

CAROLINA CENTINEL.

VOLUME III.]

NEWBERN, N. C. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 4, 1820.

[NUMBER 137.]

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY
PASTEUR & WATSON,
At \$3 per annum—half in advance.

CULTURE OF COTTON.

In the Centinel of the 30th September, we published some remarks of a Jones county correspondent respecting the culture of Cotton. The Editor of the American Farmer in republishing that article, has subjoined the following note,

"The writer of a communication in the North Carolina Centinel, from which the above is an extract, estimates too highly the humble services of the Editor of this paper—but we trust that we shall be able in a few weeks to throw some light on the culture of Cotton and Sugar—two of the great staples of Southern Agriculture.

In August last the Editor was driven by the orders of his physician, for the revival of declining health, to make a tour on horse back, through the high lands of Virginia. To a very distinguished and wealthy planter of South Carolina, whom he met at the Warm Springs—he submitted such queries in writing, as seemed best calculated to develop information on the most essential points—touching the culture—the diseases, &c. of Sugar and Cotton—and most especially to the causes and means of prevention, or cure of the rot in Cotton. This gentleman with an urbanity which marked all his deportment to a stranger in ill health, and therefore not likely to be forgotten, promised at the first leisure moment, after his return home, to make out replies, in detail, to all the interrogatories proposed—and as the season for "pitching the crop" is not near at hand, we forbear to anticipate these details—by giving our imperfect notes of the conversation on these subjects—any further than merely at this time to warn the Planter to take more care of his Cotton seed—to have them well dried, cured and secured from the weather—more hereafter.

The Editors of the Centinel are respectfully requested to copy the above note.

Editor American Farmer.

POLITICAL.

FROM THE NATIONAL ADVOCATE.

BRITISH POLITICS.

It is somewhat amusing to observe the efforts made by some to persuade the people of this country, that the British nation enjoy the greatest portion of Freedom of any other nation on the face of the earth. They can see no difference between an hereditary King, holding his power by "divine right," and incapable by law of doing wrong, and the elective chief magistrate of a people to whom he is at all times accountable; they pretend to discover nothing incongruous in the establishment of a haughty and dominant nobility, born to honors and wealth, which they frequently disgrace and abuse, and to legislative power of which they are incapable, and never are deprived, though they are generally the most immoral and flagitious of men. These admirers of this "stupendous fabric of human wisdom," of these "Corinthian pillars of the state," can see nothing wrong in all this, nor in the existence of religious hierarchy, which denies to every man the exercise of his political rights, unless they profess the established creed. They tell us, that the enormous amount of taxes levied upon the people, so far from being oppressive, is a proof of the great wealth of the nation, and of its ardent devotion to a government which it regards as the wisest and best constructed on earth. It is impossible say these admirers of the British constitution, that the sovereign or the nobles can exercise despotical power, because this is sufficiently provided against by the House of Commons, the "third estate of the realm," the "free and fair representation of the people, forming a counterpoise to the other two estates, and a formidable barrier against all unconstitutional encroachments." Such is the language which may be every day heard coming from the mouths of men pretending to be republicans, but who, in fact, are only so in name, and wholly undeserving the privileges of freemen.

Nothing shows more clearly the want of correct information on the subject of British politics than to hear these men enlarging upon the advantages of the English constitution. The British nation has no constitution, nor ever had one. It has a religious creed and a bo-

dy of civil law, but we search in vain for any thing like a written exposition of civil rights. Their much boasted *magna charta* and their *bill of rights* are mere shadows, which have long ago been divested of their substance by the inroads of the crown. Even the commentaries of Blackstone, which have been regarded as an epitome of the British constitution, only represent things as they ought to be, or might have been many centuries past. When it is found necessary to accomplish a particular object the King and his Ministers make no scruple of violating the most obvious principles of equity without regard to the authority of this or any other English lawyer. The celebrated writings of D'Loime on the English constitution present a beautiful picture of civil liberty, but it is a picture merely; the reality is no where to be found.

Some idea may be found of the equitable principles, which guide the House of Peers, by the proceedings now going on against the Queen of England. It is evidently from these that a predetermination exists in the minds of the "noble Lords" to convict her. A little attention to the House of Commons will show that no greater reliance is to be placed in the justice of that "honorable body." In all cases, indeed, where the rights of the people are concerned, the "third estate," instead of being a check upon the other two branches uniformly decided in conformity with their known wishes, and hostility to the views of the nation. This is perfectly in unison with the corrupt formation, which takes its rise, not from the free suffrages of the people, but from the influence of the crown, the nobles, and, what are called the borough-mongers. The following statement exhibits, as near as possible, the present constitution of the British House of Commons:

| | |
|--|-----|
| Members returned by 87 Peers in England and Wales, | 218 |
| by 21 Peers in Scotland | 31 |
| by 36 Peers in Ireland | 51 |
| — | 300 |
| 144 | 300 |
| by 90 Commons in England & Wales | 137 |
| by 14 Commons in Scotland | 14 |
| by 19 Commons in Ireland | 20 |
| by Governmental Nomination | 16 |

Total returned by nomination in which the people have no vote 487

Independent of Nomination, 171

Total House of Commons, 658

A Majority of the above members is actually nominated by 189 individuals; and this majority decides all questions in the name of the whole population which amounts to nearly fourteen millions. Of this population, it is calculated, that the number of persons qualified to vote did not exceed 122,084. The city of Glasgow, with a population of 100,784, has not a single representative in Parliament. This is also the case with Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, and Sheffield, the population of which extends from 35,000, to 98,000. There are upwards of 20 others cities, none of which have less than ten thousand inhabitants, that have no voice in the national representation. One city, Bath, with a population of 31,469, has only 30 persons qualified to vote, and these send two members to Parliament. Gatton, and Castle Rising, in which there are only four dwelling houses, together with old Sarum and Midhurst, in which there are no dwelling houses return four members!

But this shameful inequality, is not the only feature in the English representation deserving of reprobation. All the ministers of the king and many of their clerks have seats in one or other of the houses of Parliament; and by an official document, printed by order of the House of Commons, dated in May 1809, it appears that 76 members of the then parliament received in salaries and pensions, free from all deductions, no less a sum than £164,003 sterling, or \$728,137 per annum. The ancestors of the present race of Englishmen had enacted "that no person who has an office or place of profit under the King, or receives a pension from the crown, shall be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons." They had also declared, that "it is a high infringement of the liberties of the Commons of England, for any lord of parliament or lord lieutenant to take any concern, or in any way interfere with the return of members to that house." These salutary declarations proceeded upon the principle, that a servant of the crown could not at the same time be a faithful servant of the people, and that a member ought not to

be allowed to spend the money which he is expressly deputed to save. It was left to the profligate ministers of the last and the present reign to violate these correct principles. Even the selling of seats in the House of Commons, which a member openly declared to "be as notorious as the sun at noon-day," has been vindicated by the very virtuous ministers of the no less virtuous George the IV.

The people of England have, for upwards of half a century, been endeavouring to obtain a reform of parliament.—Petitions after petitions have been presented for that purpose without the least redress. Some of the greatest men in the country, among whom, at one period ranked the celebrated William Pitt, took part in these efforts to restore their natural rights, but they have always been defeated by the ministers of the crown, and by no one more strenuously than by the same William Pitt, who very early became an apostate from liberty, & a violent abettor of corruption in all its multifarious forms. It was this servile tool of despotism who stood foremost in denouncing the friends of freedom as jacobins, and levellers, while he recommended, and carried into effect by his pensioned majorities, those political measures which have reduced the people of England to a state of slavery and wretchedness. It is absurd to expect, that men, possessing such unlimited power, and who can at all times purchase a majority in the House of Commons, will ever think of reforming themselves. History affords no instance of a single tyrant abdicating his authority. It would be a real phenomenon to expect this of the many tyrants, who rule the English nation with a rod of iron. If the head of this phalanx, was favourably disposed to his subjects there might be some chance of their being heard; but as he constantly lends deaf ear to their complaints, nothing but a revolution, by which the inordinate power of the crown will be brought within proper bounds, can ever restore the free and universal right of election to the British nation.

From the Baltimore Morning Chronicle.

We have noticed of late an extraordinary opinion advanced by an English writer; it is this: If the monarchs of Europe are destined to fall, let America beware; if strong governments cannot stand the shock of popular commotion, how shall weak ones abide such a trial? Now, what does this writer mean by popular commotion, as applied to a government of the people? He has indeed cited the republics of Greece and Rome, which are in all points different from the American.—Let us state at once the specific point of difference—the American constitution contains the principle of its own reformation—the principle of its own adoption to times and to circumstances, may vary—the people are by the terms of the constitution itself empowered to make any alterations that they may deem necessary—in fact, such alterations have already been made with as little popular commotion, of which this writer speaks so flippantly, as if the same amendments had been made to a lease by the concurrent assent of the parties. What have the people to fight about when the instrument is in their own hands, and revocable or amendable at their own sovereign will and pleasure? But not to spin metaphysical cobwebs, not to substitute speculation for fact let this English writer point out in all the histories of all the European monarchies a change, except by an appeal to military force.—The thing is not even calculated on; Blackstone in his analysis of the English constitution, endeavors to evade the objection urged by the principle, that "the King can do no wrong," that he may even commit murder with impunity, states, as Burke after him does, that this must be a case of war, and not a case provided for by the constitution itself.—The policy of this argument, goes upon the ground that not only the kingly office, but the person is so essentially a part of the constitution, that nothing can affect him personally, without the whole constitutional edifice is prostrated by his downfall.—Arguing from such postulates, our English friend sees the same difficulties in the change of a President, as he would in the change of the Hanoverian or of the Bourbon dynasty.

What right for instance, has a son of James Monroe, provided he should be blessed with one, to inherit the paternal office? Will he plead an hereditary? Will John Quincy Adams rest his claim to that office on that plea? No, before either the one or the other can claim this confidence, they must be able to convince ten millions of people, that they have no hereditary right, and they must rely exclusively on their personal claims to pre-

eminence. Let George the Fourth now disband his army, abandon his crown, retire to the shade of private life, and rest his pretensions to the sceptre on the ground of his personal merit, if he dares to abide such an ordeal. We will appeal to the common sense of all mankind if this comparison is invidious.

A change is made, in our Chief Magistrate, once in 8 years regularly, & it may be made once in four. It is a part and an essential part, of the Constitution, that this change must take place. No change, on the other hand, is admitted in European monarchies, without a broad and direct appeal to military force, without, as the writer thinks proper to express himself "popular commotion." Popular commotion, according to the very principle laid down by the temperate Blackstone himself, must attend such a change in the English government, as is done once in every four years by the quiet and peaceable progress of election. The change of dynasty is provided for in the constitution itself. But our constitution does not end even here in its anxiety to prevent popular commotion. The people authorize themselves to say, we will abide by this instrument, so long as we deem it necessary—we reserve to ourselves the right of making such alterations as we deem proper, and we will even specify in that instrument itself the manner in which such alterations shall be made. When an indictment is presented against an individual for a breach of the laws in the United States, does it state that the crime was done against the Majesty of James Monroe? No, his name is not even mentioned; it is stated to have been done against the majesty, not of a monarch, but of ten millions of people—against the majesty of those who can, by a single word from their lips, establish or prostrate the government.—In short, our government is built on revolutionary principles, and on that account there is no danger of a revolution; the people as long as they are satisfied with the Constitution do not alter—in other words, revolutionize it; because there is no occasion. When such an alteration does become necessary, it is provided for in the body of the Constitution itself, and the people can do that legally, which in all European governments can be done only by rebellion? Will it be said that there is any parallel between the two cases? Will it be said that we cannot choose a president without a rebellion. If we allow the principles of this English writer their full swing, he is prepared to maintain this hypothesis.

Late from England.

New-York, Oct. 22.

By the arrival of the British ship Mars, captain Mitchell, in 22 days from Liverpool, which place she left on the 29th, we have received papers to the 22d, of which the following are extracts:

The London Traveller of the 20th of Sept. states, that Lord Castlereagh is reported to have said in the British House of Commons, on Monday evening, that if the whole proceeding against the queen were a conspiracy, no person would be more willing to get at the fact than himself.

The Liverpool Advertiser of the 26th says:—"There is some reason to hope that the present pause in the legislative proceedings against the Queen, may be attended with salutary effects."

The last accounts from Spain state the interesting fact of the actual destruction and sale of the property of the Inquisition.

Admiral Sir Home Popham, died at Cheltenham, on the 11th of September. He had recently returned from the Jamaica station.

The Emperor of Russia has declined the invitation of the Emperor of Austria, to meet his Imperial Majesty at the camp at Pest.

The ship Liverpool was lost on the coast of Africa, in May last. The blacks boarded the wreck, and robbed her of every thing they could lay their hands on; stripped the captain and crew, and took them ashore in canoes, entirely naked. The captain and three of the crew were afterwards purchased.

Addresses to the Queen were daily and hourly received by her majesty.

The Ladies of Edinburgh have sent the Queen an Address.

The females of Exeter have also sent the Queen an Address.

On the 12th of Sept. her majesty received addresses—3 from Exeter; 1 from the parish of St. Sidwell; 1 from Montrose; from the males and females of Leeds; from Ross; 1 in verse from the ladies of Bristol, with 11,047 signatures; from Carlisle, Hereford, Ipswich, &c.

On the 13th of September, the Cap-

tains, Mates and Seamen of the British merchant service, whose vessels were lying in the river, were presented to her majesty at Brandenburg house by a numerous deputation.

The procession arrived in the Strand about one o'clock, from the city. It was headed by a gentleman on a white horse, holding in his hand a blue flag, fringed with white, inscribed with

"The Seamen's Address."

Then followed the seamen, walking four abreast, all decently dressed, and wearing white favours. They amounted to about 5,000, and, with their friends who accompanied them, formed a line that filled the street from Temple bar to Adelphi.—There were three other similar flags, each carried by a seaman in the procession. The first was inscribed—

"Heaven protect the Innocent."

The second—"God save the Queen."

And the third—"Non Mi Ricordo."

Several naval flags were also carried in the procession; in the midst of it was a small cart with two men seated on it, sustaining a pole, on the top of which was the figure of a sailor, with a roll in one hand, and a hat in the other, in the act of cheering. The procession was closed by a considerable number of hackney coaches, full of company, male and female. The windows in the line of the procession were filled with spectators. The ladies waved their handkerchiefs, and the sailors occasionally cheered as they passed. They conducted themselves in the most orderly manner.

The Queen's answer to the address from Exeter, is worthy of notice. She says:—"I consider myself as perpetually acting in the presence of the Universal Father; and I endeavor to measure my happiness, more by conformity to His will, than by any variable compliances with individual inclination. Whatever may have been my personal afflictions, I consider them as designed either for the benefit of others, or for my own ultimate advantage. Hence, that Power whose afflicting dispensations have caused many a torturing pang to my heart, and many a sorrowful hour in my life, is the object of my devout, and my humble adoration. In all trials, I place a firm reliance on his goodness, without whose permission not a sparrow falls to the ground."

Passports were signed on Saturday, by his excellency Prince Paul Esterhazy, on the application of the Queen, for one of her Majesty's couriers to pass through the Austrian dominions in Italy.—Carlos is the courier appointed to this service; and it is said, that one of the objects of his mission is to accompany the celebrated Bergami to London. The courier left London on Monday morning.

The House of Commons met on the 18th September and adjourned to the 17th of October, by which day Lord Castlereagh calculates the House would be able to find its way, and to determine, from the proceedings of the other House, to what farther period it might be expedient to adjourn. If the Bill of Pains and Penalties should come down from the other House, it would be obviously desirable that the House should be called over, with a view to render the attendance as full as possible; and, therefore, he thought it proper to mention his intention to propose that the House should be called over early in November. This he states now, in order that Members might be in readiness to attend within the period of three weeks after the day to which his present motion referred. In the course of the debate upon it, Lord Castlereagh denied that her Majesty's witnesses met with any obstructions that were not common to both sides. How are we to reconcile this assertion with the evidence of the witnesses against the Queen, stating that they apprehended force on the part of their Government to compel them to go to England?

Lord Castlereagh, in answer to a question from Mr. Home, stated that Ministers were yet in possession of no authentic information as to the proceedings in Portugal, and were therefore unable to deliver any opinion upon the subjects. This answer has dissipated one of the rumours assigned for the depression of the funds.

Accounts from Corfew of the 4th ult. represent the affairs of Ali Pacha in a desperate condition. The Turkish fleet of 24 sail, men of war and transports, had occupied all the ports of Epirus. The Duke of Cambridge passed through Nuremberg on the 27th ult. on his way to Vienna. Austria continues to pour her troops into Italy. Austrian garrisons are already established in Bologna and Comacchio, in the Pope's territories. It is understood that orders have been issued by the Austrian cabinet, to prevent the new ambassador from the Court of Naples, the Duke of Gallo, from passing the Austrian frontiers. The accounts re-