Free Trader

# JEFFERSONIAN

The [illegible] in the United States by the C[illegible] prohibited by the States, [illegible] of the United States.

EDITOR & PROPRIETOR.

[illegible] APRIL 19, [illegible] VOLUME 13.

[illegible] ...ments not inserted with the number [illegible] will be continued until forbid, and [illegible] accordingly.

[illegible] candidates for office, five dollars, [illegible] invariably in advance.

[illegible] business with the office, to ensure [illegible] must be post paid or free.

[illegible] may be sent by mail at our risk, if a [illegible] taken from the postmaster.

[illegible] must be paid for on delivery.

From the Mississippian.

## [illegible]ETING—THE ANNEXATION [illegible] TEXAS TO THE UNION.

[illegible] Louisiana Courier of the 21st inst., [illegible] a statement in regard to the annex[illegible] Texas to the United States, which [illegible] the rumors heretofore afloat rela[illegible] negotiation of a treaty at Wash[illegible] the ratification thereof by the [illegible] of Texas. From the unequivo[illegible] employed by the Courier we [illegible] there can no longer be a doubt en[illegible] that the treaty has been agreed up[illegible] ratification of the treaty will be [illegible] in American history, second only [illegible] of the Federal Constitution [illegible]. The extent and fertility of [illegible] thus acquired, will incalcula[illegible] the agricultural products of this [illegible]—opening at once to the South, [illegible] the spread of the culture of our [illegible] to the north, a market for their [illegible] to the west, a place of trade [illegible], and to American [illegible] and mariners, a vast business [illegible] otherwise would have passed into [illegible] of a trans-atlantic power. The [illegible] benefit, politically, is to be [illegible] point of view. It offers to [illegible] people a home to quiet, and re[illegible] the machinations of the misguid[illegible] of the north. It renders south[illegible] interests, by the trade [illegible] the latter with the former. It [illegible] United States the almost undi[illegible] of the Gulf of Mexico. It [illegible] conflicting weight of sections [illegible], rendering the south capable [illegible] the equal of the north and west [illegible], and in influence in the nation[illegible].

[illegible] some of the advantages which [illegible] from the consummation of this [illegible] in diplomacy.

[illegible] following is the article from the [illegible] which we had reference in the [illegible]

[illegible]ing.—We have information from [illegible] on which we rely, that a treaty [illegible] be concluded between the United [illegible] Texas, by which the latter repub[illegible] annexed to our Union. The no[illegible] has been conclude[illegible] at Washing[illegible] probably is by this time consum[illegible] the ratification of the Senate. It is [illegible] and surprising developpe[illegible] been made as to the expediency [illegible] this great measure, a speedy [illegible] and in consequence of these it [illegible] supported by men of both parties in [illegible]. Considerable speculations in [illegible] have been made by individuals, [illegible] of the progress of the [illegible] in the cities of Baltimore, Philadel[illegible] New York.

[illegible]ment, who has access to the [illegible] of information, says—we [illegible] man's motive and purpose [illegible] the treaty was agreed upon [illegible] President on board the Princeton, [illegible] was sent to Texas for ratifi[illegible] least preliminary [illegible] It [illegible] since the [illegible] Texas negotiations were [illegible] and the treaty was now [illegible] the Senate. And was the [illegible] Gen. Henderson in [illegible] and he is not informed [illegible] Mr. Calhoun [illegible] was [illegible] of all.

[illegible] Philadelphia about the 10th [illegible] Winthrop of Massachusetts [illegible] party [illegible] [illegible] and [illegible] and the author [illegible] publications [illegible] One [illegible] circumstance is [illegible] his observations respecting the effects [illegible] emancipation upon slavery; have astounded [illegible] and convinced the remnant of abolitionist.

We express the most perfect confidence in the accuracy of our correspondent's information, and anticipate further developements by every mail from Washington. The conspiracy, [illegible] of which he speaks, will constitute a memorable epoch in the annals of our country. The Mexican minister at Washington, some time ago threatened war in case such a treaty were concluded. But our government knows what it is about.

## LATER INTELLIGENCE.

The *Picayune* of the 26th, says, "so far as the President of the United States and the President of Texas are concerned, the treaty is all but made." It further remarks that "the negotiation of the treaty was nearly concluded by the late Secretary Upsher, and that the Attorney General Nelson, (acting Secretary of State had brought it almost to a conclusion."

Nothing is certainly known of the details of the treaty. The country is rife with speculation in regard to it.

In part confirmation of the intelligence contained in the preceding extract from the *Louisiana Courrier*, we have to state, that Gov'r Henderson of Texas passed up the Mississippi River about ten days ago on his way to Washington. He called at Vicksburg to see his brother, Dr. Henderson, who resides in that city, but nothing clearly was ascertained as to the object of his mission to the American metropolis. None doubted but that he was the bearer of important despatches in relation to the treaty.

## FURTHER PARTICULARS IN REGARD TO ANNEXATION.

We feel satisfied that we cannot offer our [illegible] such as we receive through our exchange papers touching the annexation of Texas to the Union. We begin to fear the treaty will meet with much opposition in the Senate, and that if any, by abolition and whig influence there fail. We conversed with our Senator, Mr. Walker, on this point, when he was in Jackson in November last. He was, at that time, sanguine of the ratification of the treaty whenever it should be presented by the President. We do not doubt now that the proposition will receive the undivided support of the republican party in the Senate. Recent developements have filled us with fears that the drilled forces of federalism may defeat the grand enterprise. What are these developements? First, we find, Mr. Webster giving to the public press a long letter in *opposition to annexation*. The National Intelligencer, too, the organ of the federal party, is out in furious opposition. Even in Mississippi, it is well known, that some of the federal journals have taken the same position. If ever there was a question which should be decided withot reference to party feelings, surely this is one. Every patriot should look at this as a great National issue. No man who has watched the progress of events in Texas since the battle of San Jacinto, can have failed to arrive at the conclusion, that she is physically unable to sustain her independence. The question presented to our government is forcibly stated by a correspondent of the *Richmond Enquirer* who signs himself "Randolph of Roanoak." It is this,—"Texas now, or Texas never.—Texas for us, or Texas for Great Britain." With a population of less than 100,000 souls—in debt—without credit—without a navy—without an army; constantly threatened with a border war; how can Texas sustain the expensive paraphernalia of an independent nation. She cannot.—Her people already see this; and before entering into an alliance with Great Britain, they earnestly seek a union with their kindred in this country. Shall we spurn them, when we have so much to gain—so much to lose? Patriotism, disinterestedness, must surmount the demon of party spirit, which would oppose it.

In the globe of the 30th of March we find the subjoined interesting letter from Gen. Jackson. It presents some of the arguments to be considered in a military point in the event of annexation. Except Mr. Webster's letter and the news of the National Intelligencer, all news from Washington is [illegible] Thousands of letters from all parts of the United States, politicians of all parties, are pouring in upon Mr. [illegible] Wednesday. On the [illegible] by Mr. [illegible] Winthrop of Massachusetts [illegible] [illegible] of the [illegible] of Kentucky, [illegible] The House gave [illegible] by a vote of 119 to [illegible] [illegible] well.

## GEN. JACKSON'S LETTER.

*Copy of a letter from Gen. Andrew Jackson to A. V. Brown, Esq., a member of the House of Representatives.*

Hermitage, February 12th, 1844.

My Dear Sir,—Your's of the 23d ultimo has been received, and with it the Madisonian containing Gov. Gilmer's letter on the subject of the annexation of Texas to the United States.

You are not mistaken in supposing that I have formed an opinion on this interesting subject. It occupied much of my attention during my Presidency—and I am sure, has lost none of its importance, by what has since transpired.

Soon after my election in 1829 it was made known to me by Mr. Erwing, formerly our Minister to the Court of Madrid, that whilst in that Court, he had laid the foundation of a Treaty with Spain, for the cession of the Floridas, and the settlement of the boundary of Louisiana, fixing the western limit of the latter at the Rio Grande, agreeable to the understanding of France—that he had written home to our Government for powers to complete and sign the negotiation—but that instead of receiving such authority, the negotiation was taken out of his hands, and transferred to Washington, and a new treaty was there concluded—by which the Sabine and not the Rio Grande, was recognised and established as the boundary of Louisiana.

Finding that these statements were true; and that our Government did really give up that important territory, when it was at its option to retain it, I was filled with astonishment. The right to the Territory was obtained from France, Spain stood ready to acknowledge it to the Rio Grande, and yet the authority asked by our Minister to insert but in lieu of it a limit was adopted which stripped us of the whole of the vast country lying between the two rivers.

On such a subject I thought with the ancient Romans, that it was right never to cede any land or boundary of the Republic, but always to add to it by honorable treaty, thus extending the area of freedom; and it was in accordance with this feeling, that I gave our Minister to Mexico instructions to enter upon a negociation for the retrocession of Texas to the United States.

This negotiation failed, and I should ever regret it as a misfortune to both Mexico and the United States. Mr. Gilmer's letter presents many of the considerations, which, in my judgment, renders the step necessary to the peace and harmony of the two countries, but the point in it at that time, which most strongly impelled me to the course I pursued, was the injustice done to us, by the surrender of the territory, when it was obvious that it could have been retained, without increasing the consideration afterwards given for the Floridas. I could not but feel, that the surrender of so vast a territory, was attributable to an erroneous estimate of the tendency of our institutions, in which there was mingled somewhat of jealousy, to the rising greatness of the South and West.

But I forbear to dwell on this part of the history of this question. It is past, and cannot be undone. We can now only look at it, as one of annexation, if Texas presented to us; and if she does, I do not hesitate to say, that the welfare and happiness of our Union requires that it should be accepted.

If, in a military point of view alone, the question be examined, it will be found to be most important to the United States, to be in possession of that territory.

Great Britain has already made treaties with Texas; and we know that far-seeing nation never omits a circumstance in her extensive intercourse with the world, which can be turned to account, in increasing her military resources. May she not enter into an alliance with Texas? and reserving, as she doubtless will, the North Western boundary question as a cause of war with us, whenever she chooses to declare it. Let us suppose, that as an ally to Texas we are to fight her!

Preparatory to such a movement, she sends 20,000 or 30,000 men to Texas—organize them on the Sabine, where supplies and arms can be concentrated, before we have even notice of her intentions—make a lodgment on the Mississippi—arouse the negroes to insurrection—the country falls, and with it New Orleans, and a servile war rages through the whole South and West.

In the meantime, she is also marching an army along the upper Western frontier from Canada, which, in co-operation with the army from Texas, spread ruin and havoc from the lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

[illegible] the national loss we may [illegible] a movement would be [illegible] with such force as we could be [illegible] on short notice.

[illegible] that Texas borders upon us on our West to the 42d degree of North latitude, that our Southern boundary to the Pacific [illegible] remember, also, that if annexed to the United States, our Western boundary would be the Rio Grande, which is of itself a fortification, an account of its extensive, barren, and uninhabitable plains. With such a barrier on our West, we are invincible. The whole European world could not, in combination against us, make an impression on our Union. Our population on the Pacific would rapidly increase and soon be strong enough for the protection of our Eastern Whalers—and in the worst event could always be sustained by timely aids from the intermediate country.

From the Rio Grande overland a large army could not march, or be supplied, unless from the Gulf by water, which by vigilance could always be intercepted—and to march an army near the Gulf, they could be by militia harrassed and detained, until an organized force could be collected to meet them.

But I am in danger of running into unnecessary details, which my debility will not enable me to close. The question is full of interest also, as it affects our domestic relations, and as it may bear upon those of Mexico to us. I will not undertake to follow it out to its consequences in those respects—though I must say, that in all its aspects, the annexation of Texas to the United States promise to enlarge the circle of free institutions, and is essential to the United States, particularly, as lessening the probabilities of future collision with foreign powers, and giving them greater efficiency, in spreading the blessings of peace.

I return you my thanks for your kind letter on this subject, and subscribe myself, with great sincerity, your friend and [illegible]

N. B. The papers furnished me by Mr. Erwin, to which I have refered in this letter, can be placed in your possession if desired. A. J.

The following is a letter from Colonel Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky to Mr. Walker.

*White Sulpher*, Ky. Feb. 24, 1844.

My Dear Sir: I have received and read your letter upon the re-annexation of Texas to the United states. It is a 120 pounder. It does you honor and credit—proving your patriotism, your talent and industry. It is a master piece of composition and information, &c.

Mr. Calhoun, in a letter to Mr. Walker, says: "It is well known that I have been from the first in favor it," (annexation.)

---

*Knock Down Argument.*—The New Haven Register thus cleverly exposes the absurdities of those who undertake to defend the new tariff.

'The whigs have at least five strings to their fiddle, when discoursing tariff music. First, they insist that our manufactures are reviving because the present tariff law shuts off foreign importations, and gives us the market. Secondly, that under its wise provisions, commerce is improving, and that foreign goods are pouring into the country at an unprecedented rate, threatening to overflow the treasury with money received in duties! Thirdly, that the home market, being *thus secured* to the Americans, competition among ourselves reduces the prices of wares from what it was before the present law was made. Fourthly, that we were starving at the old prices, because foreigners undersold us in the market—while we are now growing rich at even less prices, when the foreign importations are increasing!—Lastly, that the foreigner pays the duty—and finally, that 'duties do not affect at all the price of articles.'

These different positions are all necessary to the vindication of the restrictive system. The only misfortune is that they refute each other, but this seems to be no misfortune at all in the eyes of those who use them as arguments.

There are persons who take a mischievous pleasure in getting people together who cannot help quarrelling. It appears to us that the friends of the tariff have something of this feeling. They seem to delight in arguments which disagree and contradict each other. Their arguments are truly knock down arguments, for they knock each other down.—*Evening Post.*

---

Women use lovers as they do needle-cases, they play with them awhile, and when they have got all they can by them, throw them away, and for new cases, and then perhaps take by the new ones all that they got by the old ones.