

son was here not only arraigned, but condemned by the gentleman's own votes, without opportunity of being heard in self-defence. The gentleman was his judge, his juror, and witness. He condemned him first, in order that he might impeach him afterwards. How supremely absurd!

Again: Civil officers only are constitutionally subject to impeachment. Does the gentleman again desire the floor to explain? If so, it will be cheerfully yielded to him. [Here Mr. Edwards observed, "he would take occasion, in his reply, to explain."] It is manifest the gentleman is embarrassed by the inconsistency of his conduct. Let me entreat him, then, to pause and abstain from the consummation of this partisan act, which, while it purports on its face, to condemn Mr. Mangum, will thrice, on record, condemn himself. If it is his object to expunge from the journals of Congress all censure of Gen. Jackson for violating the Constitution, he should move to amend the resolutions by including his own votes censuring Gen. Jackson for the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambister, and the forcible occupation of Pensacola and the Barrancas. The only difference between the two gentlemen is this: when the gentleman from Warren censured Gen. Jackson, the General was powerless, and had no patronage to dispense. When Mr. Mangum censured him, he had every thing to risk, and nothing to gain. His elevated and patriotic bearing entitles him to the plaudits of his countrymen; but he has certainly yielded up all claims to the favor of the Administration. In the exercise of this high censorial power, which you have gratuitously assumed, why shrink from the discharge of your whole duty? Is it because Gen. Jackson's conduct may be called in question? Does he, too, possess *inherent* powers, authorising him to do what no body else has a right to do? When we dissolved our connexion with the mother country, we repudiated the doctrine of the divine right of Kings; but, it seems, this odious attribute of royalty is to be revived, under a new name.

With a hope that you would dispense justice to all parties, I have passed in review before you the abuses of Mr. Adams's Administration. Let me entreat you to go along with me, in comparing the abuses of this administration with those of the preceding one. Mr. Adams's you have condemned in the most unmeasured terms. Will you approve in this, what you have condemned in that? We shall see.

Mr. Adams expressed the opinion that it was competent for him alone to appoint Ministers to Panama. But he took care not to exercise the power. Gen. Jackson expressed no opinion, but, without the consent of the Senate, he actually sent a Minister to the Ottoman Porte, and *has in utter contempt of the Senate*, and in palpable violation of the Constitution, put men in office, who had previously been rejected by the Senate, *on his nomination for the same office*; as for instance, the case of Gunn. Mr. Clay displaced a few printers who had been appointed by his predecessor to print the laws of Congress. Gen. Jackson has done the same thing through his Secretary of State. Nay, more—in defiance of recorded pledges, he has appointed scores of partisan editors to offices of profit and honor. Against this I remonstrated at the time; and yet, sir, truth compels me to acknowledge that, in one instance, I participated in it.—With the knowledge of Gen. Jackson, I appointed your newly elected State Printer to a highly lucrative office in the Navy, *whence he has been sent to you*. You, my friend from Burke, may smile; but you advised it. Whether we served the country, or strengthened the malignant influences with whom we are now grappling, time will determine. I must acknowledge, however, that I have misgivings.

I may now ask, what has General Jackson not done to corrupt the press, and make it subservient to his purposes! Permit me to lay before you an instance of the indirect action of the government, through its patronage, on a leading press in the Old Dominion—a press which Mr. Van Buren, I know, was anxious to conciliate, and bind by the strongest cords. I mean the "Richmond Enquirer." When Mr. Stevenson was nominated to the Senate of the United States as Minister to England, I was lost in wonder; for I well knew Gen. Jackson's opinion of him; it was never disguised. When, sir, I separated from Gen. Jackson but a short time previous to his determination to appoint Mr. Stevenson Minister to the Court of St. James, he did not regard him as "worth the powder and ball it would take to kill him." This very expression *I have heard used or assented to by him*, and candor compels me to admit that I heartily concurred with Gen. Jackson in his estimate of Mr. Stevenson's worth. When the developments which took place in the Senate of the United States were laid before the public, more particularly the correspondence between William B. Lewis and Mr. Ritchie, the mystery was unravelled, and thus it appears that the first diplomatic appointment in the gift of the President was conferred on Mr. Stevenson for the patriotic purpose of conciliating this Editor.

Again: the last year of Mr. Adams's administration, he expended a little upwards of twelve millions of dollars. Gen. Jackson, the last year of his administration, expended nearly double that sum. You charged Mr. Adams with negligence and prodigality; but have no censures to impose on this economical administration!

Where are the pledges he made to the people, to curtail expenses and abolish useless offices?—Unredeemed and abandoned! Where is your regard for the freedom of the press, end your abhorrence of Executive patronage when brought into conflict with the freedom of elections? When you see the patronage of the government, through one of its well feed officers, buying up a press in this city, can you not be roused from your deathlike slumber to a proper sense of the true condition of the country, and of the obligations you are under to hand down to posterity that liberty which a race of illustrious ancestors has bequeathed to you? or will you rather prefer the ignoble fate that awaits the degenerate sons of noble sires? Can you overlook the means which are daily practiced to control the freedom of our elections, and thus virtually take from the people the right to choose a successor to Gen. Jackson? In whatever direction you turn your eyes, you have the most convincing proofs that the money and the offices which belong to the people are bestowed with lavish hand to influence their choice. So daring have these corruptors of public morals become, that it matters not whether the applicant for executive favors be for the Bank or not, State Rights or not, Gen. Jackson or not, provided he be in favor of Mr. Van Buren for the succession.

Can you flatter yourselves with the belief that our representative form of government can long continue when the source whence our public func-

tionaries emanate becomes impure and corrupt?—The elective franchise in its purity is vital to liberty, and ought to be guarded with unwearied vigilance. But, say you, my constituents are Jackson men, and, as I am told this is a Jackson measure, I feel bound to sustain it. It is to be borne in mind that most of us are planters; and, therefore, I must observe, without intending any disrespect, but ill qualified to settle and adjust such difficult constitutional questions as we shall necessarily have to encounter in reviewing the decisions of the Senate of the United States. Does your being a member of this General Assembly, by magic convert you into a profound constitutional lawyer? Did your constituents send you here for such purposes, or with such expectations? No, gentleman, you deceive yourselves and misrepresent them grossly, if you believe they would willingly see their Senator, Mr. Mangum, who has risen from among them without the aid of opulent friends to push him forward, prostrate at the feet of Gen. Jackson, thereby dishonoring himself and the sovereign State he so ably represents. But, says another, I don't expect him to obey—I wish him to resign. Then why not let the resolutions speak your wishes? It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, their intention is to drag down this distinguished Senator from that high station he has attained to their own level. When you shall have done this, and thereby made yourselves acceptable to the influences which dictated these resolutions, what will you have done to shield yourselves from the indignation of the virtuous and enlightened portion of the community? Surely you cannot flatter yourselves with the belief, that you will have secured a glorious immortality, or entitled yourselves to the gratitude of the country.

But it is said that, in opposing these resolutions we are taking sides with the Bank. Against whom could such a charge be made with less semblance of truth than myself? I own no Bank stock, I am not indebted to any Bank, and have no sympathies in common with any such institution. My opinions and official acts for near a quarter of a century, are conclusive to show my decided hostility to a paper system in every variety of form. No man who knows me, believes any thing of the United States."

In what section of the country is the President most severely censured for having seized the public treasure and taken it out of the custody of the law? The South. Who, or what portion of our people are most opposed, *on principle*, to rechartering the United States Bank? That portion which inhabits the Southern States. While we believe that the Constitution has not conferred on Congress the power, we, nevertheless, know that it has been exercised from the adoption of the Federal Constitution; and, as I observed before, that it has received the direct approval of Washington and Madison.

We are further told that the Bank gave no equivalent for the use of the Government deposits.—Permit me to say, I think I know better. In 1816, some person or persons, who I know not, appointed me one of three commissioners to open books in this place for the subscription of stock to this very Bank. The charter came to us as it had passed Congress, and was tendered to the people for their acceptance or rejection. No persons' names were attached to it as its proprietors. As applications were made, we received them from A., B., C., and D. You are entitled to all the privileges and immunities of exclusive banking in the United States for twenty years: you are entitled to the use of the Government deposits for the same time, and to every other right which the charter confers on you; for which you are to give to the Government one million and a half of dollars.—This, sir, was the language, and these were the terms held out to the subscribers, among whom were to be found the widow and the orphan, relying implicitly upon the plighted faith of the Government for a strict performance of all its promises. And yet, sir, because Senator Mangum has demanded the bad faith of the Executive, in depriving the stockholders of the benefit of these deposits without good and sufficient reasons, you are urged to condemn and disgrace him. Where, sir, is the man reckless enough to declare that the reasons of the Secretary of the Treasury were sufficient to justify the President in executing this rash and lawless act? Thrice were the House of Representatives of the United States, plant as in every other instance they had shewn themselves to be, pressed to approve this course, and thrice did they refuse their assent.

Then, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mangum has done nothing more than it became him to do; and, instead of deserving your censure, he is justly entitled to your applause. For Gen. Jackson's virtues, patriotism, and distinguished public services, I respect and honor him. For him personally, I entertain no unfriendly feeling: on the contrary, there is an irrepressible feeling of kindness for him in my bosom, (created by the reminiscences of former days,) which often compels me to rush into his presence, and attempt his deliverance from the perfidious embrace of his vile betrayers. But it is impracticable. We are separated, —forever!

I thank the Senators for their indulgent hearing. I feel that I have addressed them with the great freedom, in the discharge of a high and solemn duty which I owed to the country. In performing this painful task, I have endeavoured "nothing to extenuate, nor ought set down in malice;" I have taken no greater liberties with others, than I am willing—nay, anxious that they shall take with me. The public acts of public men are open to scrutiny. I go into private life with as few personal regrets as any man ever did: I know I have given to my fellow citizens the most conclusive proofs that the allurements of office have not been sufficient to make me unmindful of my country's rights and honor, or my own. Let those who practice on other principles enjoy, if they can, the triumphs which they may now or hereafter achieve by the ascendancy of corrupt influences. To a just God I confidently appeal, by whose award I am not only bound, but willing to abide.

JOB PRINTING.

THE Proprietors of THE WESTERN CAROLINIAN having a very large supply of

Job Type, Cuts, &c.,

Every description of Printing will be done in the neatest possible style, and on the most moderate terms. Orders from a distance will be promptly attended to, and forwarded in the safest and most expeditious manner.

Salisbury, February 28, 1835.

RELATIONS WITH FRANCE.

From the New York American of February 23.

LATE AND IMPORTANT FROM FRANCE.

The town was thrown into commotion last evening by the arrival from Brest of a French bring of war after a short passage. She brings despatches for M. Serurier, but is not, as we hear, destined to take him home. The Bring Le Dassas sailed from Brest on the 20th, but brings no papers—having received by Telegraph, orders to prepare for sailing, six hours only, before messenger with despatches reached her, when she put to sea forthwith.

The Sully, however, from Havre arrived, bringing us Havre papers of the 17th ult., and Paris of the 16th. We consider the accounts by this vessel are on the whole pacific,—that is, as we hope, the decision in the Chamber be delayed, till after the Senate's proceedings on the message should reach France.

One thing is certain, Mr. Livingston had not left Paris, and had intimated to the French Government that he would not take upon himself the responsibility of doing so, unless positively ordered away by it. In this we think Mr. L. has made a just and patriotic sacrifice of personal feeling to the interest of the country and the duties of his station.

The decision to recall M. Serurier was a sudden one, and wholly unexpected, alike to Mr. Livingston and the Americans generally in Paris. There is no ground for the surmise of the Tribune, that M. Serurier is recalled from dissatisfaction with his conduct—that recall was put as we are informed, expressly upon the ground, that "the King could no longer suffer his Minister in the United States to remain exposed to hear such language as that contained in the Message of the President of the United States."

We have every reason to believe that M. Serurier, so far from diminishing the effect of our claims upon France by representing that they might be liquidated for half the sum stipulated in the treaty, has urgently recommended the ratification of that treaty.

It may be worth while to add, as we have undoubtedly authority for doing, that the statement in Paris paper of the 14th, that Mr. Livingston had an interview on that day with the King, is without foundation.

Extract of a letter from Paris, 15th January, 1835.

Mr. Livingston has decided, since yesterday, before asking for his passports to request an explanation from the Minister of Foreign Affairs here, upon the communication made to him—that is—whether it was the intention of the Government here to leave his taking his passports to his own decision, in which case he will remain until he receives instructions from his own Government, or whether this intention was to request him to take his passports, in which case he should ask for them. Our opinion is now, under these circumstances, that he will remain at his station for the present.

The law for granting the 25 millions for the American indemnity, has been proposed to the Chamber of Deputies to-day, by the Minister of Finance, with the reserve that this money should be ascertained that no reprisals had been made by the authority of the American Government upon the French property. This was immediately sent to a Committee to report thereon.

From the National Intelligencer.

Extract of a Letter from a respectable gentleman, an inhabitant of the State of New York, now in Paris, to a Member of Congress, dated

PARIS, January 15, 1835.

"There has been much excitement since the receipt of the document, (President's Message,) and some anxiety has been felt for the issue. The French admit the justness of our claim, and the facts of the message are not denied; but the spirit in which they are set forth, and the language employed by the Executive, are, unfortunately, regarded as offensive and insulting to France, to a degree that should forbid a further discussion of the matter."

"The best opinion I can give you is derived from a quarter entitled to regard. The French Government will do nothing further to liquidate the debt, until it be seen whether Congress sustain the President in what the French understand to be the position assumed. If Congress do not concur in the message, the difficulty will be settled by a prompt payment of the claim. That this is the ground to be taken here, I am assured by gentlemen who have it from members of the legislative bodies."

The following article is from the Paris Correspondent of the London (England) Courier:

FRENCH AND AMERICAN DISPUTES.

PARIS, (France) January 10, 1835.

To the Editor of the Courier:

SIR: The speech of the President of the United States has filled us with sorrow and regret—sorrow, that the Chief of the American Government should feel it his duty to express himself as he has done, with reference to France, on a question of twenty-five millions of francs, or a million sterling—and regret, that a foolish vote of the Chamber of Deputies last session should have justified the language which is now held. As, however, it is very possible that the history of this transaction may not be familiar to you, I propose to supply you with a narrative of the negotiation, and of their results, to the present time.

In 1803, a commercial treaty between France and the United States was signed. It established the principle of free navigation, and the rights and obligations of neutral flags and states. This principle of maritime neutrality was again consecrated in 1803, by a treaty between the two countries, which had for its object the cession of Louisiana to America; and on the other hand, the granting of commercial advantages to France. The principle that the flag covered the merchandise, and that right of search should not be allowed, was adopted by secondary maritime powers for their protection; but England, as mistress of the ocean, would not consent to it; and, therefore, immediately after the treaty of 1803 had been signed, issued new Orders in Council, submitting neutral flags to the right of search, and even to impressment and compelled American vessels to touch at English ports, and discharge and recharge their cargoes, before proceeding to their future destination. Of these Orders in Council, it is unnecessary to pronounce any opinion, as they gave rise to a French and European war, and to a resistance upon which history has already decided.

The Chamber of Deputies refused its approbation on the ground that a compensation had been granted, indirectly, for the seizures of American vessels in Spanish ports, by a treaty which was made be-

England declared all the ports between Brest and the Mouth of the Elbe in a state of blockade.—This continual blockade was met by the savage and odious decrees of Berlin and Milan, and the battle of Waterloo, in 1815, decided the long contested disputes. In 1803 and 1805, the United States of America submitted without hesitation to the Order of the Council. It is said that this line of conduct was dictated by the old federal party, which was always opposed to France, and which dominated in the sea port towns, and in all the northern States. Napoleon, on the contrary, replied to these Orders of the Council by the decree of Berlin, which declared the British Isles in a state of blockade. In having recourse to this measure, Napoleon said to the Americans, "You always submit to the pretensions of England; you suffer her cruisers to visit your vessels; you allow yourselves to be conducted into British ports, or you go there by her orders. Besides this, you pay a tax on the cargoes which you carry. Thus you constitute yourselves the vassals and the subjects of England. The moment you do so, I consider you no longer as Americans. Then in my eyes your ships are English ships—your cargoes are English cargoes—and, in one word, you have anti-nationalized your flag." The United States thus found herself placed between the menace of France and the Order in Council of England, and witnessed, off the American coast, the impressment of sailors on American vessels, and the attack of the Chesapeake. In 1807, the President, Jefferson, ordered all American ships to enter into American ports, and thus to prevent the meditated attacks on the independence of the American navy.

This order was made in ignorance of the decree of Napoleon, of Milan, but in knowledge of his decrees of Berlin. The execution of this order, issued by President Jefferson, became very difficult, and was eluded by many American vessels, which continued to convey English merchandise to those German, Austrian, Italian, and Spanish ports, which were not occupied by French troops. The American Government subsequently issued an order, prohibiting American vessels from having communication with France or Great Britain, but re-establishing all relations with the other powers;—When this last order of the American Government, prohibiting any intercourse with France, was published, Napoleon took it into his head to consider this measure as a declaration of rupture between France and America, and founded his quarrel on the fact, that as he had permitted American vessels, which were in the French ports, to return to the United States on the demand of Jefferson, that now America had no right to prohibit the intercourse of American vessels with France. This was most absurd reasoning on the part of Napoleon; for, inasmuch as he had complained of American vessels holding intercourse with England, and submitting to English search, &c., the moment the Government of the United States declared that no intercourse should take place with either France or England, in American vessels, he (Napoleon) ought to have been satisfied; but he was not so, and he signed, at Rambouillet, a decree, ordaining that every vessel carrying an American flag, which should, from the 20th of May following, be brought into or enter a French port, or a port of any French colony, or of any country occupied by its armies, should be seized, sold, and the produce thereof paid into the sinking fund of the national debt.

By virtue of this abominable decree, which was most outrageously unjust, various seizures were made in the port of St. Sebastian and other places of American vessels. In addition to this, at the epoch of the expedition of St. Domingo, several American vessels were burnt on the high seas by the French fleet, with no other object than to prevent, by that means, the secret of its expedition from being discovered. These seizures and this destruction of property are the basis of the American claims made to-day; claims which are just and undeniable, and which no one, who respects France and her national honor, can refuse to recognize. On the 2nd November, 1810, the Government of the United States recalled its decree of "non intercourse," as far as France was concerned, and required England to revoke her orders in Council within a short time.

In 1811 and 1812, when the relations between the two countries were established, and when negotiations were opened for the adoption of a treaty founded on maritime neutrality, Mr. Barlow, the American minister, demanded of Napoleon 70,000,000 of francs, as an indemnity for past seizures and losses, and Napoleon went as far as to offer 30,000,000. He thus recognized, as far as America was concerned, the injustice of barbarous decrees of Berlin and Milan, and the flagitiousness of the burning of American vessels by the French fleet proceeding to St. Domingo. In the mean time the United States had declared war against England, and Napoleon, then engaged in his expedition against Russia, invited Mr. Barlow to meet him at Wilna, in order to terminate the treaty. Mr. Barlow, however, never reached him, and died on his journey. This matter remained in a state of suspense until the month of January, in the year 1814, when France was invaded by all her former allies, and when the United States alone continued their war against the British flag and British navy. Napoleon being desirous of standing well with America, directed the Duke of Vicenzo to examine the claims made principally with reference to the burning of the American ships by the St. Domingo Fleet, and these were said to be just and right to the extent of eighteen millions of francs. This did not include the claims for seizures of American vessels, by virtue of the decrees of Berlin and Milan.

Then arrived the restoration of peace; and, although the annual Message of the President always referred to the subject, yet no direct negotiations were renewed until 1818. From 1818 to 1830, the question was always on the tapis: Delay was added to delay, and intrigue to intrigue, and in the meantime, the claims of the Merchants and American subjects were bought up by a few individuals for the lowest possible prices. Prince Polignac pretends that France owes nothing to America.—At length came the Revolution of 1830. In 1831 the negotiations were renewed, and a treaty was signed, by which France agreed to pay twenty-five millions of francs to the United States. For a long time the negotiations were suspended, and the treaty was not signed, and the treaty was signed. For three years this treaty was kept secret by the French Government, and it was not till 1834 that it was presented to the French Chamber of Deputies for its ratification.

The Chamber of Deputies refused its approbation on the ground that a compensation had been granted, indirectly, for the seizures of American vessels in Spanish ports, by a treaty which was made be-

tween Spain and the United States, by which the former power ceded the Floridas to America; and, therefore, that France is not bound to pay any sum of money to the United States, that Government having already been indemnified for its losses in respect of seizures, by the Spanish cession of the Floridas. Still, at any rate, the burning of the ships by the St. Domingo fleet, remains to be paid for, and yet the treaty has been wholly rejected. This has led to the determination of the President of the United States; and it may end in another American war.

I am, sir, yours, &c.,

I. O. U.

THE OUTRAGE.

From the United States Telegraph, February 23.
GOVERNOR POINDEXTER AND THE PRESIDENT.

We insert below the letter of Governor Poindexter to the Vice President, and its enclosure, the letter from the honorable Dutee J. Pearce, of Rhode Island, by which the charge of an attempt to implicate Governor Poindexter, as necessary to the attempted assassination by Lawrence, is traced to the President himself. We forbear the expression of the feelings which this disclosure calls forth.—The Senate unanimously referred the subject to a committee, consisting of Messrs. Smith, Tyler, Mangum, Wright, and King, of Georgia. We insert the correspondence, with the single remark that we do not believe that there is a single individual in the District, who believes that there is the least foundation for the charge.

CHARGES AGAINST A SENATOR.

The Chairman