Louis McLane and the Oregon Treaty.

His Speech in Reply to the New York Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen—It is so difficult as almost to discourage the attempt to find adequate words in which to make you my thanks, for the sense you entertain of my public services, for the flattering terms in which you have been pleased to give it expression. Such a compliment, proceeding from such a body of my countrymen, would be an ample reward for greater merit than I could possibly pretend to; and I will not attempt to disguise the sincere gratification it has afforded me. Highly as I value it, however, it gives me pleasure to acknowledge, that being myself upon the occasion to which you particularly refer, only an instrument in assisting the purpose of others, the greater share of your approbation is due those with whom I co-operated. Omitting, for a moment, a more particular reference to the conduct and disposition of our own government, I may, without impropriety, assure you that your reference to the distinguished British statesman, by whom the negotiation on the part of that government was directed, is fully merited, and that upon any occasion of congratulation upon the result, too much praise cannot be bestowed upon his manly sense and unanimous determination to promote an amicable settlement of the question. I am free at the same time to assure you, gentlemen, that no one can be more sensible of the importance of peace to all the interests of the country, and especially to those you so worthily represent, than I am. Of course, where the honor of the country is involved, no one would stop to count the cost, or estimate the evils of war, but it is a gratifying evidence of the advance of the age in which we live, that the rulers of states are not afraid to acknowledge that the national honor is more apt to be committed by hasty and impracticable demands, than by wise and timely concessions; for a country, like ours especially, can rarely disturb the peace of the world, without incurring a weighty responsibility to the cause of civilization and human happiness, and, if not hazarding their own stability, without seriously impairing their moral influence.

I certainly could not have been induced to return to political life, as the representative of my country abroad, unless I had been persuaded that in the crisis to which you have referred, the views of my own government had been entirely consistent with such a settlement of the Oregon question as ought to have secured an honorable peace, and unless I had entertained the hope that I might be enabled in some degree to co-operate to that end.

For myself, after our several conventions of 1818, and 1828, (the latter of which received my support as a Senator of the United States,) for the joint occupation of the territory, I had always regarded the Oregon question as less dependent upon the force of title, than upon the principles of an equitable partition. It would have been unreasonable to expect, after such acknowledgments of the rights of joint occupancy, that either party would be permitted wholly to dispossess the other, without some regard to interests which had grown up during their mutual possession. It appeared to be, also, that all the previous acts of our government had not only been consistent with, but affirmatory of those views; and I could see nothing in the national honor that would justify, much less demand, a departure from it. Possessing before, in an equal degree as after the treaty with Spain in 1819, all the title, which, on the ground of discovery, we could assert to the country, drained by the waters of the Columbia, and which, if good for any thing, was valid beyond the 52d parallel of latitude; our government at no time proposed a more northern boundary than the parallel of 51, and never demanded more than that of 49. Having some knowledge, from my official position at that time, of the policy and objects of the convention of 1828, I am quite persuaded that its main design was to lead in a future partition of the territory to the recognition of our claim to the country, not north, but south of the forty-ninth parallel, and between that and the Columbia river. A division of the country upon that principle, with a reasonable regard to rights growing up under the joint possessions, always appeared to me to afford a just and practicable basis for an amicable and honorable adjustment of the subject.—Such, also, I was satisfied, were the views of my own government at the time I engaged in my recent mission, and in earnestly and steadily laboring to effect a settlement upon that basis, I was but representing the policy of my own government, and faithfully promoting the intentions and wishes of the President.

It must be very rare, if, in complicated differences between great nations, peaceful relations can be preserved without some modification of extreme pretensions; and upon the present occasion, from the length of time for which the question had been depending, together with the oft repeated propositions on both sides, the two governments could not have been reasonably expected to come to an amicable arrangement without some mutual concession of their former demands. I, on our side, by dividing on the 49th parallel and the Straits of Fuca, we yielded the Southern cape of Vancouver's Island, Great Britain surrendered her previous claim to the navigation and unoccupied territory between the 49th parallel and the Columbia river. At the same time we have effected a material modification of our former offer of the surrender of the perpetual navigation of the Columbia river to British trade and British subjects generally. Although from deference to the views and opinions of others, which it was no less my wish than duty to respect, I earnestly endeavored to effect a settlement upon the basis of allowing the navigation of the river to the general trade for a period of twenty years, when that, from causes which I need not now particularly refer, proved to be impracticable, in, nevertheless, suggesting and urging that it should be restricted to the Hudson Bay Company, I thought I was effecting an object less objectionable.

It seems to me in the present state of commerce, it is not only the interest, but the practice of nations, independent of some inveterate notions of colonial policy already yielding to more enlightened views, to allow the greatest freedom of rivers and ports to the trade of the world; and it may be observed, that until the United States and Great Britain shall determine to abandon the reciprocity secured by their existing commercial convention, the recent Oregon treaty confers fewer privileges of navigation than may be claimed and enjoyed under the commercial convention. I felt confident, moreover, that long before the two governments would desire to alter their existing commercial freedom, if, indeed, they should ever desire to do so during the continuance of peace, the Hudson's Bay Company would cease to have any occasion or motive to navigate such a river as the Columbia is known to be. It would not be easy to imagine any use they could make of it during a state of peace, inconsistent with the commerce and interest of our own citizens.

Universal satisfaction at the adjustment of a difficulty so complicated and inveterate was scarcely to be expected, and yet it is a source of satisfaction to know that its general acceptableness to the country at large affords a sure guarantee of the continuance of our future peace. The tone and temper with which the negotiation was conducted in their several departments by both governments, have been creditable to their wisdom and moderation, and have already served to elevate our own in the opinion of other nations.

I sincerely believe that these efforts cannot be too highly appreciated; and if any portion of our fellow citizens in any section of the country should feel that they have not obtained all the territory and advantages they had expected to acquire, it will be hoped that they will nevertheless be satisfied that the national honor, so far from suffering, has really been elevated by the result, and that in preserving the blessings of peace, and keeping our country steadily in a career of glorious prosperity, they will be amply compensated for any disappointment they may have experienced, and they gain far more than an equivalent for any doubtful advantage only to be sought through the instrumentality of war. Having now effaced, upon honorable terms, the last cause that threatened the peace of two people of kindred origin, and associated by commercial relations more extensive and important than exist beween any other two nations of the earth, may we not now hope to begin a new career of international intercourse, and, by the uninterrupted pursuit of commerce and the arts, extend and cement our relations. It ought to be considered as fortunate that these results have happened at a moment when, by the wisdom and courage of British statesmen, a new and important step has been taken in the enlargement of commerce, by which the trade of different nations must be widely extended, and the motives of harmonious relations indefinitely multiplied. As between the U. States and Great Britain especially the causes which ought naturally to associate the two people upon an honorable basis and contribute to their mutual prosperity, may now have fair play, and our competitions in future be confined to a generous rivalry in all that can advance the happiness of the people of both countries, and of mankind at large.

I would do injustice to the occasion, if I should omit to state it as my opinion, that in the country and among the people I have just left, these expectations begin to be generally entertained; and that the settlement of the Oregon question will soon come to be universally regarded as the knell of those inveterate jealousies and feuds which, it may be apprehended, have so long exerted a mischievous influence on the people, if not upon the counsels of both countries.

I may say, with certainty, also, that whatever may be thought of the result by some respectable portions of our countrymen, the terms we have ultimately obtained, no less than the vindication of our rights, and the ultimate approval of an honorable concession, have added another refutation to the charge of undue ambition, and to the imputation upon our national faith and stability not unfrequently made in some quarters of Europe.

If these advantages be properly appreciated, the time is not remote when all will be ready to acknowledge and rejoice in the result.

The occasion may not be inapt to bear testimony to the sense universally entertained abroad of the enterprise and punctuality of the commercial classes of the United States, and of the influence it has exerted in sustaining American credit in defiance of causes which, I, too, deeply deplore, to attempt at this time more particularly to allude to. I will add, too, that even these causes are beginning to feel the influence of a juster and of a higher hope, and that little more than a perseverance of some of our local governments in their exertions to maintain the public credit, is needed to elevate our country to a proud and enviable rank among the nations of the earth.

We learn that the principal merchants of the city, headed by the Mayor, George Newbold, Jonathan Goodhue, Collector Lawrence, Stephen Whitney, &c., &c., waited upon Mr. McLane, and tendered him a public dinner. We have not heard whether or not he will accept of this hospitality.

[From the Raleigh Register.]

RE-DISTRICTING THE STATE.

We hold it to be the very first duty of the General Assembly, at the ensuing Session, to repeal the odious Gerrymander of 1842, and re-district the State. We have known that some few Whigs of high respectability for talents and character, entertained doubts as to the policy of this course, but of these every one, we believe, has changed his first view, and is now clear for the measure. Of the *power* of of the General Assembly, we had not supposed that any doubt was entertained, and it was with surprise we heard, within a few days, that one intelligent Whig has expressed an opinion *against* the power. We propose, therefore in calling the attention of our readers to this great and important subject, to submit some views, to show that the power exists, and ought to be exerted.

Frst, as to the power: The Constitution of the U. States, (Article 1, Sec. 2.) provides that "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States, according to their respective numbers, &c. The actual enumeration shall be made within three years after the first meeting of the Congress of the United States, and within every subsequent term of ten years, in such manner as they shall by law direct." By this clause, representation is to be allotted every ten years, according to a Census to be directed by Congress; and thus, the "appointment" of its Representatives to each State is required to be made for ten years, and when made, it stands, of course, for ten years. But how are the Representatives to be chosen?—Does the Constitution, in any manner, rquire or intimate, that the *manner* of choosing, shall be determined for the period of ten, or any other number of years?

Section 4th of the same Article, is in these words: "The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in *each* State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may, at any time, by law, make or alter such regulations, except as to the place of choosing Senatars." Now here, is a matter to be regulated by the Legislature of a State; but the Regulation made by a Legislature is, of course a law, and it is known to every tyro, that the power which makes a law, may repeal or modify it. This is, no doubt, subject to exceptions; as for instance where by law, rights are granted, and become vested in citizens, and repeal of the law cannot amount to a resumption of the rights granted because (amongst other reasons,) the Constitution of the United States prohibits the passing by the States of laws impairing the obligation of Contracts.—But there is no prohibition in the clause before us—no restraint upon the Legislative power either decidedly expressed, or to be gathered from the subject. It was important that the apportionment of Representatives should, at fixed periods, be ascertained—so as, at once, to pay a just attention to the comparative growth of population, amongst the States, and, at the same time, to prevent too frequent and inconvenient changes in the relative representation of the several States, and, hence, the Constitution determines the rule by which representation should be apportioned and fixes the times at which the rule shall be applied. But *how* the Representatives should be chosen by each State; whether, in Districts or by General Ticket; whether, first in one mode, and then in another; whether, the Districts should be the same for ten years, or should be altered from time to time—all these things are left to the sound discretion of the Legislature of each State, subject only to the controlling power of Congress. And such has been the practice under this clause, Districts have been abolished, and a General Ticket established, and, again, the latter repealed and the former laid out by the Act of the State Legislatures. Indeed, the contrary doctrine would be attended by startling consequence. Before the last Apportionment law, Congress had never prescribed whether Representatives should be chosen by General Ticket, or by Districts. Suppose then, at the Session of the Legislature of a State, at which this matter regularly came up, a law had been passed establishing a General Ticket, thereby enabling a small *majority* to silence altogether in the House of Representatives the voice of a large *minority*. According to this doctrine, such a law is necessarily unalterable for ten years. In vain, the people of the State declare their disapprobation, by sending a majority of members to the Legislature, willing and pledged to repair the wrong, and repeal the law; it must stand against public opinion, against justice, against the very principles of all fair representation. But if such a law *can* be repealed, so can a law laying out a State into Districts; for the same reason which is alleged for making the one unalterable, directly applies to make the other so.

But, further: The apportionment of Representatives by Congress, determines the number of Electors, to which each State shall be entitled in choosing a President and Vice President. The Constitution, (Article 11, Sec. 1, clause 2.) provides that each State shall appoint in such manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a number of Electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress.

Here is a case, exactly parallel to the one we are considering. The apportionment of Representatives made by Congress, determines the number of Electors—the opportionment is to be made once in ten years. As to Representatives, the Legislature of the State is to prescribe "the *times, places* and *manner* of holding elections." As to Electors, the Legislature is to direct the manner in which they are to be appointed. Now, there is nothing, absolutely nothing, to distinguish the one case from the other, in the point to which our attention is now drawn. If a regulation as to one, when once made, is necessarily to stand until a new apportionment, so it must be as to the other; and if, on the contrary, such regulation as to one case may be modified as the Legislature may deem proper, so may it also be as to the other. But, in regard to Electors of President, our past history is full of precedents, showing the power of alteration. But it will be sufficient to refer to me one such precedent in our own State. In 1802, an Act was passed, laying off the State into Districts for electing Representatives, according to the Census of 1800; and in 1803, another Act, for laying off the State into Districts for electing Electors of President and Vice President, according to the same Census. In 1810, another Census was taken, and, at the Session of Congress of 1811, a new apportionment was made, to take effect on the 4th of March, 1813. And, at the Session of the General Assembly, held in 1811, before the new apportionment bill was passed, a law was enacted, repealing both the Act of 1802, and the Act of 1803, and directing the next General Assembly, (to wit, that of 1812,) to elect Electors of President and Vice President, by joint ballot of both Houses!—thus, not only abolishing the Districts established by law, under the Census of 1800, and which had theretofore been in force, but transferring the choice of Electors from the People to the Legislature! We therefore confidently assert that, upon a just construction of the language of the Constitution, as upon the practice of the States, no power is clearer than the power of the General Assembly to remodel the Districts established by the Act of 1842.

The next question is—Ought the power to be exercised? And that, we apprehend, depends solely on the question—Is the existing arrangement of Districts just and fair? Does it enable the people of the State to speak their voice truly in the House of Representatives? We admit that no law ought to be changed without adequate reason—no important law, without important reasons. We submit then, these as sufficient reasons for the proposed change:

First—The effect of the present arrangement is to enable *a minority* of the People to choose *a majority* of the Representation.

Secondly—This unjust result is not accidental, but the fruit of a fraudulent contrivance of the Democratic party, by which undue force should be given to them, and all due power withdrawn, as far as possible, from the Whigs of the State.

Thirdly—It is now certain that Mr. Calhoun will be a candidate at the next Election of President, and that he will *not* be the candidate of the Democracy of the United States; and hence, that we shall have *three* candidates, from which it may probably result, that the choice will be cast upon the House of Representatives. Should this happen, we should have the voice of the State disregarded and misrepresented by a Democratic majority of her Representatives in that body.

If then, the object of having Representatives, be to express the opinions of their constituents—if a Representative Republic is not to be reduced *in substance* to the condition of England under her old rottenborough system—if fraud is to be repressed and fairness encouraged in the delegates of the people—if it is a matter of any consequence that North Carolina should speak her own wishes in the choice of a Chief Magistrate—if, indeed, there be any thing in our form of Government worthy the love and confidence of intelligent and honest Freemen—it is plainly just, and an imperative duty of the General Assembly, to rid us of an odious GERRYMANDER, and afford the People of the State an opportunity to have a real, and effective, as well as an apparent influence in controlling the conduct of public affairs.

So plain is this duty, that one of the best men, and best Whigs of the State, altho' taking no part in the political contests of the day, has declared that the Whigs have their choice of two things—either to redistrict the State, or else to admit that their charge of a fraudulent GERRYMANDER against the Legislature of 1842, is unfounded and false! And another, of like character, has declared, that if the General Assembly shall adjourn without having discharged this duty to the People of the State, the Whig party deserves to be in a minority forever hereafter!

Indeed, we do not see how the Whig members of that body can reconcile it to their consciences, to leave in force a law by which the voice of the People is stifled; and a State, electing a Whig Governor, Whig Senate, and Whig House of Commons, is misrepresented in the National Councils by a Democratic Delegation, voting *for* every measure disapproved by the people, and *against* every measure which their interests and their opinions require, and ready, when the time shall come, to cast the vote of the State for a Democrat as President, although the People shall have declared by ever so large a majority for a Whig!

From the Richmond (Va.) Times.

PRICES OF GOODS.

We ask the candid attention of our readers to the following paragraph from the Journal of Commerce, a professedly neutral paper, but unquestionably the most strenuous opponent of the tariff of 1842, in this country:

"DRY GOODS.—The opening sales of the season exhibit prices greatly reduced from those of last year. Printing cloths, which last year brought 7¼ cents, have recently been sold at 4 cents, and yet we are told that the new mills can afford to make them. Calicoes have fallen in something like the same proportion. The prices are now quite as low here as in England for common goods.—Woolens too are very cheap, and our manufacturers have acquired such skill that they make beautiful cassimere for 65 to 75 cents, and yet save something. There is no fear of England, France or Germany, in such a market. *Whether these prices are the consequence of the excessive action under a high Tariff*, or the apprehended influence of a lower one, *we cannot say. The low prices which both Protectionists and Free Traders have predicted as the consequence of high protection, have come about and are present with us.*"

Perhaps the Southern reader needs to be informed that a main objection to the protective system at the North, has constantly been, *that it would produce low prices.* Yet such is the fact, as it here appears, from the declaration of the Journal of Commerce, that, "the low prices, which both Protectionists and FREE TRADERS HAVE PREDICTED, as the consequence of high protection, HAVE COME ABOUT, AND ARE PRESENT WITH US." This view was taken by Mr. Van Buren in one of his messages, and we well remember, was sustained with great earnestness by a Northern Democratic Governor, whose object was to convince the *manufacturers* that they would ultimately lose by protection.

But we wish especially to note the pregnant admission of the Journal of Commerce, that prices have greatly fallen under the tariff of 1842, according to the predictions OF ITS FRIENDS.—Account for it as we may, THE FACT IS SO; and the people will be called upon to recollect it, when the effects of that beneficent law shall have passed away, by reason of its inconsiderate repeal. It is true, the Journal of Commerce, with its usual disingenuousness, insinuates that the expectation of a lower tariff may have produced these low prices; but as the Tribune well replies, "that paper ought to have stated, that this reduction began long before it was known or believed by our manufacturers that the Tariff would be reduced, and has been gradually going on ever since." If it were shewn that there was a sudden fall in prices as soon as it was ascertained that the new bill would become a law, then such fall might be justly attributed to the anticipation of the change. And even if this should turn out to be so, it would not all militate against the fact that the tariff of 1842 is a better measure than the new one, for reducing prices. The explanation is this, and we trust our readers will duly consider its soundness. A small surplus thrown upon a good supply must always produce a sudden depression of price, whilst a small deficiency is apt to cause a corresponding advance. Now, by the reduction of the tariff so as to admit foreign goods, it may easily happen that prices will materially fall, by the introduction of a small surplus from abroad, which the foreigner is obliged to dispose of, whether at a profit or not. It then becomes a race which shall hold out longest. The prices not remunerating either party, one or the other must break down. Of course the side which has the largest capital will sustain itself. What, then, will be the effect? Why, the supply being now reduced by destroying one of the competitors, *prices must again rise*, and be perpetually at the mercy of the successful contestant. In a contest between this country and England, it is useless to inquire which has the most capital, and is therefore most likely to gain the victory.

Now we do not pretend that all this will take place with all articles. It certainly will not result where the duty of 30 or 20 per cent is sufficient to give the American manufacturer assurance of being able to keep the market: but where the duty is not high enough to force a heavy loss upon the foreigner, if he temporarily reduces present prices, with the intention of raising them when he can command the market, it is manifest to us that most injurious consequences will ensue. To express the same idea differently: in those cases where the new tariff is sufficiently protective, prices will continue to fall; but in those cases where it is not sufficiently protective, they may fall for a time, but will inevitably rise again, and remain permanently higher than they are at this moment.

Gen. Taylor's reply to his proposed nomination for President.—The following letter has been received from Major General Taylor, by the Chairman of the meeting therein referred to, held in New York, in which that gallant officer responds in handsome terms to the resolution passed on that occasion:

"HEAD-QUARTERS, ARMY OF OCCUPATION,
Camargo, Mex., Aug. 14, 1846.

"HON. GEO. FOLSOM:

Dear Sir,—The mail of yesterday conveyed to me your letter of the 16th of July, accompany a copy of the resolutions recently adopted in New York city, and expressive of the approbation of a large number of citizens, for the recent services of the Army of Occupation. For these expressions our warmest gratitude is due, and they will be long remembered as renewed incentives to exertion in the cause of the country.

For your own very complimentary note, my personal thanks are also due. Permit me to say it is a source of gratulation to me, that the meeting refrained from the meditated nomination; for the high office in question I have no aspirations. The Government has assigned to me an arduous and responsible duty, in the prosecution of the existing war; in conducting it with honor to the country, lie all my real aspirations.

It is with great pleasure, sir, that I thus acknowledge the gratitude of the Army for the good opinion and cheering approval of the citizens of New York City.—With assurances of our warm appreciation and my own personal wishes for your prosperity in life,

I remain, Dear Sir,
Most sincerely yours,
Z. TAYLOR, Maj. Gen. U. S. Army.

A correspondence on the same subject has also taken place between a number of citizens of Philadelphia and Gen. Taylor. The following is the reply of the General:

HEAD QUARTERS, ARMY OF OCCUPETION,
Camargo, Mexico, Aug. 14, 1846.

Sir: Your letter of July 20th has been duly received, and read, with much pleasure. I return my sincere acknowledgments of thankfulness for the complimentary expressions made by many of the citizens of Philadelphia. My thanks are especially directed to you sir, as the medium of communication, and as expressing the good will of so many of my fellow countrymen. My real feelings impel me to say, however, that I do not desire a nomination as candidate for the Presidency. Your letter finds me no aspirant for that office, and the agitation of such a question in my present responsible position, is yet more a cause of serious regret, as tending to embarrass me in the successful prosecution of the existing war.—With this frank expression of my feelings, however, do not believe that I am insensible to the high consideration and kind approval of my fellow-citizens, which are warmly remembered and cherished.

Please accept for yourself and friends, who have thus honored me, my most cordial esteem and regard, and sincere wishes for your health and prosperity. I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

Z. TAYLOR,
Major General U. S. Army.

To. D. M. Leisenring, Esq., for William Moore, Jas. L. Blake, and others.

THE CAROLINA W

Salisbury, N.

FRIDAY EVENING, SEP

THE CONNECTING

We see by the Fayetteville mington papers that there strong opposition between those two places in relation necting Link." The people ville wish to have it run through their Town, then and thence to intersect Carolina line either at, or The people of Wilmington with the South Carolina lower down,—or perhaps to Charleston. We shall they get the question settl commodate the interest number, without the ing all by attempting to We have had enough of chief in North Carolina think gentlemen should Without professing to subject mature reflection, liberty to express our pr upper route. The road pass through a more productive country, than sea shore, as will be the er route, particularly if direct to Charleston.

But we will forbear, party or the other afou they will make a good work of the "connecting it may prove a work of building up of the Old

By the way, gentlemen do you think of our proje Yadkin River? The day we think, when the slumb the West will arouse them complish this most desira the spirit is up, already along the valley, and spread.

☞ Read Mr. McLane this paper. It seems to settled fact that President double game on the subj question. He was one and a very different then England he was in favor on the 49th; and in the was for thirty-hour Verily, he is a bright dignity.

"*The Palmetto State* have received the first N ocratic paper bearing just commenced in Colu C. Morgan. It is very to the mechanical par be a very spirited advoc principles. Mr. Calhoun be its polar star. The latter clause of the sec the editor's opening "The Constitution of and the luminous expo strument, made by Jeffe will be our guide and

Iredell Superior Co term of this Court, Gallimore was put upon dictment for *negro steali* for the State, and G. Sharpe for the Prisoner ted of the charge; moved first for new trial found against the evide in arrest of judgment and an appeal to the Su ken."

An unfortunate Occurre greeable circumstance below Rutherfordton, N. C. lican" of that town, on whereby a negro man, *Bridges*, was deprived of his for some reason proceeded the negro made resistance, and choking him, as we when the master got up the house, the negro endea The Owner turned and over the head with a pi death in a few hours.

☞ *New Cotton.*—The linian" says—The first brought to market this sea nesday the 9th instant; and P. P. Johnson & Co., at 7 ity *fair.*

It was brought in by M Duplin county.

☞ Major Ennis has ing Tobacco in these the Major's Apothecary, "Ayres' Hyco Smoking decidedly "pleasant to

Mr. Pakenham, the Brit visit to Mr. Webster, at