

# Carolina Sentinel.

VOL. X.

NEWBERN, N. C. SATURDAY, MAY 19, 1827.

NO. 478.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY  
WATSON & MACHEN,  
At \$3 per annum—half payable in advance

## Miscellaneous.

From the Boston Daily Advertiser.

**Correspondence between Mr. Gallatin and Mr. Canning.**—Among the documents communicated to Congress by the President of the United States, at the opening of the late session of Congress, was a letter from Mr. Canning to Mr. Gallatin of Sept. 11, 1820, the answer of Mr. Gallatin, of Sept. 22, and a letter of instructions from Mr. Clay to Mr. Gallatin of Nov. 11. Among the documents laid before the House of Commons March 26, as mentioned in our paper yesterday, is the reply of Mr. Canning to Mr. Gallatin, dated Nov. 13,—a letter from Mr. Gallatin to Mr. Canning, dated Dec. 28, after the receipt of the despatch above mentioned from Mr. Clay, and communicating the substance of that despatch,—and lastly a letter from Mr. Canning to Mr. Gallatin, dated Jan. 27, 1827.

In the letter of Nov. 13, Mr. Canning maintains the ground, that Great Britain has a right to preserve the monopoly of the trade of her colonies; that it is a right which has been practised and acquiesced in by all nations, and a right of a different nature, from that right by which a nation may interdict all foreign trade with herself. He replies at some length to the argument of Mr. Gallatin, that the United States are excluded from a trade with the colonies, which is open to the rest of the world. Mr. Canning says, that Great Britain, for considerations of which she alone is the judge, has opened her colonial trade to other nations, not as a matter of special favour, or of special claim to any one, but on specified conditions, common to all nations who might think fit to subscribe to them, and to the United States among the rest. If some of the nations have taken advantage of the opening offered to them, by accepting the condition annexed to it, and others, including the United States, have omitted so to do, it is not a correct description of the consequence, to say that they are excluded by Great Britain from a trade which on the contrary she invited them to share. The U. States cannot put forward the pretension, that what is granted to others on terms, should be granted to them unconditionally.

The letter of Mr. Gallatin recapitulates very distinctly the principal points in the history of the case, states the reasons which the government had for supposing that that of Great Britain would be still willing to settle the points in dispute by negotiation, notwithstanding the act of Parliament of July, 1825, and dwells at considerable length on the difficulties in the way of adjusting the conditions on which the trade should be continued, by independent acts of legislation, arising from the difficulty of interpreting annually the act of 1825, and of complying with all the conditions of it. The letter concludes with expressions of a desire on the part of the government of the United States, to cultivate a cordial and lasting friendship with Great Britain, and to settle every controverted question between them on principles of justice and reciprocity. It announces the intention of the President to lay the correspondence on the subject before Congress;—which body would decide, whether the colonial intercourse should be altogether closed, or the conditions to which they would assent for retaining it. Mr. Gallatin, as well as the British government, will probably learn with some surprise, that no measure was adopted by Congress on the subject, and that the intercourse would cease in consequence of a disagreement of the two houses on an incidental question.

Then follows the annexed letter from Mr. Canning to Mr. Gallatin, which closes the correspondence:—

Mr. Secretary Canning to Albert Gallatin, Esq  
FOREIGN OFFICE, Jan 27, 1827.

The undersigned, &c. has the honour to acknowledge the note addressed to him on the 28th ult. by Mr. Gallatin, &c; in reply to which, the undersigned will, as far as possible conform himself to the example of Mr. Gallatin, in putting aside those points of the question in agitation between them, which have been already exhausted in argument, and the further discussion of which would not tend to any particular advantage.

The nature of Mr. Gallatin's last note, which appears to the undersigned to require any observation, relate to matters rather of fact than of reasoning.

Mr. Gallatin complains that the Act of Parliament of 1825, was not officially communicated to the Government of the United States.

It is perfectly true that it was not; nor has it been the habit of the two Governments to communicate reciprocally to

each other Acts of their respective Legislatures.

The Act of Congress of 1823—an Act, the provisions of which specially affected Great Britain—was not officially communicated, either to the King's Minister at Washington, or to his Majesty's Government by the American Minister resident at this Court. So far from any such communication being made, or any voluntary explanation of the bearing of that act being offered, it was not till after repeated and pressing inquiries, that his Majesty's Minister at Washington succeeded in obtaining from the American Secretary of State, the true construction of the most important clause of that act, the clause in which the United States claimed that their trade to the British West India colonies should be put on the same footing with the trade to the same colonies from 'elsewhere'; and learnt, to his great astonishment, that under that word, 'elsewhere,' was intended to be signified, not only the other dependencies of Great Britain, but the 'Mother Country itself.'

The undersigned, at the same time, begs that it may not be supposed that the British Government withheld from the Government of the United States communication of the act of Parliament of 1825, from any notion of retaliation for the omission of the Government of the United States to communicate to that of his Majesty the act of Congress of 1823. He refers to that instance of omission on the part of the American Government only in proof.

First, That the ordinary and natural course between States, is not to make diplomatic communications of the acts of the respective legislatures; and secondly, that no inference could be drawn from such an omission on the one side, any more than on the other, of (what the undersigned disclaims for his Government) an intentional want of courtesy or respect.

But the act of 1825, did not relate specially to the United States. It held out to all nations of the world certain benefits (or what were believed by the British Government to be so,) on certain conditions.

If a communication of the act had been made alike to all.—Such communication would have been liable to different misrepresentations: some governments might have considered it as a solicitation to which they were bound in courtesy to give some answer, explaining their reasons for declining (if they did decline) to avail themselves of the provisions of the act: others might perhaps have taken umbrage at it, as an authoritative pretension to impose the legislation of this country upon other nations.

The simplest course was to allow the provisions of the act to find their way to general knowledge through the usual channels of commercial information.

The undersigned has no reason to apprehend that this course has proved less effectual on the present than on former occasions.

The condition of the act of 1825 have been accepted and carried into effect by some governments: that of the United States has not thought it expedient to take advantage of them. But the undersigned cannot but be still of opinion, that the resolution proposed in the House of Representatives, at Washington, at the beginning of the last session of Congress, for the express purpose of urging the Executive Government of the United States to come into the terms of the act of 1825, the debates which took place upon that proposition; and the final rejection of it by a majority of only two votes, show that it was not for want of a sufficient understanding of the intent of the act of Parliament, that the conditions of it were not accepted by the United States.

To one piece of evidence, which proves the perfect understanding in America, not only of the purport and provisions of the Act of Parliament of 1825, but of the conditions which it would be requisite for the American Legislature to perform in order to entitle the U. States to the benefit of that Act, the undersigned might have scrupled to refer (as not being of the nature of a Diplomatic Document,) if Mr. Gallatin had not encouraged him to bring forward any document tending to throw light on the matter in dispute, by citing, in support of his own view of that matter, a private letter from Mr. Clay, to a Member of Congress.

Early in the session of Congress of 1825-6, a petition from Baltimore was presented to both houses of the American Legislature, in which petition it was distinctly pointed out, that the British Act of Parliament of July, 1825, had not only manifested the readiness of this country to move all discriminating duties, but also to permit American ships to clear out from British Colonies, not, as theretofore, to the ports of the United States only

but to all parts of the world, (the United Kingdom and its Dependencies alone excepted.)

The petition, with equal distinctness, invite the attention of the American Legislature to the conditions on which these advantages might be secured to the United States, and prayed for the removal of the several restrictions imposed by the American act of 1823, not of the "discriminating duties" only, but of the prohibition of what is called by Mr. Gallatin the "circuitous intercourse in British ships;" the petitioners expressly submitting to Congress the propriety of admitting British vessels, from whatever ports, on the same terms as the vessels of the most favoured Nations.

It appears from the reports of the proceedings of Congress that it was against the prayer of this petition, (but without impeachment of any of its allegations,) that the decision of the American Legislature, at the close of the Session, was taken; it cannot be doubted, therefore, that the American Legislature had the whole purport and bearing of the act of '25 full before their eyes.

The fact that some of the British authorities abroad took upon themselves to suspend the execution of the act of 1825, towards the United States, is undenied.

But the only effect of this suspension was—the continuance of the benefits of the then existing state of things to the U. States, for nearly a twelvemonth longer than they would otherwise have enjoyed it.

That continuance was permitted by the British government, mainly in consideration of the then pendency, in the Legislature of the United States, of the Resolution herein before mentioned, for conforming to the conditions of the act of 1825.

Immediately upon the receipt of authentic intelligence of these proceedings at Washington, an instruction was sent out to Mr. Vaughan, grounded on the belief of the British government, that Congress would not separate without adopting the Resolution then under their consideration. In that case, and upon receiving an assurance from the American government that the restrictions and charges on British shipping, and British Colonial produce, would be withdrawn by the United States, Mr. Vaughan was authorized to deliver a note to the American Secretary of State, declaring—that the discriminating duties imposed upon American ships and their cargoes in the W. Indies should immediately cease. Mr. Vaughan was actually in possession of this instruction, when the resolution, on the assumed adoption of which the instruction to Mr. Vaughan had been founded, was rejected. It was no part of Mr. Vaughan's duty to make any communication upon the subject, to the American government before the result of the discussion was ascertained. After that result, (wholly unexpected to this country,) any such communication would have been not only useless, but might, perhaps, have been considered as an improper appeal against the formal decision of the American Legislature.

That Mr. Vaughan should not afterwards have been authorized to enter into any discussion of the act of 1825, "so late as Oct. last," is not surprising, when it is considered that Mr. Vaughan, immediately after the close of the session of Congress, was instructed to announce the intention of his Majesty's government to pass the Order in Council of July, (consequent upon the decision of the American Legislature,) by which the terms of the act of 1825 were virtually declined.

Mr. Gallatin accounts for the rejection of the resolution proposed to the American Legislature, by the persuasion which he says, the Government of the United States entertained, that the negotiation on the subject of the Commercial Intercourse between the United States and the British West India Colonies would be renewed.

The undersigned is at a loss to understand on what ground it was assumed at Washington, that there would be, at all times, an unabated disposition on the part of the British government to make the trade of its West India colonies the subject of diplomatic arrangement.

The circumstances of the case were entirely changed.

Repeated negotiation had failed to produce any material approximation of opinions upon that subject.

The last attempt at an adjustment had been made, with an evident conviction on both sides, that there existed between them an unconquerable difference of principle: and that it was by that difference, rather than by any decided irreconcilable-ness of interests, that a satisfactory arrangement was rendered hopeless.

The nature of that difference has been sufficiently discussed; it lies in the determination of the United States to dispute, and in that of Great Britain to

maintain the established distinction between general and colonial trade.

Great Britain had, therefore, an obvious motive for doing thenceforward whatever she might think right to do, in relaxation of her colonial system, rather by the instrumentality of her own Legislature than by compact with a state with which she disagreed in opinion, as to the principles of colonial trade, so widely, that it would have been impossible to construct a preamble to a treaty on that subject, in the enunciations of which the two contracting parties should have concurred.

But there was yet another reason for avoiding further negotiations upon the subject.

Hitherto, when the trade with the British West India colonies had been opened to all, it had been opened chiefly, though not exclusively to the United States.

To no other country had it been opened by specific and positive convention.

But a time had now arrived, when, from motives of general policy, Great Britain thought it advisable to allow access to her colonies to all foreign powers, without exception, on conditions tendered alike to all.

Such indiscriminate opening could only be effected by some process common to all those who were permitted or invited to take advantage of it, impartiality was thus maintained towards all parties, and the power of control over her own colonies was, at the same time, retained in the hands of the mother country.

The undersigned believes that he has now touched on every topic in the last note addressed to him by Mr. Gallatin, to which he had not had occasion to advert in former stages of their correspondence. He will not allow himself to be drawn again into a discussion of topics already more than sufficiently debated.

The undersigned trusts that it is unnecessary for him, in concluding this note, to return to Mr. Gallatin's assurances of the friendly disposition of the United States of America, assurances equally sincere that there is the most cordial desire, on the part of Great Britain, to cultivate the friendship of the United States.

The ties of common origin, laws, and language, must always form strong bonds of national alliance between them. Their respective interests, well understood, harmonize together as much as their feelings.

But it has never yet been held a duty of international amity (any more than of friendship in private life) to submit to unequal compacts. Nor has it ever been held an offence against such duty that a nation (any more than an individual) should decline to make such uncompensated sacrifices.

Between two nations, as between two individuals most friendly to each other, there may sometimes happen, unfortunately, to exist some known subject of incurable difference of opinion. In any such case it is perhaps most advisable to keep that subject as much as possible out of sight, and to take care that it shall not interfere with the tenor of their general intercourse, and of their habitual relations.

The refusal to regulate the trade of our colonies by a commercial treaty, which the British Government may think (even if erroneously) disadvantageous to its interests, cannot give just cause of offence to any power whatever.

In the present instance the undersigned is most happy to be able to qualify such refusal with the declaration, that it is not in any degree dictated by sentiments either unfriendly or disrespectful to the United States, or by any indifference to the amicable adjustment of all other questions at present pending between them and Great Britain.

Of these questions, one has been already happily arranged since Mr. Gallatin's arrival in this country.

The undersigned looks forward with confidence, no less than with anxiety, to such an arrangement of the remainder, as effacing all traces of past discussions, and satisfying all fair and reasonable pretensions on both sides, may secure, for a long period of years to come, reciprocal good understanding and good will between the two kindred nations.

The undersigned has the honour, &c.  
[Signed.] GEORGE CANNING.  
Albert Gallatin, Esq. &c. &c. &c.

FOR SALE AT THIS OFFICE,  
And at the Book-Stores, of S. Hall,  
and T. Watson,

THE  
WAY TO CHRIST  
By JACOB BEHMEN.

In 1 VOL. 12mo.—Price, 50 Cents.  
Feb. 24.

From the London New Monthly Magazine.

## ANECDOTAL RECOLLECTIONS

**The Bourbons.**—It has been repeatedly asserted, that the Allied Powers were willing to leave the settlement of the form of government to the French people themselves, in the year 1814, provided Napoleon and his family were excluded from the throne. Whether this declaration was sincere or not, it is very certain they took no pains to ascertain the sentiments of the nation upon that subject, and that the ancient dynasty was recalled, not by the voice of the people at large, but and the trickery of a few leading men in Paris, who had been Bonapartists, Bourbonites, Republicans, and had betrayed all in turn. It was asserted, that the citizens of Paris crowded to the Hotel of the Emperor of Russia, and demanded Louis XVIII. and that the determination of the Allied Powers was fixed upon that prince in consequence. It may be worth while to know how this affirmed demand on the part of the people was brought about, especially when at the return of Napoleon from Elba none were found to follow the fortunes of this imbecile family—no struggle was made by the people in its behalf. If no more upon this subject comes to light hereafter, the following may afford a cue to explain this seeming mystery.

It was in the year 1816, that I became acquainted with a French officer, whose name, De F—, as he is, I believe, still alive, I will not give at full length. He commanded the *gens d'armes* of a northern arrondissement, and had been some years a prisoner in England. He was the man who shot Lieutenant D—, of the Peterel schooner, by which vessel he was captured last war, and for which service he was honoured by Napoleon with the cross of the Legion of Honour. Dining with me one day, and talking of the restoration of the Bourbons, I expressed my surprise, that having served Napoleon so faithfully, he could turn round, and become a staunch adherent of the old dynasty. He very frankly said, "I will explain how it was. My relations were several of them emigrants. I had been a long while a prisoner in the north of England, and saw no chance of returning home. Upon the ill success of Napoleon in Russia, hopes were immediately conceived by the emigrants in England, and by the Royal Family there, that it might lead to a restoration of the present king. Several persons had been despatched to Paris, to open a correspondence with their friends.—None that I know of had been successful; several were imprisoned and sentenced to death, having been discovered to be agents in traitorous correspondence. I was sent for from Scotland to London\* by my relations, and the question put to me, if I would venture to Paris, as being a prisoner of war and an officer of Napoleon's: I could easily pretend to have made my escape. I took a little time to consider, and then determined to venture. I received three letters, one for Prince T— another for the Duke de F—: [I forgot for whom he told me he received the third.] I reached Paris in safety; the letters were concealed in the lining of my hat, and were delivered according to their address. I was told by Prince T—, to remain quiet, and when he had any thing to say he would send for me. I remained so a considerable time, until the Allies marched into Paris, and the Emperor of Russia fixed his quarters in the palace of Elisee Bourbon, when one day I was sent for by a relative, and asked if I had any objection to make myself useful. I replied, that having embarked in the Bourbon cause, I was willing to stand by it to the last: I had no hope but that. The orders I received were, to go to the Garden of the Tuileries, and give away money, with which my pockets were purposely fully supplied, and that when they were exhausted I should receive more. "But the police," I replied,—"Mind nothing," was the answer.—"You will see plenty of idlers about there, principally of the lowest classes; fling away your silver, and call out *Vivent les Bourbons! Vive Louis XVIII!* When you have collected a good number around you, it will soon appear what you are to do." I did so, said De F—: may five franc pieces soon collected a score or two of persons, and then the mob began to increase rapidly. I had no idea of what all this could be for, and shall never forget how I hesitated before I began the cry *Vivent les Bourbons!* and threw away my first five franc piece. I feared the interposition of the sentinels planted at the gates of the palace, but they remained idle spectators, at which I wondered. None of the police interfered, and I had got together two or three hundred per-

\* Centenagh must have give him leave to come up, and was perhaps in the plot.