETING.

We had the pleasure of attending on Friday the 20th ult. the Oglethorpe Meeting, gotten up by the Union Democratic Republican Jackson party in that county, and which resulted quite to their disappointment and chagrin. Between eleven and twelve o'clock the people assembled in the Court-house to the number of, 350 or 400—perhaps more, when instead of organizing the meeting by the appointment of a Chairman and Secretary, as is usual on such occasions a gentleman got up and read from a paper which he held in his hand, that the Union Dem. Rep. Committee had arranged the matter for the discussion to be commenced by the State Rights party, and the Union party to have the reply—to this a gentleman of the State Rights party replied that inasmuch as the Union party had called the people together, it was proper that they should make their showing. The object of the Union Dem. Reps. in not organizing the meeting in the regular way, evidently arose from a disposition on their part to prevent a vote from being taken, for they plainly saw from the complexion of the meeting, that they were in a most woful minority. After some conversation about the order of the speaking,

COL. ANDREWS, the champion of the Union Dem. Rep. party rose and addressed the meeting in an earnest and vehement manner for upwards of an hour and a half, in defence of doctrines of their party and against the doctrines of States rights and State remedies. He contended that the General Government was sovereign in the powers delegated to it by the constitution, and that the States were sovereign as to all others—that the only remedies derivable to a State from the Sovereignty against the enforcement of unconstitutional laws by the General Government were—first—change of Representatives—second—the rights of petition remonstrance and protest; and lastly the natural right of revolution or rebellion against intolerable oppression. He avowed the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions as containing the basis of the Union Dem. Rep. faith, and declared that each State had the right of judging of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of a law of Congress, and the right to pronounce that law unconstitutional, null and void, but not the right of prohibiting its execution within its limits. He repeatedly repudiated the proclamation but yet defended or palliated nearly all the objectionable doctrines contained in it, and finally defended the administration of General Jackson with great zeal.

JUDGE CLAYTON, replied to Col. Andrews in an able and interesting speech, interspersed occasionally with excellent anecdotes, which served at once to enchain the attention of the people and elucidate the points in discussion. He was repeatedly interrupted by enthusiastic applause. He demonstrated with great cogency, the right of State interposition, and the necessity of its exercise when occasion required it. He reviewed the various instances in which Georgia had annulled and vacated the laws and treaties of the General Government, and declared that the application of the sovereignty of the State to those acts, was nothing but a practical operation of the doctrine of State interposition as understood and contended for by the State Rights party. He read Gov. Troup's reply to President Adams' letter, threatening to employ military force to prevent the survey of the creek lands in 1827, and commented upon it in connexion with the report adopted by the Legislature thereon. He demonstrated with great force and ability the injustice of the Tariff, and exposed in a clear and lucid manner the wild and extravagant system of public expenditures by the General Government, adopted for the purpose of draining the Treasury of the United States to create an excuse to revive in full force, the system of high duties for the benefit of manufacturing capitalists.

JUDGE CRAWFORD, said, that the States were sovereign, and that the highest evidence of it was their right to change their forms of government. He said that the States had the right of judging of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of a law of Congress, and of pronouncing the law to be unconstitutional, null and void—that if Great Britain should enact a law to operate in Georgia, every body sees that we would pay no attention to it;—that a law passed by Congress in violation of the constitution and the rights of the State were of no more force and no more binding upon us than a law passed by Great Britain—but still he could not see how South Carolina nullification could come from this.

COL. YOUNG, upon being called for, addressed the meeting in a handsome and forcible manner, demonstrating the coincidence between the doctrines, of the Federalists of '08 and the proclamation and other measures of Jackson's administration.

The meeting then dissolved, having ended doubtless in a manner very different from the expectations of those who got it up—Oglethorpe is true to the core.