

North-Carolina Free Press.

Whole No. 390.

Tarborough, (Edgecombe County, N. C.) Tuesday, February 14, 1832.

Vol. VIII.—No. 26.

The "North-Carolina Free Press,"

BY GEORGE HOWARD,

Is published weekly, at Two Dollars and Fifty Cents per year, if paid in advance—or, Three Dollars, at the expiration of the year. For any period less than a year, Twenty-five Cents per month. Subscribers are at liberty to discontinue at any time, on giving notice thereof and paying arrears—those residing at a distance must invariably pay in advance, or give a responsible reference in this vicinity.

Advertisements, not exceeding 16 lines, will be inserted at 50 cents the first insertion, and 25 cents each continuance. Longer ones at that rate for every 16 lines. Advertisements must be marked the number of insertions required, or they will be continued until otherwise ordered. Letters addressed to the Editor must be post paid, or they may not be attended to.

DOMESTIC.

Mr. Van Buren.—To enable our readers to form a correct opinion respecting the rejection by the U. S. Senate of the nomination of Mr. Van Buren as Minister to England, we will copy a few speeches, against and for it, made on the occasion. We accordingly commence with the remarks of Mr. Clay:—

Mr. CLAY said, after the most deliberate consideration, I regret that I find myself utterly unable to reconcile with the duty I owe to my country, a vote in favor of this nomination. I regret it, because in all past strife of party, the relations of ordinary civility and courtesy, were never interrupted between the gentleman whose name is before us, and myself. But I regard my obligations to the people of the United States, and to the honor and character of their government, as paramount to every private consideration. There was no necessity known to us for the departure of this gentleman from the U. States, prior to the submission of his name to the Senate. Great Britain was represented here by a diplomatic agent, having no higher rank than that of a Charge des affairs. We were represented in England by one of equal rank, one who had shed lustre upon his country by his high literary character; one whom it may be justly said, in no respect, was he inferior to the gentleman before us. Although I shall not controvert the right of the President, in an extraordinary case, to send abroad a public minister, without the advice and consent of the Senate, I do not admit that it ever ought to be done without the existence of some special cause to be communicated to the Senate. We have received no communication of the existence of any such special cause. This view of the matter might not have been sufficient alone to justify a rejection of this nomination; but it is sufficient to authorize us to examine the subject with as perfect freedom as we could have done if the minister had remained in the United States, and awaited the decision of the Senate. I consider myself, therefore, not committed by the separate and unadvised act of the President in despatching Mr. Van Buren, in the vacation of the Senate, and not a very long time before it was to assemble.

My main objection to the confirmation of his appointment, arises out of his instructions to the late minister of the United States at the Court of Great Britain. The attention of the Senate has been already called to parts of those instructions;

but there are other parts of them, in my opinion, highly reprehensible. Speaking of the colonial question, he says: "In reviewing the events which have preceded, and more or less contributed to a result so much to be regretted, there will be found three grounds on which we are most assailable. First, in our too long and too tenaciously resisting the right of Great Britain to impose protecting duties in her colonies;" * * "and thirdly, in omitting to accept the terms offered by the act of Parliament of July, 1825, after the subject had been brought before Congress, and deliberately acted upon by our Government. * * You will therefore see the propriety of possessing yourself fully of all the explanatory and mitigating circumstances connected with them that you may be enabled to obviate, as far as practicable, the unfavorable impression which they have produced." And after reproaching the late Administration with sitting upon claims for the first time, which they explicitly abandoned, he says, in conclusion, "I will add nothing as to the impropriety of suffering any feelings that find their origin in the past pretensions of this Government to have adverse influence upon the present conduct of Great Britain."

On our side, according to Mr. Van Buren, all was wrong; on the British side, all was right. We brought forward nothing but claims and pretensions; the British Government asserted on the other hand a clear and incontestable right. We erred in too tenaciously and too long insisting upon our pretensions, and not yielding at once to the force of their just demands. And Mr. McLane was commanded to avail himself of all the circumstances in his power to mitigate our offence, and to dissuade the British Government from allowing their feelings justly incurred by the past conduct of the party driven from power, to have an adverse influence towards the American party now in power. Sir, was this becoming language from one independent nation to another? Was it proper in the mouth of an American minister? Was it in conformity with the high, unsullied, and dignified character of our previous diplomacy? Was it not, on the contrary, the language of a humble vassal to a proud and haughty lord? Was it not prostrating and degrading the American Eagle before the British Lion?

Let us examine a little these pretensions which the American Government so unjustly put forward and so pertinaciously maintained. The American Government contended that the produce of the United States ought to be admitted into the British West Indies, on the same terms as similar produce of the British American possessions; that, without this equality, our produce could not maintain in the British West Indies a fair competition with the produce of Canada; and that British preference given to the Canadian province in the West Indies would draw from

the western part of New-York and the northern part of Ohio American produce into Canada, aggrandizing Montreal and Quebec, and giving employment to British shipping, to the prejudice of the canals of New-York, the port of New-York, and American shipping.

This was the offence of the American Government, and we are this moment realizing the evils which it foresaw. Our produce is passing into Canada, enriching her capitals, and nourishing British navigation. Our own wheat is transported in British ships in the form of Canadian flour. We are thus deprived of the privileges even of manufacturing our own grain. And when the produce of the United States shipped from the Atlantic ports, arrives at the British West Indies, it is unable in consequence of the heavy duties with which most of it is burthened, to sustain a competition with British or colonial produce, freely admitted.

The general rule may be admitted that every nation has a right to favor its own productions, by protecting duties or other regulations; but like all general rules, it must have its exceptions. And the relation in which Great Britain stands to her Continental and West India colonies, from which she is separated by a vast sea, and the relations in which the United States stand to those colonies, some of which are in juxtaposition with them, constitute a fit case for such an exception.

It is true that the late Administration did authorize Mr. Gallatin to treat with Great Britain upon the basis of the rule which has been stated, but it was with the express understanding that some competent provision should be made in the treaty to guard against the British monopoly of the transportation of our own produce passing through Canada. Mr. Gallatin was informed "that the United States consent to waive the demand which they have heretofore made of the admission of their productions into British colonies at the same time, and no higher rate of duty, as similar productions are chargeable with when imported from one into another British colony, with the exception of our produce descending the St. Lawrence and the Sorrel."

There was no abandonment of our right, no condemnation of the previous conduct of our government, no humiliating admission that we had put forth, and too tenaciously clung to, unsustainable pretensions, and that Great Britain had all along been in the right. We only forbore, for the present, to assert a right, leaving ourselves at liberty, subsequently, to resume it. What Mr. Gallatin was authorized to do was to make a temporary concession, and it was proposed with this preliminary announcement: "But, notwithstanding, on a full consideration of the whole subject, the President, anxious to give a strong proof to Great Britain of the desire of the government of the United States to arrange this long contested matter of the colonial intercourse, in a man-

ner mutually satisfactory, authorizes you," &c. And Mr. Gallatin was required "to endeavor to make a lively impression on the British Government, of the conciliatory spirit of that of the United States, which has dictated the present liberal offer, and of their expectation to meet, in the progress of your negotiations, with a corresponding friendly disposition."

Now, Sir, keeping sight of the object which the late Secretary of State had in view, the opening of the trade with the British colonies, which was the best mode to accomplish it? To send our minister, to prostrate himself, as a supplicant, before the British throne, and to say to the British King—We have offended your Majesty; the late American Administration bro't forward pretensions which we cannot sustain, and they too long and too tenaciously adhered to them. Your Majesty was always in the right. But we hope that your Majesty will be graciously pleased to recollect, that it was not we, who are now in possession of the American power, but those who have been expelled from it, that wronged your Majesty; and that we, when out of power, were on the side of your Majesty. And we do humbly pray that your Majesty, taking all mitigating circumstances into consideration, will graciously condescend to extend to us the privileges of the British act of Parliament of 1825, and to grant us the boon of a trade with your Majesty's West India colonies? Or, to have presented himself before the British monarch in the manly and dignified attitude of a Minister of this Republic, and, abstaining from all condemnation or animadversion upon the past conduct of his own government, to have placed the withdrawal of our former demand upon the ground of concession, in a spirit of amity and compromise?

But the late Secretary of State, the appointed organ of the American people to vindicate their rights with all foreign powers, and to expose the injustice of any unfounded demands which they might assert, was not content with exerting his ingenuity to put his own country in the wrong and the British government in the right. He endeavored to attach to the late administration the discredit of bringing forward unfounded pretensions, and, by disclaiming them, to propitiate the favor of the British King. He says that the views of the present administration, upon the subject of the colonial trade, "have been submitted to the people of the United States; and the counsels by which your conduct is now directed, are the result of the judgment expressed by the only earthly tribunal to which the late administration was amenable for its acts. It should be sufficient that the claims set up by them, and what caused the interruption of the trade in question, have been explicitly abandoned by those who first asserted them, and are not revived by their successors." The late Secretary of State, the gentleman under consideration, here makes the statement that the

late administration were the first to set up the claims to which he refers. Now, under all the high responsibility which belongs to the seat which I occupy, I deliberately pronounce that this statement is untrue; and that the late Secretary either must have known it to be untrue, or he was culpably negligent of his duty in not ascertaining what had been done under prior administrations. I repeat the charge—the statement must have been known to be untrue, or there was culpable negligence. If it were material, I believe it could be shown that the claim in question—the right to the admission into the British West Indies of the produce of the United States upon an equal footing with similar produce of the British continental colonies—is coeval with the existence of our present Constitution; and that whenever the occasion arose for asserting the claim, it was asserted. But I shall go no farther back than to Mr. Madison's administration. Mr. Monroe, the then Secretary of State, instructed our then minister at London, upon this subject; he negotiated with Lord Castlereagh in respect to it, and this very claim prevented an adjustment, at that time, of the colonial question. It was again brought forward under Mr. Monroe's administration, when Mr. Rush was our Minister at London. He opened a long and protracted negotiation upon this and other topics, which was suspended in the summer of 1824, principally because the parties could not agree on any satisfactory arrangement of this very colonial question.

Thus, at least, two administrations, prior to that of Mr. Adams, had brought forward this identical claim or pretension which his was the first to assert, according to the late Secretary of State.

The next charge which the late Secretary of State, the official defender of the rights of the American people, preferred against his own government, was that of "omitting to accept the terms offered by the act of Parliament of July, 1825, after the subject had been brought before Congress, and deliberately acted upon by our government." Never was there a more unfounded charge bro't forward by any native against his own government; and never was there a more unwarranted apology set up for a foreign government; and a plain historical narrative will demonstrate the truth of both these propositions.

It has been already stated that the negotiation of Mr. Rush, embracing the precise colonial claim under consideration, was suspended in 1824, with an understanding between the two governments that it was to be resumed on all points, at some future convenient period. Early in July, 1825, neither government having then proposed a resumption of the negotiation, the British Parliament passed an act to regulate the colonial trade with foreign powers. This act was never, during the late administration, either at London or Washington, officially communicated by the British to the American govern-