

The North Carolina Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY
WILLIAM W. HOLDEN,
EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE UNION OF THE STATES—THEY "MUST BE PRESERVED."
RALEIGH, N. C., WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 1844.

VOLUME X.—NUMBER 498.
TERMS—\$3 PER ANNUM,
PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

TERMS

THE NORTH CAROLINA STANDARD
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
THREE DOLLARS PER ANNUM, IN ADVANCE.

Those persons who remit by Mail (postage paid) Five Dollars, will be entitled to a receipt for Six Dollars, or two years' subscription to the Standard—one copy two years, or two copies one year.

For four copies, : : : \$10 00
" ten " : : : 20 00
" twenty " : : : 35 00

The same rate for six months.

Any person procuring and forwarding five subscribers, with the cash (\$15), will be entitled to the Standard one year free of charge.

ADVERTISEMENTS, not exceeding fourteen lines, will be inserted, *one time* for One Dollar, and twenty-five cents for each subsequent insertion;—those of greater length, in proportion. *Court Orders and Judicial Advertisements* will be charged twenty-five per cent. higher than the above rates. A deduction of 33 1-3 per cent. will be made to those who advertise by the year. If the number of insertions be not marked on them, they will be continued until ordered out. Letters to the Editor must come free of postage, or they may not be attended to.

LETTER OF MR. WALKER, OF MISSISSIPPI.

Relative to the annexation of Texas: in reply to the call of the people of Carroll county, Kentucky, to communicate his views on that subject.

WASHINGTON CITY, Jan 8, 1844.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter, dated Ghent, Carroll county, Kentucky, November 25th, 1843, has been received. It contains the resolutions of a meeting of the people of that county, in favor of the annexation of Texas, and requesting the candidates for the presidency and vice presidency of the Union to make "known to (you) or to the public" their views on this subject. As a committee, you have transmitted me these proceedings together with a special letter, addressed to me as a candidate for the "vice presidency," requesting my opinions on this question. I am not a candidate for the vice presidency. The only State in which my name has been designated, to any considerable extent, for this station, was my own; and knowing how many, with much older and better claims than mine, were named for this office, for this and other reasons, by letter dated November 20, 1843, addressed by me to the democratic convention which assembles this day in Mississippi, my name is withdrawn unconditionally.

The treaty by which Texas was surrendered to Spain, was always opposed by me; and in 1826, 1834, and 1835, various addresses were made by me, and then published, in favor of the reannexation of Texas; and the same opinions have been often expressed by me since my election, in 1836, to the Senate of the Union.

It was a revolution in Mexico that produced the conflict for independence in Texas. The citizens of Texas had been invited there by Mexico, under the solemn guaranty of the federal constitution of 1824. This constitution, to which Texas so long and faithfully adhered, was prostrated by the usurper Santa Anna. After a severe struggle, the people of Mexico were subdued by a mercenary army; the States were annihilated, and a military dictator was placed at the head of a central despotism. In the capital of Mexico, and of the state of Coahuila and Texas, the civil authorities were suppressed by the bayonet; the disarming of every citizen was decreed, and the soldiery of the usurper proceeded to enforce this edict. The people of Texas resolved to resist, and perish upon the field of battle, rather than submit to the despotic sway of a treacherous and sanguinary military dictator. Short was the conflict, and glorious the issue. The American race was successful; the armies of the tyrant were overthrown and dispersed, and the dictator himself was captured. He was released by Texas, and restored to his country, having first acknowledged, by a solemn treaty, the independence of Texas. After the fall of Santa Anna, and the total route and dispersion of the Mexican army, and when a resubjugation had become hopeless, I introduced into the Senate the resolution acknowledging the independence of Texas. It was adopted in March 1837, and the name of Texas inscribed on the roll of independent nations. Subsequently, France, England, and Holland, have recognised her independence; and Texas now has all the rights of sovereignty over her territory and people, as full and perfect as any other nation of the world. It was to Spain, and not to Mexico, that we transferred Texas by treaty; and it was by a revolution in Mexico, and by a similar successful revolution that Texas has obtained the same territory. These principles have been recognised for many years by Mexico, and by this republic; and it is absurd in Mexico now to attempt to recall her unequivocal assent to these doctrines, and ask to be permitted to change the well-settled law of nations, and oppose the reannexation of Texas. It is an admitted principle of the law of nations, that every sovereignty may cede the whole or any part of their territory, unless restrained by some constitutional interdiction; and which, if it exist, may be removed by the same sovereign power which imposed the limitation. There is, however, no such limitation in the constitution of Texas, which is a single central government, with the same authority to make the cession, as appertained to France or Spain, in the transfer of Louisiana or Florida. Nor does it change the question of power, that these were distant colonies; for the sovereignty extends alike over every portion of the nation: and this principle was fully recognised, when Mr. Adams, as President, and Mr. Clay, as Secretary of State, in 1825 and 1827, by instructions to our minister at Mexico; and General Jackson, as President, and Mr. Van Buren as Secretary of State, by subsequent similar instructions in 1829, endeavored to procure from Mexico the cession of Texas, then a contiguous and integral portion of the Mexican confederacy. And if a nation may cede a portion of her territory, being completely sovereign over the whole, she may certainly cede the whole; and, in any event this would be a question, not of our right to receive, but of the authority of the ceding nation to make the transfer, or simply an inquiry, whether we obtained a good or a bad title. In this case, the title would be unquestionable; for Texas being independent in fact, and so recognised by ourselves, and the great powers of Europe,

as completely sovereign throughout her territory, Mexico could make no just objection to the transfer.

In 1836, this question, together with that of ratifying their constitution, was submitted by the constituted authorities to the people of Texas, who, with unparalleled unanimity, (there being but ninety-three dissenting votes,) decided in favor of reannexation.

Texas, then, has already assented to the reannexation, not merely by the act of all her authorities, but of her people, and made it a part and parcel of the organization of the government itself; and he who, with the knowledge of these facts, would now deny the power of Texas to assent to the reannexation, must reject and discard the great fundamental principle of popular sovereignty. Surely, then, no one will contend that the monarchies may transfer, and we receive, their colonies and subjects, without and against their consent; but that the entire people of a single republic, in whom resides the only rightful sovereignty, cannot cede, nor we receive, their own territory, and that monarchs have more power than the people, and are more truly sovereign. Texas, then, having the undoubted right to transfer the whole, or any part of the territory, there can be no difference, as a question of constitutional power, between our right to receive a part or the whole of the territory.

The reannexation, then, can be accomplished by any one of three modes. 1st, by treaty; 2d, by an act of Congress, without a treaty; and 3d, by the authority reserved to each State, to extend their boundaries, and annex additional territory with the sanction of Congress.

1st. By treaty.—This right was established in the cession of Louisiana and Florida, and cannot now be questioned, without menacing the organization of the government and integrity of the Union; for, by virtue of this power, three States and several Territories now compose a part of the republic. In 1842, we acquired territory by treaty, and attached it to the States of New York and Vermont. There was there no disputed boundary, for the call was for a certain parallel of latitude—a mere question of measurement—which, when made, placed this territory within the undoubted limits of Canada; in consequence of which, we had abandoned the fortress erected at Rouse's Point, and the ground it occupied, (which was a part of this territory,) which we acquired by the treaty of 1842. The question of the power of annexation by treaty is settled, and incorporated into the very existence of the government and of the Union.

2d. The object may be accomplished by act of Congress, without a treaty.—The language of the constitution is: "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union; but no new State shall be formed or erected within the jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the junction of two or more States, or parts of States, without the consent of the legislatures of the States concerned, as well as of the Congress." The grant is unlimited, except that the boundary of an existing State cannot be disturbed by Congress without the assent of the State legislatures. "New States may be admitted by the Congress into this Union." This is the broad language of the constitution; and, to confine it to territory then acquired, is to interpolate most important words into that instrument. Nor could it have been the intention of the framers of the constitution to prevent the acquisition of new territory. Louisiana was not then a part of the Union, but it was a most important part of the valley of the Mississippi, containing New Orleans, and the whole of the western, and the most essential part of the eastern portion of that territory, with both banks of its great river for many hundred miles above its mouth, and the only outlet of the products of the mighty valley starting at the Youghiogany in Maryland, and the Alleghany in New York, uniting at Pittsburg, where they form the Ohio, to the outlet of all into the Gulf. If we look at the condition of many of the States when the constitution was framed, we will find it could never have been adopted had it forbidden the acquisition of the only outlet of all the products of the West. The waters of western Maryland, and of western New York, commingle with those of the Ohio and Mississippi. There stood Pittsburg at the head of the Ohio; and one-third of Pennsylvania is intersected by streams which water a part of the great valley. Virginia then included Kentucky; three-fourths of her territory was within the great valley, and the Ohio and Mississippi itself were its boundary for more than a thousand miles. North Carolina then included Tennessee, and was bounded for hundreds of miles by the river Mississippi; and Georgia then embraced Alabama and Mississippi, and was not only bounded for several hundred miles by the great river, but advanced to within a few miles of the city of New Orleans. Is it possible that all these States, in forming the constitution, could have intended to prohibit forever the acquisition of the mouth of the Mississippi, then in the hands of a hostile and despotic foreign power? The constitution contains no such suicidal provision; and all the historical facts, both before and after its adoption, are against any such anti-American restrictions. As to a treaty, it is only necessary as indicating the assent of the ceding nation; and if that has been given already, as in the case of Texas, without a treaty, our acceptance may be made by Congress. Suppose the constitution of Texas forbid the cession, except by Congress: when their Congress passed the assenting law, could not we accept, by act of Congress? Or suppose Texas, or any other contiguous territory, was vacant and unclaimed by any power: could we not annex it by act of Congress? One of the grounds assumed in Congress, and by our government, in defence of our title to Oregon, is its alleged discovery and occupancy by us, (long before the treaty with France,) being one of the acknowledged modes by which nations acquire territory; but if we can only acquire territory by treaty, then this ground, upon which we claim title to Oregon, must be abandoned. It would be strange, indeed, if the treaty-making power (which, under our constitution, is purely an executive power) could annex territory, and yet that the Executive, and both Houses of Congress combined, could not. Then if France or Spain had forever refused to cede to us Louisiana or New Orleans, could we never—no, not even by conquest in war—have occupied and annexed them by act of Congress? Congress, then, having the undoubted power to annex territory, and admit new States, and Texas having assented in advance, may be either admitted at once, as a Territory, or a State, or States, or Congress may provide for the prospective admission of one or more States from Texas, as has often heretofore been done as

to other new States, the whole question of annexation not being one whether this government has the power, but only how it must be exercised; and whether only by one of the branches of this government, or by all combined. And if the power vested in Congress by the constitution to admit new States, does not of itself embrace territory then constituting a part of the Union, as well as all future acquisitions, there is no power to admit new States, except of territory which was a part of the Union when the constitution was formed; but as this interpretation cannot prevail without expelling three States from the Union and forbidding the admission of Iowa, it must be conceded that this power of Congress to admit new States does extend to future acquisitions. This being the case, what can be more clear than that Congress may admit a State or States out of Texas, if her assent is given, as we perceive it has been, in a form as obligatory as a treaty? In truth, the power to annex territory by treaty does not so much exist as a mere implication from the treaty-making power, as from the grant to Congress to admit new States out of any territory whatever, although not then a part of the Union; and the right to annex by treaty results mainly as a means of obtaining, when necessary, the assent of another government, especially when that assent can be obtained in no other manner.

Something like this was done by the annexation, by Congress, of the Florida parishes to the State of Louisiana. They had been claimed, and remained for many years after the cession of Louisiana, in the exclusive occupancy of Spain, when the American settlers revolted, assembled their convention, declared their independence, and, by a successful revolution, wrested this territory from the dominion of Spain, and Congress recognized the acts, and assumed and paid the debts of the insurgent convention; and the Legislature of Louisiana, after the adoption of her constitution, and submission into the Union, without this territory, subsequently, by mere legislative enactment, with the consent of Congress, annexed it to the State of Louisiana.

3d. The annexation may be accomplished by one of the States of the Union, with the sanction of Congress.—That each of the States possess the power to extend her boundaries before the adoption of the constitution, will not be denied; and that the power still exists, is certain, unless it is abandoned by the State in forming the government of the Union. Now, there is no such abandonment, unless it is found in the following clause of the constitution: "No State shall, without the consent of Congress, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." Each State, then, may, with the consent of Congress, "enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power." Texas, if not ours, is a foreign power; and if she, by law, assents to the reannexation, in whole or in part, to Louisiana, or to Arkansas, and those States, by law, agree to the annexation, it is "an agreement or compact" between a foreign power and a State of the Union, and is clearly lawful, with "the consent of Congress." It would not be a treaty, which is the exercise of an executive power, but a compact by law, and precisely similar to the numerous compacts, so called, by which, by acts of Congress and of a State legislature, so many agreements, especially with the new States, have been made by mere legislative enactments. Nor need the assent of Congress be given in advance; it was not so given on the admission of Tennessee, Arkansas, and Michigan; but if given subsequently, it would ratify the previous extension of their boundaries by Louisiana or Arkansas. There are, then, these three modes, by any one of which Texas may be reannexed to the American Union. 1st. By treaty; 2d. By act of Congress, without a treaty; and 3d. By the act of a State, with the sanction of Congress. But, if it be otherwise, and the constitution only applies to territories then attached to the Union, and delegates no power for the acquisition of any other territory, nor prohibits the exercise of the pre-existing power of each State to extend her boundaries, then there would remain in each State the reserved right of extension, beyond the control of Congress. I have not asserted the existence of such a right in a State; but, if the clauses quoted do not confer the authority on Congress, and the reannexation is refused on that ground, then the annexing power, as a right to enlarge their boundaries, would result to any one of the States, and with the consent of Texas, could be exercised. Perceiving, then, what power results to the States, from the denial of the power of annexation by Congress, let us agitate no such question in advance of a denial of its own authority by Congress, but discuss the question on its merits alone.

Is it expedient to reannex Texas to the American Union? This is the greatest question, since the adoption of the constitution, ever presented for the decision of the American people. Texas was once our own; and although surrendered by treaty to Spain, the surrender was long resisted by the American government, and was conceded to be a great sacrifice. This being the case, is it not clear that, when the territory, which we have most reluctantly surrendered, can be reacquired, that object should be accomplished? Under such circumstances, to refuse the reannexation is to deny the wisdom of the original purchase, and to reflect upon the judgment of those who maintained, even at the period of surrender, that it was a great sacrifice of national interests.

Texas, as Mr. Jefferson declared, was as clearly embraced in the purchase by us of Louisiana as New Orleans itself; and that it was a part of that region, is demonstrated by the discovery by the great La Salle, of the source and mouth of the Mississippi, and his occupancy for France west of the Colorado. Our right to Texas, as a part of Louisiana, was asserted and demonstrated by Presidents Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and John Quincy Adams. No one of our Presidents has ever doubted our title; and Mr. Clay has ever maintained its clear and unquestionable. Louisiana was acquired by a treaty with France, in 1803, by Mr. Jefferson; and in the letter of Mr. Madison, the Secretary of State, dated March 31, 1804, he says, expressing his own views and those of Mr. Jefferson, that Louisiana "extended westwardly to the Rio Bravo, otherwise called Rio del Norte." Orders were accordingly obtained from the Spanish authorities for the delivery of all the posts on the west side of the Mississippi. And in his letter of the 31st January, 1804, Mr. Madison declares that Mr. Laussat, the French commissioner who delivered the possession of Louisiana to us, announced the "Del Norte as its true boundary." Here, then, in the delivery of the possession of Louisiana by Spain to France, and France to us, Texas is included. In the letter of Mr.

Madison of the 8th July, 1804, he declares the opposition of Mr. Jefferson to the "relinquishment of any territory whatever eastward of the Rio Bravo." In the letter of James Monroe of the 8th November, 1803, he incloses documents which he says "prove incontestably" that the boundary of Louisiana is "the Rio Bravo to the west;" and Mr. Pinckney unites with him in a similar declaration. In a subsequent letter—not to a foreign government, but to Mr. Madison—of the 20th April, 1805, they assert our title as unquestionable. In Mr. Monroe's letters, as Secretary of State, dated January 19, 1816, and June 10, 1816, he says none could question "our title to Texas;" and he expresses his concurrence in opinion with Jefferson and Madison, "that our title to the Del Norte was as clear as to the island of New Orleans." In his letter, as Secretary of State, to Don Onis, of the 12th March, 1818, John Quincy Adams says: "The claim of France always did extend westward to the Rio Bravo;" "she always claimed the territory which you call Texas as being within the limits, and forming a part, of Louisiana." After demonstrating our title to Texas in this letter, Mr. Adams says: "Well might Messrs. Pinckney and Monroe write to Mr. Cevallos, in 1805, that the claim of the United States to the boundary of the Rio Bravo was as clear as their right to the island of New Orleans." Again, in his letter of the 31st October, 1818, Mr. Adams says our title to Texas is "established beyond the power of further controversy."

Here, then, by the discovery and occupation of Texas, as a part of Louisiana, by La Salle, for France, in 1685; by the delivery of possession to us, in 1803, by Spain and France; by the action of our government, from the date of the treaty of acquisition to the date of the treaty of surrender, (avowedly so on its face,) by the opinion of all our Presidents and ministers connected in any way with the acquisition, our title to Texas was undoubted. It was surrendered to Spain by the treaty of 1819; but Mr. Clay maintained, in his speech of the 3d April, 1820, that territory could not be alienated merely by a treaty; and consequently that, notwithstanding the treaty, Texas was still our own. In the cession of a portion of Maine, it was asserted, in legislative resolutions, by Massachusetts and Maine, and conceded by this government, that no portion of Maine could be ceded by treaty without the consent of Maine. Did Texas assent to this treaty, or can we cede part of a territory, but not of a State? These are grave questions; they raise the point whether Texas is not now a part of our territory, and whether her people may not now rightfully claim the protection of our government and laws. Recollect this was not a question of settlement, under the powers of this government, of a disputed boundary. The treaty declares, as respects Texas, that we "cede to his Catholic Majesty." Commenting on this in his speech before referred to, Mr. Clay says it was not a question of the power in case of dispute "of fixing a boundary previously existing." "It was, on the contrary, the case of an avowed cession of territory from the United States to Spain." Although, then, the government may be competent to fix a disputed boundary, by ascertaining as near as practicable where it is; although, also, a State, with the consent of this government, as in the case of Maine, may cede a portion of her territory,—yet it by no means follows that this government, by treaty, could cede a Territory of the Union. Could we by treaty cede Florida to Spain, especially without consulting the people of Florida? and, if not, the treaty by which Texas was surrendered was, as Mr. Clay contended, *inoperative*.

By the treaty of 1803, by which, we have seen, Texas was acquired by us from France, we pledged our faith to France, and to the people of Texas, never to surrender that territory. The 3d article of that treaty declares: "The inhabitants of the ceded territory shall be incorporated in the Union of the United States, and admitted as soon as possible, according to the principles of the federal constitution, to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States; and in the mean time they shall be protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they profess." Such was our pledge to France and to the people of Texas, by the treaty of purchase; and if our subsequent treaty of cession to Spain was not unconstitutional and invalid, it was a gross infraction of a previous treaty, and of one of the fundamental conditions under which Texas was acquired.

Here, then, are many grave questions of constitutional power. Could the solemn guaranty to France, and to the people of Texas, be rescinded by a treaty with Spain? Can this government, by its own mere power, surrender any portion of its territory? Can it cut off a territory without the consent of its people, and surrender them and the territory to a foreign power? Can it expatriate and expel from the Union its own citizens, who occupy that territory, and change an American citizen into a citizen of Spain or Mexico? These are momentous questions, which it is not necessary now to determine, and in regard to which I advance at this time no opinion. Certain, however, it is, that, with the consent of the people of Texas, Congress can carry out the solemn pledges of the treaty of 1803, and admit one or more States from Texas into the Union.

The question as to Texas is, in any aspect, a question of the re-establishment of our ancient boundaries, and the repossession of a territory most reluctantly surrendered. The surrender of territory, even if constitutional, is almost universally inexpedient and unwise, and, in any event, when circumstances may seem to demand such a surrender, the territory thus abandoned should always be reacquired whenever it may be done with justice and propriety. Independent of these views, we have the recorded opinion of John Q. Adams as President, and Henry Clay as Secretary of State, and also of Gen. Andrew Jackson as President, and Martin Van Buren as Secretary of State, that Texas ought to be reannexed to the Union. On the 26th of March, 1825, Mr. Clay, in conformity with his own views, and the express directions of Mr. Adams as President, directed a letter to Mr. Poinsett, our Minister at Mexico, instructing him to endeavor to procure from Mexico a transfer to us of Texas to the Del Norte. In this letter Mr. Clay says, "The President wishes you to effect that object." Mr. Clay adds: "The line of the Sabine approaches our great western mart nearer than could be wished. Perhaps the Mexican government may not be unwilling to establish that of the Rio Brasso de Dios, or the Rio Colorado, in lieu of it." Mr. Clay urges, also, the importance of having entirely within our limits "the Red river and Arkansas, and their respective tributary streams."

On the 15th of March, 1827, Mr. Clay again renewed the effort to procure the cession of Texas. In his letter of instruction, of that date, to our Minister at Mexico, he says: "The President has thought the present might be an auspicious period for urging a negotiation at Mexico, to settle the boundary of the two republics." "If we could obtain such a boundary as we desire, the government of the United States might be disposed to pay a reasonable pecuniary compensation. The boundary we prefer is that which, beginning at the mouth of the Rio del Norte in the sea, shall ascend that river to the mouth of the Rio Puerco, thence ascending this river to its source, and from its source by a line due north to strike the Arkansas; thence following the southern bank of the Arkansas to its source, in latitude 42 deg. north; and thence by that parallel of latitude to the South Sea." And he adds, the treaty may provide "for the incorporation of the inhabitants into the Union."

Mr. Van Buren, in his letter, as Secretary of State, to our minister at Mexico, dated August 25, 1829, says: "It is the wish of the President that you should, without delay, open a negotiation with the Mexican government for the purchase of so much of the province of Texas as is hereinafter described." "He is induced, by a deep conviction of the real necessity of the proposed acquisition, not only as a guard for our western frontier, and the protection of New Orleans, but also to secure forever to the inhabitants of the valley of the Mississippi the undisputed and undisturbed possession of the navigation of that river." "The territory, of which a cession is desired by the United States, is all that part of the province of Texas which lies east of a line beginning at the Gulf of Mexico, in the centre of the desert, or grand prairie, which lies west of the Rio Nueces." And Mr. Van Buren adds, the treaty may provide "for the incorporation of the inhabitants into the Union." And he then enters into a long and powerful argument of his own, in favor of the reacquisition of Texas.

On the 29th of March, 1833, General Jackson, through Mr. Livingston as Secretary of State, renews to our minister at Mexico the former "instructions on the subject of the proposed cession." On the 2d of July, 1835, General Jackson, through Mr. Forsyth as Secretary of State, renews the instructions to obtain the cession of Texas, and expresses "an anxious desire to secure the very desirable alteration in our boundary with Mexico." On the 6th of August, 1835, Gen. Jackson, through Mr. Forsyth as Secretary of State, directs our minister at Mexico to endeavor to procure for us, from that government, the following boundary, "beginning at the Gulf of Mexico, proceeding along the eastern bank of the river Rio Bravo del Norte, to the 37th parallel of latitude, and thence along that parallel to the Pacific." This noble and glorious proposition of General Jackson would have secured to us, not only the whole of Texas, but also the largest and most valuable portion of upper California, together with the bay and harbor of San Francisco, the best on the western coast of America, and equal to any in the world. If, then, it was deemed, as it is clearly proved, most desirable to obtain the reannexation of Texas, down to a period as late as August, 1835, is it less important at this period?

We find the administration of Messrs. Adams and Clay in 1825 and 1827, and that of Jackson and Van Buren, in 1829, and subsequently in 1833 and 1835, making strenuous efforts to procure the reannexation of Texas, by a purchase from Mexico, at the expense of millions of dollars. Let us observe also the dates of these efforts. That of the first, by Messrs. Adams and Clay, in March, 1825, was within three years only after the recognition of the independence of Mexico by this country; and prior to its full recognition by other powers; and it was within less than five years subsequent to the final ratification of the treaty by which we surrendered Texas, not to Mexico, but to Spain. Now, as Spain had not then recognized the independence of Mexico, and the war was still waging between those nations, the only title which Mexico had to Texas, was by a successful revolution, and is precisely the same title, and depending on the same principles, as that now possessed by Texas. The same remarks apply to the subsequent efforts of Messrs. Adams and Clay in 1827, and of Jackson and Van Buren in 1829, to acquire Texas by purchase from Mexico. And even at the latest period, no more time had elapsed between the date of the recognition of the independence of Mexico, and the proposed purchase from her, than the time (now about seven years) since our recognition of the independence of Texas. Throughout the period of all these proposed treaties, the war was waging between Mexico and Spain. The brave Porter, our own gallant commodore, commanded the Mexican navy, aided by many American officers and crews. In the earlier part, also, of the conflict on the land, the gallant Perry, and the brave Magee, an American officer, with a combined American and Mexican army, had defeated the royal forces of Spain in many a glorious conflict. Throughout this whole period, Mexico was soliciting and obtaining the aid of our countrymen, on the ocean and on the land; and it is more than doubtful whether, in the absence of that assistance, Mexico would yet have achieved her independence. On the 27th July 1829, Barradas, with a Spanish army of four thousand men, captured the Mexican city of Tampico, which he held until the 10th September of the same year. Yet, on the 25th August, 1829, whilst the fate of this expedition was yet undetermined, the administration of Jackson and Van Buren, as we have seen, proposed the purchase of Texas from Mexico. If, then, there be any force in the objections, that Texas was aided in her conflict by American citizens, that the war is still waging, (which it is not), or that the independence of Texas is still unrecognized by Mexico, or that a treaty with Mexico (as we had with Spain) had been ratified,—all these reasons apply with far greater force against the proposed purchase of Texas from Mexico in 1825, 1827, and 1829, when Mexico was yet unrecognized by Spain; when our treaty, surrendering Texas to Spain, was unrescinded, except by the revolution in Mexico; and when our citizens were still aiding, as they always had done, the people of Mexico in their struggle for independence. It is true, that, in 1837, within a few weeks or months succeeding our recognition of the independence of Texas, and before her recognition by any foreign powers, it might have subjected us to unjust imputations; and therefore might have been deemed inexpedient, at such a time, and under such circumstances, to reannex Texas by a treaty to this Union. But now, when seven years have elapsed since our recognition of the independence of Texas; and she has been recognized for many years

as an independent power by the great nations of Europe; and her sovereignty fully established, and fully acknowledged, there can be no objection to such a treaty at this period.

The reasons assigned in 1825, 1827, 1829, 1833 and 1835, for the reannexation of Texas, apply now with full force. These reasons were, that the Sabine, as a boundary, was the near New Orleans; that the defence of that city was rendered insecure; and that the Arkansas and Red rivers, and all their tributaries, ought to be in our own exclusive possession. The present boundary is the worst which could be devised. It is a succession of steps and curves, carving out the great valley of the West into a shape that is absolutely hideous. It surrenders the Red river, and Arkansas, and their numerous tributaries, for thousands of miles, to a foreign power. It brings that power upon the Gulf, within a day's sail of the mouth of the Mississippi, and in the interior, by the curve of the Sabine, within about one hundred miles of the Mississippi. It places that power, for many hundred miles, on the banks of the Red river, in immediate contact with sixty thousand Indian warriors of our own, and with very many thousand of the fiercest savage tribes in Texas, there to be armed and equipped for the work of death and desolation. It enables a foreign power, with such aids, to descend the Red river, to the junction of the Mississippi, there to cut off all communication from above or below, to arrest at that point all boats which were descending with their troops and munitions of war for the defence of New Orleans, and fall down suddenly on that city, thus isolated from the rest of the Union, and subjected to certain ruin.

From the mouth of the Mississippi to the Sabine there is not a single harbor where an American vessel of war could find shelter; but westward of the mouth of the Sabine, in Texas, are several deep bays and harbors; and Galveston, one of these, has a depth of water equal to that at the mouth of the Mississippi. Looking into the interior, along this extraordinary boundary, we find a foreign power stretching for many hundred miles along the Sabine to the Red river; thence west several hundred miles along that river to the western boundary of our Indian territories; thence north to the Arkansas, and up that stream to the southern boundary of the territory of Oregon, and at a point which, according to the recent most able survey of Lieutenant Fremont, is within 20 miles of the pass of the Rocky mountains, which secures the entrance to Oregon. We thus place a foreign power there, to move eastward of westward, upon the valley of the Columbia or Mississippi. We place this power north of St. Louis, north of a portion of Iowa, and south of New Orleans, and along this line for several thousand miles in our rear.

Such is the boundary at present given to the valley of the West; such the imminent dangers to which it is subjected of massacre; such the dismemberment of the great valley, and of many of the noblest streams and tributaries of the Mississippi; such the surrender of so many hundred miles of our coast, with so many bays and harbors; such the hazard to which New Orleans is subjected, and the outlet of all our commerce to the gulf. Such is our present boundary; and it can be exchanged for one that will give us perfect security, that will place our own people and our own settlements in rear of the Indian tribes, and that will cut them off from foreign influence; that will restore to us the uninterrupted navigation of the Red river and Arkansas, and of all their tributaries; that will place us at the north, upon a point to command the pass of Oregon, and, on the south, to secure New Orleans, and render certain the command of the Gulf of Mexico. In pursuing our ancient and rightful boundary, before we surrendered Texas, along the Del Norte, we are brought, by a western curve of that great river, to a point within four hundred miles of the Pacific ocean, and where the waters of the Del Norte almost commingle with those that flow into the Western ocean. Up to this point on the Del Norte it is navigable for steamboats; and from that point to the Pacific is a good route for caravans, and where, it is believed, the Pacific may be united with the Del Norte and the Gulf by a railroad, not longer than that which now unites Buffalo and Boston; and where, even now, without such a road, we could command the trade of all the northern States of Mexico, and of a very large portion of the western coast of America.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Information and Knowledge. There is a wide and obvious distinction between knowledge and information. A man may be well informed who possesses but an indifferent stock of knowledge. Information may consist in such a general idea of things, as to enable a man to talk about them, but knowledge comprehends the minutiae of every thing within its scope. A well informed man may be able to take a share in almost every conversation arising in the company in which he is present. Talk of politics—he knows public characters, understands daily changes, is not at fault with a new ministry, or at fault with a foreign ambassador. Talk of astronomy—he is aware that the sun is our centre, that the earth has a twofold revolution, that there are a number of other planets revolving in like manner around the sun, and that the fixed stars are in all probability, suns, the centres of other systems. Talk upon any topic—he has information on all, and can talk respectably upon all. But the man of knowledge can lay down the boundaries of kingdoms, track the course of armies, lay his finger on the constellations, and has a well defined meaning attached to his ideas. You may by plausible ingenuity, deceive and bewilder an informed man, but the man of knowledge is secured in his footing, and cannot be easily overcome.

Happy old Farmers. The following, drawn by an old farmer 80 years of age, is one of the best sketches of human happiness we have ever read. We bespeak for it an attentive perusal, as it shows how easy it is for man to find contentment if he would but seek it in the only way where it is to be found:

"I have lived on this farm more than half a century. I have no desire to change my residence as long as I live on earth. I have no wish to be richer than I am now. I have worshipped the God of my fathers for more than forty years. During that period I have scarcely ever been absent from the sanctuary on the Sabbath, and never have lost more than one communion season. I have never been confined to my bed by sickness a single day. The blessings of God have been richly spread around me, and I made up my mind long ago, that if I wished to be happier, I must have more religion."