

NORTH CAROLINA SENTINEL.

LIBERTY...THE CONSTITUTION...UNION.

VOL. XVI.

NEWBERN, WEDNESDAY, MAY 9, 1832.

NO. 795.

PUBLISHED BY THOMAS WATSON.

Three dollars per annum—payable in advance. No paper will be discontinued (but at the discretion of the Editor) until all arrearages have been paid up. Remittances by mail will be guaranteed by the Editor.

BY AUTHORITY.



By the President of the United States of America.

A PROCLAMATION.

WHEREAS a treaty of Limits between the United States of America, and the United Mexican States was concluded and signed by the Plenipotentiaries of the two countries, at Mexico, on the 12th January, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-eight:

WHEREAS, also, an additional article thereto was concluded and signed by the Plenipotentiaries of the two countries, at Mexico, on the 5th April, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-one, which treaty and additional article are word for word as follows:

The limits of the United States of America, with the bordering territories of Mexico, having been fixed and designated by a solemn treaty, concluded and signed at Washington, on the twenty-second day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, between the respective Plenipotentiaries of the Government of the United States of America, on the one part, and that of Spain on the other: And whereas, the said treaty having been sanctioned at a period when Mexico constituted a part of the Spanish Monarchy, it is deemed necessary now to confirm the validity of the aforesaid treaty of limits, regarding it as still in force and binding between the United States of America and the United Mexican States:

With this intention, the President of the United States of America has appointed Joel Roberts Poinsett their Plenipotentiary; and the President of the United Mexican States their Excellencies Sebastian Camacho and Jose Ygnacio Estevea:

And the said Plenipotentiaries having exchanged their full powers, have agreed upon and concluded, the following articles:

Article I. The dividing limits of the respective bordering territories of the United States of America and of the United Mexican States, being the same as were agreed and fixed upon by the abovementioned treaty of Washington, concluded and signed on the twenty-second day of February, in the year one thousand eight hundred and nineteen, the two high contracting parties will proceed forthwith to carry into full effect the third and fourth articles of said treaty, which are herein recited, as follows:

Article II. The boundary line between the two countries, west of the Mississippi, shall begin on the Gulf of Mexico, at the mouth of the river Sabine, in the sea, continuing north along the western bank of that river, to the 32d degree of latitude; thence, by a line due north, to the degree of latitude where it strikes the Rio Roxo of Natchitoches, or Red river; then, following the course of the Rio Roxo westward, to the degree of longitude 100 west from London, and 23 from Washington; then, crossing the said Red river, and running thence by a line due north, to the river Arkansas; thence, following the course of the southern bank of the Arkansas, to its source, in latitude 42 north; and thence, by that parallel of latitude, to the South sea; the whole being as laid down in Melish's map of the United States, published at Philadelphia, improved to the first of January, 1818. But, if the source of the Arkansas river shall be found to fall north or south of latitude 42, then the line shall run from the said source due south or north, as the case may be, till it meets the said parallel of latitude 42; and thence, along the said parallel, to the South sea. All the islands in the Sabine, and the said Red and Arkansas rivers, throughout the course thus described, to belong to the United States, but the use of the waters, and the navigation of the Sabine to the sea, and of the said rivers Roxo and Arkansas, throughout the extent of said boundary on their respective banks, shall be common to the respective inhabitants of both nations.

The two high contracting parties agree to cede and renounce all their rights, claims, and pretensions to the territories described by the said line; that is to say: the United States hereby cede to his Catholic Majesty, and renounce forever, all their rights, claims, and pretensions to the territories lying west and south of the above described line; and, in like manner, his Catholic Majesty cedes to the said United States all his rights, claims, and pretensions to any territories east and north of the said line; and for himself, his heirs, and successors, renounces all claim to the said territories forever.

Article III. To fix this line with more precision, and to place the landmarks which shall designate exactly the limits of both nations, each of the contracting parties shall appoint a commissioner and a surveyor, who shall meet before the termination of one year from the date of the ratification of this treaty, at Natchitoches, on the Red river, and from the Red river to the river Arkansas, and to ascertain the latitude of the source of the said river Arkansas, in conformity to what is agreed upon and stipulated, and the line of latitude 42, to the South sea. They shall make out plans and keep journals of their proceedings; and the result agreed upon by them shall be considered as part of this treaty, and shall have the same force as if it were inserted therein. The two Governments will amicably agree respecting the

necessary articles to be furnished to those persons, and also as to their respective escorts, should such be deemed necessary.

Article IV. The present treaty shall be ratified, and the ratifications shall be exchanged at Washington, within the term of four months, or sooner if possible.

In witness whereof, we, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same, and have hereunto affixed our respective seals.

Done at Mexico, this twelfth day of January, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-eight, in the fifty-second year of the Independence of the United States of America, and in the eighth of that of the United Mexican States.

J. R. POINSETT. [L. S.]
S. CAMACHO. [L. S.]
J. Y. ESTEVA. [L. S.]

Additional Article to the Treaty of Limits concluded between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, on the 12th day of January 1828.

The time having elapsed which was stipulated for the exchange of ratifications of the Treaty of Limits between the United Mexican States and the United States of America, signed in Mexico on the 12th of January, 1828; and both Republics being desirous that it should be carried into full and complete effect, with all due solemnity, the President of the United States of America has fully empowered, on his part, Anthony Butler, a citizen thereof, and Charge d'Affaires of the said States in Mexico; And the Vice-President of the United Mexican States, acting as President thereof, has, in like manner, fully empowered, on his part, their Excellencies Lucas Alaman, Secretary of State and Foreign Relations, and Rafael Maguino, Secretary of the Treasury, who after having exchanged their mutual powers, found to be ample and in form, have agreed, and do hereby agree, on the following article:

The ratifications of the Treaty of Limits, concluded on the 12th January, 1828, shall be exchanged at the City of Washington, within the term of one year, counting from the date of this agreement, and sooner should it be possible.

The present Additional Article shall have the same force and effect as if it had been inserted word for word in the aforesaid treaty of the 12th of January, of 1828, and shall be approved and ratified in the manner prescribed by the Constitutions of the respective States.

In faith of which, the said Plenipotentiaries have hereunto set their hands and affixed their respective seals. Done in Mexico, the fifth of April, of the year one thousand eight hundred and thirty-one, the fifth-fifth of the Independence of the United States of America, and the eleventh of that of the United Mexican States.

A. BUTLER. [L. S.]
LUCAS ALAMAN. [L. S.]
RAFAEL MAGUINO. [L. S.]

AND WHEREAS, the said Treaty has been duly ratified on both parts, and the respective ratifications of the same were exchanged at Washington on the fifth day of April, one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two by EDWARD LIVINGSTON, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and JOSE MONTOVA, Charge d'Affaires of the Mexican United States, on the part of their respective Governments:

Now, THEREFORE, BE IT KNOWN, That I, ANDREW JACKSON, President of the United States of America, have caused the said treaty to be made public to the end that the same, and every clause and article thereof, may be observed and fulfilled with good faith, by the United States and the citizens thereof.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand, and caused the Seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this fifth day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-two, and the fifth-fifth of the Independence of the United States the fifty-sixth.

ANDREW JACKSON.

EDW. LIVINGSTON,
Secretary of State.

From the New York Evening Post.

The abandonment of the principle of protection is the only condition upon which it is possible that a country situated like the United States can be governed, with any prospect of permanent peace or solid prosperity. The extent of the country alone, apart from other circumstances of its situation, would necessarily oppose great obstacles to the establishment of a system which might be supposed to have an equal pressure upon its different and perhaps remote divisions. But in addition to this, there are other circumstances connected with our situation, which render the establishment of such a system, almost totally impracticable.

In the first place our government is not consolidated. The nature of it is such as leaves a great deal of power in the hands of the States or local government. These possess immense facilities for opposing any laws, enacted by the federal legislature, which they deem oppressive or injurious in their operation, in relation to the States they represent. We already begin to be made sensible of the difficulties arising out of this very feature of our system of government. Properly speaking, we are now beginning to find out, in the practical operation of our government, that the division and distribution of its powers, is now answering one of the great ends for which it was designed, viz: that of protecting the minority against the oppression and tyranny of the majority.

Another circumstance of our situation is of much importance. There is a marked and obvious difference in the nature of the industry and occupations of the people of what are called the northern, and southern states—or, the slave holding and non-slave-holding states. This very naturally leads to an opinion, that where there is any interference on the part of government in the industry and pursuit of society, it is partial and unjust in its operation, and originates in unjust and partial views and notions. This natural jealousy, it is obvious, constitutes another obstacle to the establishment of what is called the principle of protection. Out of this course has arisen the objection now made at the South, to the Tariff law—designed for the benefit of the manufacturers, at the expense of all other classes of the commu-

nity. The fact that manufactures are established in the northern states, does not prevent the people of those states from being sufferers from the Tariff, as well as their neighbors from the South; but it prevents them from feeling that jealousy which is felt by the latter; and which must end, either in the overthrow of that system of folly, or in a separation of the southern from the northern portion of the States. Had it not been for that difference between the nature of the industry of the southern, and that of the northern states, there can be little doubt that the Tariff would have been carried with very little opposition; the people quietly submitting to have their pockets picked by a combination of crafty manufacturing capitalists. To have those who seek the benefit of a protection system, and those at whose expense that benefit is sought, live intermixed as it were, with one another; so that no territorial separation can be made between them; much less jealousy is felt, upon the subject of an interference on the part of government, in the exercise of what is called the power of protection or encouragement, than where the protected and unprotected classes occupy distinct and separated territorial limits. Not only is less jealousy felt when that is the case, but in fact there is no less reason for feeling it.

The various classes of industry who live within the same territory, closely united by proximity of situation, are at the same time so closely united in interest, and mutually dependent one upon another, that they very soon become convinced of the futility of any attempt to give advantages to one class at the expense of the others. Whenever this has been attempted, under such circumstances, it has been done on the supposition that the encouragement of a particular class of industry was beneficial to the country at large. The protected class has had the audacity to persuade those in power, that the public welfare would be promoted, and the national wealth augmented, by granting it encouragement, and exclusive advantages. The other classes exposing the community or majority, have acquiesced in the belief, that their governors while sustaining a particular interest, or branch of industry, were in fact advancing the prosperity and welfare of them all. The several interests of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, have at different times, and in different countries, prevailed for a season, and become the particular objects of government patronage—sometimes because such a protective policy—as really thought conducive to the public advantage, and sometimes, and probably much oftener, because those who administered the government, were bribed by the favoured classes, and received their price for the patronage which they extended. It probably never has happened that several classes composing a majority of a community, have combined upon a system, for their own advantage and the oppression of all others. The evils and disorders of such a scheme of rapine and plunder, not to speak of its iniquity, are such and so enormous, and the spoil to be divided among the majority so small comparatively speaking, that the event of its ever being realized, may be considered among the most remote possibilities of systematic and organized rapacity. But although, in a community, the classes of whose industry are closely united by proximity of situation and mutual and inseparable dependence, nothing could be more improbable than such a combination for the purpose of oppressing the minority; it by no means follows, that such a combination may not exist in a community whose situation is the reverse of that we have just described. Take the case for example of the mother country and her colonies. The classes of industry composing the majority, are here represented by the mother country; those composing the minority, by the colonies. What is called the Colonial system, is and always has been a system of oppression—it is the oppression of the minority by the majority; and it proves that where an empire is extensive, and component parts remote from one another, and especially where their occupations, habits and industry are marked by any striking dissimilitude, the sacrifice of the weaker party to the stronger is not merely a probable event, but may be regarded even as a certainty. It is enormous to suppose that the representation of the weaker, and the strict observation of constitutional forms, could be relied upon as a security against the occurrence of such an event. The only good of representation, considered in this point of view, consists in the opportunity it affords of compromise—or purchasing certain advantages, which could not have been obtained, but through the promise of supporting measures sought to be carried by another party. It is enough that where a majority are so bent upon the accomplishment of a favorite scheme as to be unmindful of all minor considerations, the representations of the minority becomes a positive nullity. If, in such a case, the majority and the minority are distinguished from one another by the occupation of distinct territories—if (to bring the case home) the majority occupy the northern and eastern, and the minority the southern states, the only security of the latter would be found, in the first instance, in narrowing and hemming in as much as possible the constitutional capacities of the federal legislature—above all, in its total renunciation of all right whatever to interfere, for the purpose of protection and encouragement, in regulating the employment of industry and capital; and in the last resort, in resisting, by means not within but beyond the forms of the constitution, measures which they deem in a high degree injurious to their interests, and utterly subversive of the true meaning and equitable spirit of the constitution.

Let us suppose, to take an extreme case, that the northern states constituting the majority, should undertake to legislate upon the subject of slavery. Let us suppose that in imitation of some of the "embryo immature" politicians of the Virginia legislature, (whose rhetorical exercises, the editor of the National Gazette has had the weakness, in sober earnestness, to

call a "noble avowal of the evils of slavery.") the northern and non-slaveholding states should declare, through their representatives in Congress, that the great curse and evil of the country is slavery; that the great blot and stain upon the escutcheon of our history is slavery; that the baneful effects of this accursed & pestilent abomination are not confined to the South or slave-holding states but extend over the whole region, far and near, infecting, with its diseased and nauseous breath the fresh and wholesome atmosphere of freedom. Suppose that in pursuance of this sounding declaration, they should proceed to enact that all slaves, born after a certain year, (1833 for example) shall when they shall have obtained a certain age, become the property of the United States, and shall forthwith be exported at the public expense, (or, perhaps, at that of the former proprietor) to Liberia. The question of its constitutionality is brought before the Supreme Court; Mr. Writ and Mr. Sergeant are employed on the part of the northern states, and the Court decide that the law is constitutional. According to the forms of the constitution, the minority, or slave-holding states must submit. Their representation in Congress is a nullity. The majority, bent upon the accomplishment of a peculiar object, are regardless of all minor considerations; and the influence of the principle of compromise in legislative proceedings, is totally lost. The situation of a minority in the case we have supposed, is absolutely and without any qualification or exception, that of an unrepresented, and dependent state—the situation of the majority, that of a dictator and a master. We think therefore that the great maxim of republican government, "the majority should govern," though generally salutary, is not equally suited to all circumstances—that it derives its chief efficacy and virtue from the principle of compromise, and that where from the unequal and dissimilar position of parties in a legislative proceeding, the principle of compromise become inoperative, the adoption of the maxim of the supremacy of majorities, makes the one party a despot, the other a slave! This I apprehend, Mr. Editor, is the view taken by the thinking men of the South, of the relations now subsisting between the slave holding and non-slave-holding states. The subject is one of vast importance undoubtedly, and pregnant with consequences of deep and vital concernment. At present, I must content myself with having offered these few suggestions.

PUBLIUS.

From the Boston Morning Post. Parliamentary Privilege.—Lord Kenyon, Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench, in England, in the case of Lord Abingdon, who took occasion to print a speech made in parliament, in which he charged Mr. Sermon, an attorney, with gross fraud, laid down the following law:—That the privilege of parliament, in the case, extended to words "spoken in the House of Lords, and confined to its walls."—He also laid down the following position:—That a member of parliament had certainly a right to publish his speech, but that speech should not be made the vehicle of slander against any individual, if it was, it was a libel.—[Espinasse's Rep. 227.]

In the Constitution of the United States, the provision of parliamentary privileges in debate, is as follows:—"For any speech or debate in either House, they shall not be questioned in any other place." The commentary by Mr. Jefferson is, "But this is restrained to things done in the House, in a parliamentary course. For he is not to have privilege contra morem parliamentarium to exceed the bounds and limits of his place and duty."

In the case of Coffin vs. Coffin, 4 Mass. Reports, page 1, Chief Justice Parsons, of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts, lays down the following positions on this subject:—"When a representative is not acting as a member of the House, he is not entitled to any privileges above his fellow citizens; nor are the rights of the people affected, if he is placed on the same ground on which his constituents stand."

"But, to consider every malicious slander, uttered by a citizen, who is a representative, as within his privilege, because it was uttered within the walls of the Representatives' Chamber, to another member, but not uttered in executing his official duty, would be to extend the privilege further than was intended by the people; or than is consistent with sound policy, and would render the Representatives' Chamber a sanctuary for calumny—an effect which never has been, and I trust never will be, endured by any House of Representatives of Massachusetts."

"A struggle for privileges, in this State, would be a contest against the people, to wrest from them what they have not chosen to grant. And it may be added, that the grant of privileges is a restraint on the rights of private citizens, which cannot be further restrained but by some constitutional law."

It should be mentioned as a fact highly creditable to the Post-Master-General, that the Mails are now expedited one day earlier between Washington City, and this place. On Saturday morning we received Washington newspapers of Thursday morning. This is twenty-four hours earlier than we have ever before received communications from the National Metropolis through the Mails. Yet the opposition will complain of the Department and its head, with the same reason, and same propriety, as on former occasions.—Hartford Times.

The Compass.—The Pantaloon 10 guns, Lt. Dawson, will proceed to sea in a few days with Col. Creighton, Royal Engineer, on board, to try the efficacy of a newly invented celestial compass, the properties of which are said to be the showing the true variation, true latitude, and true influence of the ship on the common steering compass, at eight.—London Paper.

From the Washington Globe of April 27.

H. M. BRECKENRIDGE.

An attack of this ex-Judge upon the President has found its way to the public through the appropriate columns of the United States Telegraph. If any thing were wanting to prove the utter unfitness of this gentleman for a judicial station, it is found in this appeal to the public. In ill-nature, want of dignity, and destitution of truth, it is equalled only by the fanciful Editorials of the journal in which it appears! The ex-dignitary descends even to detailing pretended private conversations with the President, and to the publication of certain hastily written private letters in which some of the A's look like O's, the I's are not dotted and the T's not crossed!

What does the honorable ex-Judge plead in justification of conduct so strange and so dishonorable? Why, he has been a Judge; his time was out; the President did not reappoint him! This is the great injury and wrong of which he complains! He is not permitted to hold an office for life which the law has expressly limited to a term of years.

Had Mr. Breckenridge any right to the office he held beyond the limit prescribed by law? Did it not just as much belong to any other man in the nation? Or does he maintain, that it was the President's duty to appoint and reappoint him as long as he lives? On no other ground has he any apology for his appeal to the people. The President has made no charge against him; he has uttered no imputation upon his character, his temper or his conduct; he has done nothing but fail to re-appoint him. Not giving him the office again which he had once held, is a justification, in the eyes of this dignitary, for forgetting, not only the respect which is due to the Chief Magistrate, but even self-respect.

The lordlings of America and the lords of Europe are exactly alike. Though their offices and their duties, their pensions and their places, deprive them of the means of living upon the labor of the people, and they denounce the democrat that does it as a tyrant and a robber! The people of Europe are turning out their lords to earn their own living; the people of America will not forget to see their lordlings share the same fate. Mr. Breckenridge has the same opportunity to earn his living as any other citizen; let him do like the thousands of freemen around him, who have more cause to complain that they never had an office, than he has to complain that he has lost one which he long enjoyed.

The following communication and extracts of letters, will show that the ex-Judge is much mistaken in his popularity among the Floridians. He, in truth, owes his disappointment rather to the want of the confidence and good will of a great portion of the people of the Territory, than to any want of a kind disposition towards him on the part of the President.

WASHINGTON, April 19th, 1832.
FRANCIS P. BLAIR, Esq.
SIR: I have seen a communication over the signature of H. M. BRECKENRIDGE, published in the Telegraph of the 17th instant, highly abusive of the President, and filled with complaints.

The Judge is mistaken if he supposes the people of his district are grieved at his discontinuance in office.

He is not considered by the Bar or the people as an able or impartial jurist. He manifests on the bench, strong prejudices and partialities. I do not believe there are more than two practising attorneys in his district, who speak in terms of commendation of Judge Breckenridge.

It will not be denied that he is a violent partisan, and has always mingled in the political conflicts in Florida. It is believed that he has devoted much of his time, in supplying the public papers with abuse of other officers, and particularly those he considered political opponents.

Judge Breckenridge is an eccentric man, inconsistent in his decisions, and by no means a man of business.

When his letter is seen by the people of Florida, it is my belief they will say he has misrepresented their feelings; and, so far from disapproving of the course pursued by the President, they will be gratified that another individual has been appointed.

The following extracts of letters from gentlemen of high respectability at Pensacola, will show that the citizens of his district are not quite in tears at the prospect of losing their present Judge.

PENSACOLA, Feb. 25th, 1832.
"The good people of Pensacola have been seriously affected for the last three or four days—many with unbounded joy—some, for instance ——— have had depicted in their countenances, deep mortification and alarm; and this is owing to a letter of yours of the 9th instant, stating that a Mr. BRUCE, of Virginia, had succeeded Henry M. Breckenridge as Judge of the Western district of Florida."

PENSACOLA, Feb. 25th, 1832.
"Dear Sir: Your letter of the 9th instant, announcing the discontinuance of Judge Breckenridge, was not only a gratification, but has spread a general satisfaction throughout the city; and those who, from fear of judicial tyranny and partiality, had signed a recommendation for his re-appointment, have, in many instances, publicly confessed the motive which induced their signatures."

A FLORIDIAN.

The military power of the European monarchies involves their own decay or at least retards their advancement in real national resources. Austria, with a revenue of 22 millions of dollars, keeps up in peace an army of 270 thousand men; the United States, with an income of 25 or 26 millions, has an army of 6 thousand men. Austria has a debt of 200 millions of dollars; that of the United States is nearly discharged. There is no question about the comparative happiness of the people of two countries in such opposite circumstances; can there be any more as to their respective real resources? The wealth of one country is swallowed up by wars, or by military establishments in contemplation of wars; that of the other goes to the improvement of the soil and the augmentation of capital. In Austria, the labour of one man out of every 118 is lost to the country, and at the same time, every 117 men are charged with the support of one unproductive person. In the United States, only one out of 2,166 is thus idle himself, and chargeable to the community.—Half Amer.