EASTON GAZETTE.

WHERE THE PRESS IS FREE--"Literature well or ill-conducted, is the Great Engine by which all Popular States must ultimately be supported or overthrown."
RELIGION purifies the Heart and teaches us our Duty--Morality refines the Manners--Agriculture makes us Rich and Politics provides for the enjoyment of all.

VOL. XIV. EASTON, MD. SATURDAY EVENING, AUGUST 6, 1831 NO. 32.

PRINTED & PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY EVENING
BY
ALEXANDER GRAHAM.

TERMS

TWO DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS Per Annum, payable half yearly in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS

Not exceeding a square inserted three times for ONE DOLLAR; and TWENTY FIVE CENTS for every subsequent insertion

Manifesto of Original Jacksonmen.

We copy, from the U. S. Gazette of Saturday a publication signed by some original supporters of Gen. Jackson's pretensions to the Presidency, announcing their resolution, and the reasons of it, not to support his suit for a re-election. This paper will, undoubtedly, produce a strong impression on the public mind.

Gen. Jackson's pledge, not to be a candidate for a second term of office, is notorious as having been made to the nation. The manifesto, which we re-publish this morning, contains positive evidence that he had made a similar pledge to his party. "The consent" say the signers, "of Gen. Jackson to become a candidate for the second term, has violated his solemn and repeated pledge to his party, that he would serve but four years," &c. &c. Some of the more prominent features of his perfidy, imbecility and corruption, are painted in colors which, though fainter than the truth, are as strong as could be expected from persons who desired to encourage some lingering feeling of kindness for him in their own breasts.

[Nat. Jour.

TO THE PEOPLE OF THE U. STATES,
On the next Presidential Election.

The subscribers, original supporters of Andrew Jackson to the Presidency of the United States, deeply and solemnly impressed with the importance of preserving great fundamental principles of liberty, free from violation—as well as of maintaining entire and unblemished their own integrity—and of redeeming to the people the faith they pledged for the fulfilment of the professions made when they selected him as a candidate, for the purpose of accomplishing great national reforms, and of establishing salutary practices of pure Republican government—deeming the period now arrived, when the public expect, and the crisis demands, a declaration of their opinions in respect to their future course, and a redemption of their pledges made in time past—do hereby represent and declare:—

That at the Presidential elections of 1824 & 1828, they gave the preference to Andrew Jackson, because they had sufficient reason to believe him identified with certain principles, professed by him, which the abuses of faction, & the inroads of ambition were rapidly sweeping from our political shores. [illegible] obviously essential to the preservation of popular rights, the duration of this happy republic, and the continuance of our inestimable Union. They looked to the man only as the means of giving a lasting establishment to those principles—his public services having inspired a confidence in his rectitude, that he would faithfully fulfil the great object of his election. A blind devotion to his will, as a chief, or an implicit acquiescence in his opinions, as those of an infallible master, were tenets never comprehended in our democratic creed. Although faithful to his country, yet we never believed him to be exalted above the erring faculties of a mortal, however confidently we cherished the conviction, that he never would prove faithless and derelict to his pledges and professions. In the wreath of glory that entwined his brows as a victor, we thought we beheld a sure guarantee for the consummation of his principles as a statesman. Without thinking him splendidly endowed, we had reason to believe him inflexibly honest, a trait in his character, that on all occasions was the theme of his exultation, and the subject of his pride. If, on this point, experience has proved us to have been too credulous, or too confiding—the fault in us is as much allied to virtue, as the failure on his part is alien to it. Still, respect for his services to his country, in the field, inspires us with clemency in our reproaches for his errors in the Cabinet. We are willing to believe that his head rather than his heart has been in fault; and that age, increasing the infirmities of a fragile constitution, has contributed to frustrate expectations which a more vigorous period of life might have fulfilled; notwithstanding the arduous nature of the task which he was called to discharge; more peculiarly arduous to him, because destitute of that experience in government, and unaccustomed to those deep habits of thought and study, which alone qualify the statesman to shine, or the patriot to triumph; a fact which, while it mitigates censure, at the same time pleads in behalf of his country, for his timely retirement to the shades of private life. For what mind, however great by nature can resist the ruinous inroads of time; and what man, who has acquired glory and renown, in the summer of his life, would consent to become a spectacle for compassion, by a public exhibition of the follies and weakness of age; detracting from his just fame, and unconsciously inflicting the most serious wounds upon his country.

When we selected Gen. Jackson for our candidate, indifferent to every thing but principle, and determined to peril all minor considerations for a great and public blessing—we announced to him our principles, and he fully reciprocated our views, elucidating their utility, and often adding embellishments to their charms. He avowed, professed, and confirmed all, and more than all that we required. Rather ultra than deficient in the doctrines of liberty, we were left to expect from him too much, rather than to distrust him of too little—thus verifying the old remark, that those who are the most zealous in preaching, are apt to be the most lax and culpable in practice.

The principles common to Gen. Jackson and his early supporters may be embraced under the following heads:

1. To establish the precedent of one Presidential term of four years.

2. To make no appointment of Members of Congress; so as to preserve the integrity of the Legislature, from the corruption of the executive power and patronage.

3. To promote American Industry by an adequate Tariff.

4. To promote Internal Improvement.

5. To establish the principle of Rotation in Office.

The consent of Gen. Jackson to become a candidate for the second term, has violated his solemn and repeated pledge to his party, that he would serve but four years, and thus establish a salutary precedent, which would apply the axe to the very root of political corruption. Nothing could have been more emphatic and solemn than his declarations on this point; and nothing more ardent and zealous than our attestations of its importance. Experience has sadly shewn, to what dangerous corruptions and abuse of the executive patronage a desire for re-election had often carried the most well meaning of our Chief Magistrates; a re-election in which the great body of the people took no active part:—a re-election supported chiefly from mercenary motives by a paid band of rapacious office holders; clamorous for the continuance of their pay—audacious in their deportment insulting to the people—and reckless of the consequences of their cupidity. Experience had also proved that it not only warped the integrity of the President but destroyed his independence, impaired his vigor, and distracted his attention:—his solicitude being directed from his country to himself, and the public interest sacrificed to personal ambition. It was found even to contaminate our morals, and corrupt the public press;—the eagerness of the incumbent to secure his renewed lease of power, leading him to acts from which the patriot would revolt as criminal and unjust; as fatal to the rights and destructive to the liberty of the citizen. How shall we express our astonishment and grief, that Andrew Jackson should have brought himself within the possible sphere of such evils? But we must supersede our administration by drawing our determination not to sustain him in a course so baneful to his country, and so blighting to the lustre of his own glory.

The appointment of Members of Congress has been the prolific source of the most dangerous collusion between the legislative and executive branches of the government. It holds out the lure of office to the representatives of the people, enticing them to a dereliction of their duty; and rewards the pliant tool of executive pleasure who may betray his country or violate his oath. The constitution itself has attempted by an express provision to guard against this impure collusion of the two separate branches of the government, where it declares—section 6, "that no member of Congress shall be appointed to any office, which was created, or the emoluments whereof were augmented during the term for which he was elected." We recite the article, to show that the spirit of this constitutional exclusion clearly extends to the inhibition of all appointments from the members of Congress. Even on the supposition that no direct possible corruption existed, in such an application of executive patronage, still the undue influence which it must exercise over Congress, cannot but ultimately lead to consequences as pernicious as the most open and high handed corruption.—The mere fact of being eligible to honors and rewards from the executive is sufficient to [illegible] power, instead of inflexible champions of freedom, and faithful agents of their constituents. The saying of Walpole, that every man has his price expresses a fallible trait in the human character that ought to construct every possible barrier against temptation. When even a patriot like Andrew Jackson can forego his purposes, and renounce his resolves, at the beck of ambition, how shall we trust those of less firmness or more frailty? When in an evil hour he threw wide open his door to corruption the patriot was lost in the politician, and the art of the demagogue triumphed over the honesty of the republican.

On this subject we must quote his own words in his letter to the legislature of Tennessee—"there is no truth more sacred in politics" says Gen. Jackson "and none more conclusively stamped upon all the state constitutions, as well as the federal constitution, than that which requires the three great departments of power the legislative, judicial, and executive, to be kept separate and apart. But simple and manifest as this truth is, the difficulty of arriving at it in practice, with constitutional restraints, still remains, and presents a question, whether the wisdom and virtue of the present generation with a view to amendment in this important matter, may not be usefully employed?"

"With a view to sustain more effectually in practice the axiom which divides the three great classes of power into independent constitutional checks, I would impose a provision, rendering any Member of Congress ineligible to the office, under the general government, during the term for which he was elected, and for the two years thereafter, except in cases of judicial office."

"The effect of such a constitutional provision is obvious. By it Congress in a considerable degree, would be free from that connexion with the executive department, which at present gives strong grounds of apprehension and jealousy on the part of the people. Members, instead of being liable to be withdrawn from legislating on the great interests of the nation, through prospects of executive patronage, would be more liberally confided in by their constituents while their vigilance would be less interrupted by party feelings and party excitements. Calculations from intrigue or management, would fail; nor would their deliberations, or their investigation of subjects consume so much time. The morals of the country would be improved, and virtue uniting with the labors of the representative, and with the official ministers of the law would tend to perpetuate the honor and glory of the government. But if this change in the constitution should not be obtained, and the important appointments continue to devolve on the representatives in Congress, it requires no depth of thought to be convinced, that corruption will be the order of the day; and that under the garb of conscientious sacrifices to establish precedents for the public good, evils of serious importance to the freedom and prosperity of the republic may arise. It is through this channel that the people may expect to be attacked in their constitutional sovereignty, and where tyranny may be well apprehended to spring up in some favorable emergency. Against such inroads, every guard ought to be interposed, and none better occurs than that of closing the suspected avenue with some necessary constitutional restriction. We know human nature to be prone to evil; we are early taught to pray that we may not be led into temptation; and hence the opinion, that by constitutional provisions all avenues to temptation on the part of our political servants should be closed."

With this corruption so justly described, and vividly painted, in all its ramifications and consequences, has General Jackson practised to a pernicious extent, unheard of among his predecessors! Comment on such transgression is needless; and surprise is stifled by grief and mortification, over the weakness of nature, and the frailty of the man. Without good faith there can be no morals in government, and the support of General Jackson for a re-election, after the flagrant violation of a pledge so solemn, and a principle so important, would be knowingly to put upon the people a fraud and imposition, as insulting to their understandings, as dangerous and destructive to their liberties.

But it is not merely one—it is on all points that he has proved reckless to his word, and inconsistent with his professions. On no part of his public character did he boast with so much pride & ardor as his Democracy. In his letter to Doctor Wm. Dickson, he makes a full avowal of the entire principles of the Jefferson School. He says:

"Believing as I do, that any citizen who does obtain the suffrages of the freemen of Tennessee, must be a character, the composition of which is virtue, talents, and the true whig principles of seventy-six; in short sir, that he must be a republican, and in politics, like Cæsar's wife, not only chaste but unsuspected.

"The first two component parts of this character I know you possess; the latter, as to myself, *I* have ever thought you did. But sir, the public mind has been lately led to believe that your political sentiments are doubtful, and some have held you up as an aristocrat. These reasons have operated with me to call on you to answer the following interrogatories:—first, are you, and have you always been a true admirer of the whig system of seventy six? Have you always been an admirer of the Constitution of the United States friendly to its administration, agreeable to the true literal meaning of the instrument, and banishing the dangerous doctrine of implication? Have you always been and are you now, opposed to standing armies in time of peace? Are you now, & have you always been inimical to a standing armament? Are you now, and have you have always been opposed to foreign political connexions? Are you now, and have you always been, opposed to the extension of executive patronage? Have you always been, and are you now, an advocate for freedom of religion & freedom of the press? Are you now and have you always been, a friend to economy in the public disbursements and an enemy to the system of loans? And lastly, are you a real republican in principle, and will you be a republican in practice?"

From a creed so full and ample, we had every reason to believe that his practice would have corresponded to his professions, and his appointments and measures assume a [illegible] shape. But when once licensed in office, what was his conduct? He called to his counsels & his confidence, some of the most conspicuous ultra-federalists of the country, who had distinguished themselves for their opposition to the late war, to compose his original cabinet. The present even exceeds the first, in this inconsistent association of the federalists of '98 [illegible] the Jefferson School. The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Attorney General, have ever been noted for their ultra devotion to the antagonist party; and in his local and minor appointments, a similar preference is generally perceived to prevail.—Fidelity to the principles of Thomas Jefferson, consistency with our past lives, honor, virtue, and a true regard for the rights of man, all forbid us to yield our support to one who has so totally sacrificed his principles, and so entirely abandoned his party. As democrats, we cannot support Andrew Jackson, or give countenance to his federal appointments, and aristocratical career.

When it is considered how intimately connected the purity of the press is with the freedom of elections, we cannot be too jealous of the exercise of government over this controlling lever of public opinion, nor too indignant when we behold it extended over the States for the purpose of promoting his re-election. His own words on this subject must be conclusive. In his inaugural speech he declared that,

"The recent demonstration of public sentiment inscribes on the list of executive duties in characters too legible to be overlooked, the task of reform, which will require particularly the correction of those abuses that have brought the patronage of the Federal Government into conflict with the freedom of elections.

It would be our desire to conceal, not parade his aberrations, were such tenderness compatible with public duty, or consonant to the justice due to ourselves. The undisguised purchase of the public press by officers & minions, furnishes a sad comment on his professed regard for its purity and freedom; when he erects in the metropolis of the nation, and through the agency of a treasury officer and the postmaster general, one of the most noted partisan newspapers, we not only feel it a wrong, but are compelled to regard it as an insult to the people whose integrity it questions and whose intelligence it derides.

As Americans, jealous of the honour, and sensitive of the fame of our country among the nations of the earth, would that we could draw a veil over the unhappy and degrading scenes that have recently disgraced the capital of the republic. Who among those who gave their rash and generous credence to the professions of Andrew Jackson, could have anticipated, amidst the wildest dreams of political adversity or forebodings of ruin, that in two short years his administration would have brought confusion on his country, shame on his friends, and triumph to his enemies? But let us, in compassion, draw the curtain over a picture which if fully exposed to view, might reveal what would crimson the cheek of chastity, as well as excite a pang in the heart of the patriot. It more than suffices to know that he composed his first cabinet on wrong principles, from the Members of Congress, and if public report speak but half the truth, he has dissolved it in principles which equally shock the moral sense & the political integrity of the American people; principles unknown to the constitution, and subversive of our rights. It now remains to state the change of position as to parties, which a dereliction from principles almost necessarily induced, when General Jackson came to power.

Whilst true to his original creed of democracy, he remained faithful to the people, who took him up from affection, and sustained him as a candidate from principle. But the moment he became derelict—the moment he left the path of the patriot for the devious way of the politician—that moment he forsook the people for intriguers and interested aspirants, who calculating to succeed, by using his popularity for their evil purposes, gave him a hollow hearted support for the substantial recompense of honors and rewards. It was in this manner that Amos Kendall and Francis P. Blair, who had advised Mr. Clay to vote for Mr Adams—were bought into his support, and became the lawgivers of his party—whilst his original friends were carelessly overlooked or ungratefully discarded, or estranged by a barrier of corruption, which to surmount required the sacrifice of all the principles and measures for which they had associated in his support.

A total revolution of character, of principles, of purposes, of opinions like this, require no argument or elucidation to prove, must reverse the position of the individual,—dissolve all the affinities of party cohesion, and rend asunder all the sympathies of party attachment, that originally existed. Whilst we announce the fact, however, we cannot give countenance to a fraud; and on the same grounds that we at first accorded him our adhesion, do we hereby withdraw from Andrew Jackson our future support; convinced that time, circumstances, and power, have destroyed that identity of political character that once attracted our admiration won our confidence, and secured our affection.

NATHAN JONES,
JOHN M. TAYLOR,
JAS. HACKARA,
STEPHEN SIMPSON,
WM. HEWITT,
HENRY S. HUGHES.

Philadelphia, July 14, 1831.

[From the U. S. Gazette.]

THE HON LOUIS McLANE, AND THE BRITISH WEST INDIA TRADE.—No. I

The conduct of the Hon. Louis McLane, as an envoy of the United States to a foreign country and entrusted in some measure with the care of our national honor, as well as our commercial interests, appears to have been highly exceptionable in many respects, and to evince a remarkable deficiency of enlarged view and national pride.

The honor of a nation requires that in its intercourse with other nations, through the instrumentality of envoys or other public ministers, there should be no cringing, no self abasement, no confession of inferiority or need. In all the difficult and important negotiations conducted on behalf of this country, there has been no example of such fawning, such solicitation, such *begging*, as have been exhibited by Mr. McLane in London.

This is strong language; but no exaggeration. Any American that will look at the dignified and manly courtesy of our diplomatic correspondence, even when this country was almost depending for life on a French alliance, or desiring very ardently a peace of England; who will observe how carefully, under the worst discouragements, the national honor was guarded, and the tone of supplication was avoided,—must feel mortified when he reads the beseeching petitions of Mr. McLane for the favor of the British government.

Lord Amherst, it is well known, after making a toilsome and perilous journey to Pekin, refused to gain an audience of the Emperor of China by submitting to the degradation which the rules of Chinese court etiquette required. He was right; for a nation loses more by one official submission to debasement, than can be compensated by any temporary favor which such meanness may purchase.

Mr. McLane would have been the very man to go to *Pekin*. No bow could have been too low for him; *ko-tows* would have suited his spirit precisely.

But the English do not exact any *ko-tow* etiquette. Many treaties, conventions, arrangements, &c. have been made with that government, by our ministers, without any servility or humiliation of language. In Mr. McLane the condescension was purely voluntary, and new.

The *formal* language of diplomacy is in a great measure fixed by usage; the observance of such forms and the customary assurances of personal friendship are matters of course; but those things being observed, there remains entire liberty to maintain the dignity and equality of the respective nations and of their official organs.

Mr. McLane went to England, in August, 1829, and was charged, among other matters, with a proposition to arrange the West India trade, on the same terms as had been previously offered, (by the instruction of Mr. Clay thro' Mr. Gallatin; or, to use Mr. McLane's phraseology, on terms "*coincident*" with that offer.

Very soon after his arrival he held conversations with the British Secretary for foreign affairs, and presented the propositions.

Not receiving any answer whatever, and after waiting till December the 12th, he put it all in writing, in the form of a letter, to Lord Aberdeen.

In this letter he speaks of the President's anxious desire to terminate a state of things prejudicial to the friendly relations of the two countries, of the President's *hopes that true policy* alone would dispose his majesty's government to change regulations injurious to the interests of *both* countries, of his own unwillingness to suppose any unfriendly motive, and of an appeal to the liberality of his majesty's government, on behalf of the commercial interests of the United States, &c.

I do not say this was going too far, but it was sufficient. This was bowing low enough. It was giving Lord Aberdeen the opportunity of making a commercial arrangement on fair and equal terms, and yet as a *grant* and a *boon* to us. It was claiming from the favor of the British what Mr Clay had intended Mr. Gallatin to propose as a matter of business and *mutual* accommodation.

Lord Aberdeen was not tempted, however, even by the chance of becoming the acknowledged benefactor of the United States, or of their "commercial interests."

A short, dry note, acknowledging the receipt of the letter, promising to bring the proposition under consideration; and ending with the usual assurance of friendly feelings towards the government of the United States, &c. was all the notice taken of it.

Mr. McLane waited till March 16th, 1830; and then, having had no answer to his propositions; or his '*appeal*,' wrote a letter, or rather a *book*, addressed to Lord Aberdeen, comprising an argument of the question on *British* grounds entirely; just such a *treatise* as might have served for an *article* in a monthly magazine; not *strong* enough, perhaps, but quite *long* enough, for the Quarterly Review; but wholly out of time and place, as coming from an *American* functionary.

It is just as if a British envoy, here, should favor us with an essay against the constitutionality of the Tariff and Internal Improvement!

My *present* subject is only the *manner* in which the *negotiation* (as it has been *mis*-called was conducted. The character of Mr. McLane's diplomacy, independent of the style adopted by him, will be the theme of another communication.

The proposition having been laid before the British government, *early* in the autumn, and repeated in writing on the 12th of December it might have been considered due to the dignity of the American government, to abstain from any further importunities until an answer of some sort, should be given. But, at all events, if Mr. McLane thought it incumbent on him, to instruct the inexperience of Lord Aberdeen, as to the 'true interests' of Great Britain; he might at least have abstained from *cringing* to his lordship, and ought to have been more sparing of entreaties than ever.

But in this most prolix of all diplomatic addresses on record, he speaks of the *reasonableness* of his demands: *prays* for a decision—'*solicits*' the earliest *convenient* answer—*regrets* that ancient prejudices exist—admits that the *measures* of the United States, had contributed to produce the present evil—has 'no disposition to deny the injurious effects of the existing regulation on the commercial enterprise' of his country—*trusts* to be *excused* for recurring to some of his own arguments—calls this his '*application*, for an early decision—speaks of *favor* expected—of the *pretensions* of the American government; or rather for his phrase is even worse—of '*American pretensions*' advanced in previous years, but now disclaimed by him; and of the *improvident* legislation; asks that the United States may be *permitted* to contribute supplies to the islands—*begs leave* further to say &c. and *hopes* to be *excused* for asking Lord Aberdeen to *consider*, &c.—Hopes for a *favorable* decision, and repeats his *deep solicitude* for the result!!

All this is very courtly, and under the circumstances, is very abject; and the whole tenor of the composition is of the same character.—But the meanest part of the whole is, that he lays the honor of his country at the feet of the British ministry, and volunteers, for the United States, a *confession of having been in the wrong!*

X. Y.

No. II.

We have already seen the very courtly and submissive style adopted by Mr. McLane in his letter to the British Secretary, and at the close of the preceding number, had come to his extraordinary admission, that his own country had been in the wrong.

He declines, he says, 'entering into a defence of the omission on the part of the United States, to embrace the offer made by Great Britain in the act of July 5, 1825,' and he declares that 'the claims advanced in justification of the United States, have been abandoned by those who made them, have received no sanction from the People, and are not now revived.'

It is difficult, if not impossible, to know what Mr. McLane intended to say in the above sentence. If he means that Mr. Adams & his Cabinet advanced claims in justification of an omission of any sort, and then abandoned the claims or the justification—or that the advocates of the omission abandoned any claims for the nation, in reference to the West India trade which had not received the sanction of the people—his assertion is a *mere libel*. It is a libel because false and malicious; and it is vile in purpose and motive, because intended to gratify the anti-American prejudice of the British Government, at the expense of the national character of the United States.

If it was his intention merely to cast censure upon the preceding Administration of his own Nation, the proceeding, even with this excuse, was totally unexampled in diplomatic history, and was equally discreditable and new.

Whatever party bickerings we may have had at home, we *had* invariably presented to foreign powers but *one* front in all our official communications with them. No diplomatic paper of an American Minister had ever before soiled its dignity by the indulgence of party malevolence.

But, whatever may have been the motive for this impropriety, the expression was not such as could be construed to apply to the conduct of a few public functionaries only. Even if it were possible to separate the Administration from the Nation and the National Legislature, Mr. McLane did not *so discriminate* nor was he so understood.

When Lord Aberdeen did at length condescend to reply to Mr. McLane's communications he took care to recapitulate, that the claims advanced in *justification* of the conduct of the *United States* had been *abandoned*, &c.

It was the *United States*—not individuals—that were declared to have acted towards Great Britain in a manner not to be justified!

It is curious to contrast the conduct of Mr. McLane with that of Mr. Gallatin, upon an occasion somewhat similar.

In the course of his correspondence with Mr. Canning, there was a letter to the British minister, which required no answer; but Mr. Gallatin thought one of its observations "had *almost* the *appearance* of a charge against the Government of the United States." He, therefore felt himself obliged to notice and repel the almost apparent charge.

But Mr. McLane himself teaches Lord Aberdeen how to make unequivocal charges, and takes the kick as tamely as a spaniel.

I have said that the charge, as made first by Mr. McLane—besides the indecency of its use on such an occasion, is in itself a falsehood; and I intend to prove it; but at present I keep to the subject with which I began.

His long and supplicatory letter of the 16th of March, besides all the coaxing phrases with which it abounds is also remarkable for the earnestness with which it advises the British Government to check the growing prosperity of our *sugar* planters. This counsel is addressed to Lord Aberdeen, just in the spirit that might be supposed to actuate a loyal *Englishman* anxious to prostrate all rival foreign interests.

But notwithstanding the English feeling displayed in this letter, no answer was returned.—Lord Aberdeen was equally insensible to the opportunity of patronizing the 'commercial interests' of the United States, or protecting the British and Spanish sugar planters.

Mr McLane was not so easily rebuffed. Never had diplomatist been more cavalierly treated; but a sturdy beggar he certainly was, and persevering beyond example. In the middle of April, he "sought a conference," and asked for an answer to his communications; but he asked in vain.

In July, 1830 four months after his long letter, and seven months after his written propositions, both being unanswered, it became his duty to communicate the act of Congress of