

THE RALEIGH STAR AND NORTH CAROLINA GAZETTE.

THOS. J. LEMAY, (Printer for the State,) EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"NORTH CAROLINA—POWERFUL IN MORAL, INTELLECTUAL AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES—THE LAND OF OUR BIRTH AND THE HOME OF OUR AFFECTIONS."

THREE DOLLARS A YEAR—IN ADVANCE.

VOL. 35.

RALEIGH, N. C. WEDNESDAY, MAY 29, 1844.

No. 31.

SPEECHES AT THE RATIFICATION CONVENTION.

At the pridesal stand, at Canton, on Thursday, when Mr. Stanley of N. Carolina had concluded his address to the assembled Convention of Ratification, Mr. J. N. Reynolds, of the city of N. York, of the Vice Presidents of the Convention, was then called out, and spoke briefly in behalf of the Young Men of New York.

Yon glorious sun (said he), that has rolled round the heavens from the commencement of Time, never looked down on a spectacle like this. The noble, the gallant, the spirited young men of the nation are here, with one purpose, one mind, one heart, one head to respond and ratify the nomination of Henry Clay.

In the choice of the second officer, New York has not been gratified in the selection of her first and undivided preference for her own candidate. But she yields to none, who now mingle spirits here, on this common altar, and Mecca of our political faith, is devotion to Whig principles and Whig measures, and the living embodiment of them all; the star not now of the West, but of the Union! Henry Clay!

The young men of New York have now what they have long labored for, the name of Henry Clay inscribed on their banners—and the rainbow that ever circles in the white sun fit spray of their mighty cataract, is but a faint emblem of their confidence and hope of the future, its mighty thunder but a faint echo of their own in November next.

With the same spirit which our institutions were framed, in the only spirit in which they can exist, and be perpetuated, I know that I speak truly the feelings of the noble, the disinterested patriotic young men of New York, from tide water to the Lakes—when I say, as I now do say,—that not with cheerfulness only—but with heart and soul, they take upon the same banner that bears the beloved name of Henry Clay, the name of New Jersey's favourite son, Theodore Frelinghuysen, and with hearts that quail not will strike again and again, not for their State, the ebb and flow of whose single soul are tides to the rest of mankind, but for their country and their whole country!

[Mr R here suspended his remarks in consequence of the shower of rain which commenced falling.]

At the second rostrum, which was placed at another side of the platform, addresses were made by several distinguished Whigs, sketches of which we annex:

Mr Crittenden, of Ky said that he felt how perfectly vain an attempt would be on his part to make his feelings audible. Whatever might be the effect of this meeting, he would go from here a much better man than when he came. He said that it is not merely on paper that the Constitution of these United States is written—it is impressed, said he, on the hearts of the American people—the bond of union which links them together. We are an united people—speak alike—think alike, ay, and sing alike. It is no common cause that brings us together. We are the People! You are the conquerors of 1840—the same banners which led us to victory then, float over us now. They talk of omens on the other side. What omens we want? We make our own omens. We have the same issues as in 1840 almost the same men arrayed against us, and additional thousands have come into our ranks.

Can you think of the possibility of Martin Van Buren going back to office with his famished dependants—delinquent when they were required—hungry now only for the polls?

They speak of the affair of 1840. Mr Van Buren had said that the election was carried in a whirlwind. This, Mr C thought would be carried in a hurricane.

They speak of the demoralizing effects of the affairs of 1840. In 1844 we shall put the seal of ratification on what was done then.

We stand opposed to a wily and expert party, who will stop at no means to accomplish their object. Let us continue to labour in season, until we shall plant our victorious banner on the Capitol. Then we may repose in peace under the protection of a virtuous Administration, but until then, let us think nothing is done until all is done.

Mr Huntington of Conn followed Mr Crittenden, and commenced his remarks by asking the question—What should he say in addition to what had been said by the illustrious son of Kentucky [Mr Crittenden], who had just addressed the meeting. He said, thousands of people are crowded around us—the majesty of the people is here and who has the power to contravene its voluntary, unbought support of Henry Clay? Who is Henry Clay? Is he unknown to you? No! There is not a child who has not heard the name of Henry Clay—no intelligent man that does not know him as one who has always been consistent and honest. Elect him, as you will, and you will have a pure administration of the government of the United States.

There is not a breeze that does not waft from some quarter the news of a new victory: Mr H desired to say a few words about his own native State. She had marched in the van with the victory which had redeemed Maryland. Go home; labour as the did; follow her example; and triumph is certain. He rejoiced to find the working men around him. They are the men able to do the work, and would accomplish it. Are you willing? [Loud cries of ay.]

Then go home—go to work, and next November give such a majority as will teach the traitors who have deceived and abused our trust, the fruitlessness of their treachery, and the fallacy of their hopes. Will you now, with one voice, ratify what your servants did yesterday, and elect the candidates of your choice? [Loud shouts of ay!]

Mr Stewart of Penn said—Ought we not all be proud of being Whigs? He had just left the camp of the enemy, and they were dismembered and dismayed. Mr Van Buren's letter on the annexation of Texas had burst upon them like the gun of the Princeton. He had heard the Locos say that their only hope was by running several candidates, and bringing the election into the House. He had told them that would be useless, as we Whigs would beat them all together.

The result of the next election is certain. The State of Pennsylvania, which has always been a doubtful State, will in '44 give a large majority for our candidates. Our enemies dare not come to the scratch; they fight for the spoils only, and will try to get over the fence into the clover field. They all claim to be tariff men in Pennsylvania—even Mr Van Buren claims to be a tariff man. Do you trust him? [Loud shouts of No!]

They are in great difficulties—they must nominate Van Buren. He is now their candidate, and they dare not refuse him. Mr Stewart made more extensive remarks illustrating the difficulties by which the party was surrounded, and the certainty of electing the Whig nomination.

Mr Webster of Mass also addressed the meeting from the other end of the stand, and said that he came to express his hearty concurrence with the nominations that had been made, and expressed his determination when he shall have returned, to use his strenuous efforts to obtain from the Eastern people a full ratification of the nomination. He said that the leading object of interest is the tariff. We need a steady, parental guardian government; we want to give to the industrial classes a protection for their labour; the means of providing for their own support, and of educating their children, so they might become virtuous and useful citizens. He said that he believed the great body of the people have discovered that they must look for repose under the wings of Whig principles.

We hear from the most remote parts of the Union, from States widely separated from each other, from the deepest recesses of the Dismal Swamp, voices in favor of the Tariff. It is our duty, so far as we can, to distribute in all sections the feelings that actuate us here. We must become missionaries. We are all one people, destined to one fate—the destinies of this great nation depend on the exercise which the people shall make of the important power confided to their charge. He hoped that the effect of this meeting and of the similar meetings which shall follow it, would result in the accomplishment of the object for which they had this day assembled.

Mr Botts of Va being loudly called for, said—Why am I asked to speak?—Why am I asked to come forward, when such a number of able men crown around me? What have I to say, but to offer my thanks and tender my congratulations for the nomination which has been made and the unanimity which prevailed among the Whig party?

Yes, (he continued) there is one thing. At the other end of the stand he had heard the noblest son of Massachusetts express such sentiments as to induce him (Mr B) to press forward and tender him the right hand of fellowship!

If there is a man who doubts the stability of our institutions, let him look back to the last four years of our government and the years that preceded it.

If any man doubts the purity of the Whig party let him know that they have refused the emoluments and blandishments of office. He then gave a sketch of the trials and virtues of the Whig party, and said if any man doubts the success of the Whig party let him look around this assemblage. Ay, even John Tyler himself, who had declared the other day that "all is—could not prevent his being President"—let him have Texas and that is the only part of the Continent he will ever get! Virginia has come into the Whig ranks, and we will keep her there.

[Mr B's speech was interrupted by the rain which commenced falling.]

THE EVENING OF THE SECOND OF MAY.

Notwithstanding the rain the speaking was kept up to a late hour in the night, both in the Rotundo of the Exchange and in Monument square. Mr Webster was introduced to a vast concourse at the Exchange at 8 o'clock in the evening, by Mr Dimmick of Boston, the President, we believe, of the Boston Clay Club.

Mr Webster spoke here with his usual force and eloquence, and commanded the most undivided attention of his hearers. He regarded the present as auspicious of the future, not only for the Union, but the Whigs. There were times when it became necessary to sacrifice local prejudices and sectional preferences for men; but upon the present occasion the benignity of a kind Providence has pointed us to one man under whom we mean to fight and hope to conquer. There was a great cohesive, adhesive, certain bond of Union between us that exhilarated us with hope for the future. We were all Americans born for a common

purpose, destined to a common end, and it was this that made the Union dear to us all. This it was that held our Union like a sheet anchor fast to her moorings.

Mr Webster was urged to visit Monument Square to address the immense concourse of People there assembled. He spoke in front of the dwelling of Reverdy Johnson, Esq and with the same spirit that had characterized his three previous speeches, pledging himself to return home to communicate to those around him the good influences of the present occasion. We come, said he, from discussion, and the present was less an occasion for discussion than for mingling together in social feeling and enjoyment. We had accomplished one part of our purpose. Action was all that remained, and action would result in the full fruition of our warmest hopes.

Mr Crittenden, of Ky followed in one of his happiest efforts. He, too, spoke of the good influence of the present occasion. The Whigs of the Union had come together from the regions of the Upper Missouri to the Green Mountains of Vermont, and it could not but be that every man who came here would go away a better Whig and dispel those idle prejudices some had endeavored to foster against different sections of the country. We have done what we design, and now execution must follow. Let us know no rest, no repose, from this time until November. A long and happy quiet will then be given us. We have a great work to perform, and we cannot lie down upon our arms until it is finished.

Mr Hoxie and Mr Thayer, of N. Y. also spoke at this stand, while at the other excellent speeches were made by Mr King, of Ga Mr McKenna, of Pa Mr Stanley, of N C (all members of the 27th Congress,) and by other gentlemen called out upon the occasion.

Mr McKenna made a suitable defence of the Tariff of 1842, and its favorable influence upon the country.

Mr King, among other things, alluded to the Texas controversy. To Mr Van Buren's letter, which was "sort of for it, and sort of not." The South,—he spoke for the Whigs,—did not seek to annex Texas to this territory at the expense of a war with Mexico, and of principles. They did not understand that kind of ethics and economy which regarded it as a monstrous thing to relieve their own States, while a readiness was manifest to assume the whole foreign debt of a foreign territory. [The speaking was kept up to a late hour, and the rain a second time dispersed the crowd.]—Balt. Amer.

MR. VAN BUREN'S LETTER ON ANNEXATION.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

March 27th, 1844

My Dear Sir: Under the belief that it is the right of every free citizen, in a free government, to know the opinion of those who aspire to public station, upon great public questions, as one of your warmest supporters in 1836 and 1840 and as an unpledged delegate to the Baltimore Convention, I desire particularly to know your opinions as to the constitutionality and expediency of immediately annexing Texas to the United States, so soon as the consent of Texas may be had to such Annexation.

The letters of Mr Webster and General Jackson on this subject—the refusal of the Legislature of Kentucky to pass approbatory resolutions—the votes taken in the Legislatures of Pennsylvania, New York, and, as I am just informed, Maine—and the impression that Mr. Clay will oppose the annexation—give great importance to your opinions.

It is believed that a full and frank declaration from you, favorable to this great object, will be of great service to the cause, at a moment, so critical of its destiny, and should you recognise my right to inquire, and your duty to answer, I shall be greatly obliged to you for a letter setting forth your opinions—promising that, if it be favorable to annexation, I will, on account of the great effect it must have on the issue of this question, give it early publicity; and if otherwise, that I will publish it only in time that your opinions may be fully known before the action of the Baltimore Convention, unless you require its immediate publication—in which event I will also comply with your request.

Pardon me for suggesting that, should your opinions be favorable to annexation, the weight and influence of those opinions will be doubly enhanced by the estimation of all true friends of the measure, by the earliest possible public avowal of them before the country.

I am, sir, with great respect,
Truly your friend and obedient servant,
W. H. HAMMETT.

Hon. M. VAN BUREN, Lindenwald,
New York.

LINDENWALD, April 20, 1844.

My Dear Sir: Your letter of the 27th of March last was duly received. Acting as an unpledged Delegate to the Baltimore Convention, you ask my opinion in regard to the constitutionality and expediency of an immediate Annexation of Texas to the United States, or as soon as the consent of Texas may be had to such annexation. Upon the receipt of your letter, I caused you to be forthwith informed that your request should be complied with in full season for the Conven-

tion. This promise I shall now perform. But, lest my motives in making a public avowal of my opinions, whilst a negotiation is supposed to be pending, should be misconstrued, I shall send this to a friend who will delay its delivery as long as that can be done consistently with a faithful compliance with the requirement of your letter, and the general objects for which it was written.

You by no means overrate the importance of the subject upon which you have been pleased to address me. It is not only a question of intense interest to every part of the country, but is unhappily also one in regard to which we may not promise ourselves that unanimity in opinions which is so important when great National questions like this are to be decided. That those which I am about to express will, in at least one important particular, differ from that of many friends, political and personal, whose judgments and purity of views I hold in high and habitual respect, I can well imagine; and it is quite evident, from the tenor of your letter, that they will not in all respects correspond with your own. If, however, such of my fellow citizens as are neither influenced by prejudices, nor warped by self-interest, concede to my opinions the merit of having been formed under views directed to the preservation and advancement of the honor and best interests of our common country, as a whole, and expressed with a sincerity which has overlooked, as far as our feeble nature will permit us to do, all personal considerations, my most favorable anticipations will be realized.

It has already been made my duty to act officially on at least two several occasions, but in different forms, upon the subject-matter to which your questions have reference.

Having charge of the Department of State in 1829, I prepared, by direction of the President, instructions to our Minister at Mexico, by which he was directed to open, without delay, a negotiation with the Mexican Government for the purchase of the greater part of the then province of Texas, and by which he was likewise authorized to insert in the Treaty a provision similar to that in the Louisiana and Florida Treaties, for the incorporation of the inhabitants of Texas into the Union as soon as it could be done consistently with the principles of the Federal Constitution. The reasons in favor of this measure I stated at large in that document.

In taking this step, the administration of President Jackson renewed (but, as was supposed, under more favorable circumstances) an attempt to accomplish the same object which had been made by its immediate predecessor. Instructions, similar in their general object, had, in the second year of the latter administration, been sent from the Department of State to the same American Minister at Mexico. I am not aware that there were any material differences between them, other than that those of 1827 proposed an acquisition of territory and the payments were modified accordingly. In respect to the proposed stipulation for the ultimate incorporation of the inhabitants into the Union, both instructions were identical.

In August, 1837, a proposition was received at the Department of State, from the Texan Minister at Washington, proposing a negotiation for the Annexation of Texas to the United States. This was the first time the question of the annexation of a foreign independent State had ever been presented to this Government. In deciding upon the disposition that ought to be made of it, I did not find it necessary to consider the question of constitutionality, nor the manner in which the object should be accomplished, if deemed expedient and proper. Both these points were therefore, in terms, passed over in the reply of the Secretary of State to the Texan Minister, as subjects the consideration of which had not been entered upon by the Executive.

The first of these—viz: constitutional power—is now presented by your inquiries not, however, in precisely the same form. Then the application was for the immediate admission of Texas into the Union as an independent State; your question looks only to its Annexation as part of the territory of the United States.—There is no express power given to any department of the Government to purchase territory except for the objects specified in the constitution, viz: for arsenals, &c.; but the power has, on several very important occasions, been regarded as embraced in the treaty-making power; and territories have been so annexed with a view and under engagements for their ultimate admission into the Union as States. If there be nothing in the situation or condition of the territory of Texas, which would render its admission hereafter into the Union as a new State improper, I cannot perceive any objection, on Constitutional grounds, to its Annexation as a territory. In speaking of the right to admit new States, I must, of course, be understood as referring to the power of Congress. The Executive and Senate may, as I have already observed, by the exercise of the treaty-making power, acquire territory; but new States can only be admitted by Congress; and the sole authority over the subject, which is given to it by the Constitution, is contained in the following provision, viz: "New States may be admitted by the Con-

gress into this Union." The only restrictions imposed upon this general power are, 1st. That no new States shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor, 2ndly, "Any State formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the Legislatures concerned, as well as of Congress"—restrictions which have no bearing upon the present question. The matter, therefore stands as it would do if the constitution said "new States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union," without addition or restriction. That these words, taken by themselves, are broad enough to authorize the admission of the territory of Texas, cannot, I think, be well doubted; nor do I perceive upon what principle we can set up limitations to a power so unequivocally recognized by the Constitution in the plain simple words I have quoted, and with which no other provision of that instrument conflicts in the slightest degree. But if, with no other guides than our own discretion, we assume limitations upon a power so generally and intelligible and definite character. The most natural, and indeed the only one, of that nature that has been suggested, and which was presented by Mr. Jefferson whilst he entertained doubts in respect to the Constitutional power to admit Louisiana, is, that the new States to be admitted must be formed out of territory, not foreign, but which constituted a part of the United States, at the declaration of independence, or the adoption of the Constitution. So far from there being any thing in the language of the Constitution, or to be found in the extraneous and contemporaneous circumstances which preceded and attended its adoption, to show that such was the intention of its framers, they are, in my judgment, all strongly to the other way. In the first place, the articles of confederation, under which the Union was originally formed, and which gave place to the present Constitution, looked directly to a broader extension of the confederacy. It contained a provision that "Canada, according to the confederation, and joining in the measures of the United States, shall be admitted into, and entitled to all the advantages of, his Union; but no other colony shall be admitted to the same unless such admission be agreed to by nine States"—The practicability, as well as expediency, of making Canada a member of the Union, did certainly, to some extent at least, occupy the minds of our public men, as well before the close of the revolution, as between that event and the formation of the new Constitution. This, is, however, only a link in the chain of evidence, to make probable what subsequent events make certain, that the framers of the Constitution had their eyes upon his very question, when this section was finally settled. That part of the Constitution, as appears by the journal of the proceedings of the Convention, was presented in a variety of forms before it assumed the shape in which it was finally adopted.

In the resolutions offered by Mr. Edmund Randolph, as a basis for the new Constitution, and which contained the first propositions of that character which were submitted to it, the power in question was described as follows, viz: that provision ought to be made for the admission of States lawfully arising within the limits of the United States, whether arising from a voluntary junction of government or otherwise with the consent of a number of voices in the Legislature, less than the whole." In Mr. Charles Pinkney's draft it was proposed that the Legislature shall have power to admit new States into the Union, on the same terms with the original States; provided two-thirds of the members present in both Houses agree"—leaving on the cause in respect to the character of the territory. Mr. Randolph's proposition, containing the restriction confining the power to States lawfully arising within the limits of the United States, was at one time adopted in Committee of the Whole and, in that state, referred with others to the Committee of detail. In a draft of a Constitution, reported by that Committee, the article upon this subject contained the following propositions: 1st. That new States lawfully constituted or established within the limits of the United States, might be admitted by the Legislature in this Government. 2d. That to such admission, the consent of two-thirds of the members present in each House should be necessary. 3d. That if a new State should arise within the limits of any of the present States the consent of the Legislature of such States should also be necessary to its admission. 4th. That if the admission was consented to, the new State should be admitted on the same terms with the original States; and 5th. That the Legislature might make conditions with the new States concerning the public debt then subsisting. The 2d, 4th, and 5th clauses were struck out by the votes of the Convention; and after that had been done, the following was adopted as a substitute for the whole, viz: "New States may be admitted by the Legislature into the Union; but no new State shall be created within the limits of any of the present States, without the consent of the Legislatures of such States as well as of the general Legislature"—leaving out that part of the first clause which related to the domestic characters of the territory, and this substitute was subsequently revised and amended, so as to make it conform in

its phraseology to the section as it now stands in the Constitution.

These proceedings show that proposition to restrict the power to admit new States to the territory within the original limits of the United States, was distinctly before the convention once adopted, by it and finally rejected in favor of a clause making the power in this respect general. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the propriety of referring to extraneous matter to influence the construction of the Constitution where its language is explicit there can certainly be no objection to a resort to such aids to test the correctness of inferences, having no other basis than supposed improbabilities. I have not, therefore, been able to bring my mind to any other satisfactory conclusion than that it was the intention of the convention to give the power of admitting new States to Congress with no other limitations than those which are specified in that instrument. The language employed, the specifications of certain restrictions, the adoption and subsequent exclusion of that which is now referred to, together with the subsequent and continued action of the new Government all seem to combine to render this interpretation of the Constitution the true one. Propositions for annexation can certainly be imagined of a character so unwise and impudent as to strike the minds of all with repugnance. But if we look over the conceded powers of Congress, we shall also find many others, the abuse of which might involve in an equally great extent the well-being of the Republic and against which as base the Constitution has provided no other safeguards than the responsibilities to their constituents and to the laws of the land, of those whose sanction is necessary to the validity of an act of Congress. Nor is it very unreasonable to suppose that those who based their Government upon the great principle that it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute new ones, in such forms as they may think most likely to effect their safety and happiness, should feel themselves secure in trusting to their Representatives in the House, in the Senate and in the executive chair, the right to admit new members into the Confederacy, with no other restrictions than those which they have thought proper to specify.

It was under this view of the constitution that the purchase of Louisiana in 1803, only fifteen years after the adoption of the constitution, promising the incorporation of the ceded territory into the Union and the admission, as soon as possible, of the inhabitants to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, was ratified, confirmed, and finally executed by every branch of the Federal Government whose co-operation is required by the Constitution. It is true that Mr. Jefferson, in the interval between the negotiation and submission of the treaty to the Senate, threw out the opinion that the Constitution had made no provision for our holding foreign territory nor for incorporating foreign States into the Union.—The fact of his approving the treaty and the laws necessary to its execution, must, however, be regarded as conclusive proof that upon looking further into the matter, his opinion was changed. The attempt to convince him of his error was made by his friend, Governor Nicholas, as appears by Mr. Jefferson's letter to him; and I have little doubt that if his letters to Breckinridge and Nicholas had been published in his lifetime or his attention been in any other way directed to their contents, he would, from his habitual care in such matters, have avowed the change and explained the grounds on which it was based. It is equally true that the acceptance of the cession, as well as the admission of the State, became party questions, and were contested with partisan warmth. Of the vital importance of that great acquisition to the safety, prosperity and honor of the whole Union there can, however, now be no diversity of opinion. But the councils of the nation in the course of time, ceased to be at all divided upon the question of constitutional power to accept a cession of foreign territory, with a view to its ultimate admission into the Union. In 1819 the Spanish treaty for the cession of East and West Florida, containing the usual stipulations for ultimate incorporation into the Union, was ratified; and, upon the call of the names of the Senators present, it appears that every one voted for the ratification. Upon the question of constitutional power so far as that case went, the Senate of the United States had, therefore, become unanimous.

Certainly no remarks are necessary to show that there can be no possible difference produced in the constitutional question by the relative positions of the territory comprising Louisiana, the Florida, and Texas in respect to the old United States.

I have gone thus fully and minutely into this matter, as well from a deep sense of the vast importance of the question as from a sincere desire to satisfy those of my friends who may differ from me on this point, and whose opinions I hold in the highest respect, that I have not yielded my assent hastily or unadvisedly to the views here taken of the subject.

Having thus given you my views upon the constitutional question, I will, with the same frankness, answer the remaining portion of your inquiries, viz: the expediency of immediately annexing Texas to the United States, as soon as her consent to such Annexation may be obtained.