

Terms.—Two Dollars per annum in advance. Advertisements inserted at \$1 per square for the first, and 25 cents for each subsequent insertion. Court Orders charged 25 per cent higher. A deduction of 33 1/3 per cent will be made to those who advertise by the year.

(From the Philadelphia Ledger.) Documents accompanying the President's Message—the Oregon Negotiation.

The Washington Union publishes the correspondence with the State department, with the British minister, upon the Oregon question. The first letter is from Mr. Fox to Mr. Webster, dated Nov. 15th, 1842, including an extract of a dispatch from Lord Aberdeen, in which the wishes of the government of Great Britain, in respect to a negotiation, are fully set forth. Mr. Webster's answer is dated Nov. 25, in which he states he is directed to say that the president concurred entirely in the expediency of making the question, respecting the Oregon territory, of immediate attention and negotiation between the two governments.

The next letters are from Mr. Pakenham, envoy extraordinary, to Mr. Upshur, then secretary of State, informing him that he was ready to confer with him with a view to ulterior negotiation, and Mr. Upshur's answer, appointing a time, February 27th, 1844.

The next letter is dated July 22d, 1844, from Mr. Pakenham to Mr. Calhoun, informing him of the steps taken in the negotiation, which the sudden death of Mr. Upshur had interfered with, and repeating the desire to proceed to the consideration of the question; to which Mr. Calhoun sent a reply Aug. 22, appointing next day for the conference, which was accepted. The conference adjourned to meet Monday, the 20th, to hear proposals from the respective governments. At the third conference the American plenipotentiary, Mr. Calhoun, presented a written statement of his views of the claims of the U. States, and declined to accept the British minister's proposal. This letter and the answer of Mr. Pakenham present the arguments advanced by the two governments, sustaining their respective claims. Mr. Calhoun declines the proposal of the British minister, on the ground that it would have the effect of restricting the possessions of the United States to limits far more circumscribed than their claims clearly entitled them to. It proposed to limit their northern boundary by a line drawn from the Rocky mountains along the 49th parallel of latitude to the north-easternmost branch of the Columbia river, and thence down the middle of that river to the sea—giving to Great Britain all the country north, and to the U. States all south, of that line, except a detached territory extending on the Pacific and the straits of Fuca, from Bullfinch's harbor to Hood's canal. To which it is proposed, in addition, to make free to the U. States any part which the United States government might desire, either on the mainland or Vancouver's island, south of latitude 49 degrees. This parallel assigns to Great Britain almost the entire region (on its north side) drained by the Columbia river, lying on its northern bank.

Mr. C. then brings forward our claim to the portion of territory drained by the Columbia river, which we possess in our own proper right, and those we derived from France and Spain. Captain Gray, a citizen of the United States, passed the bar of the Columbia river, and anchored ten miles above its mouth, on the 11th of May, 1792, and gave its present name. This claim of discovery and entrance is opposed by the alleged discoveries of Meares and Vancouver. The former, five years before Captain Gray's discovery, explored a portion of the coast through which the Columbia flows, but left a record in his own journal that he did not discover the river, and in consequence of the failure, called the promontory lying north of the point where he expected to discover it, Cape Disappointment, and the inlet itself Deception Bay. Vancouver, in April 1792, explored the same coast; but it is no less certain that he failed to discover the river of which his own journal furnishes the most conclusive evidence. He was subsequently informed of Gray's discovery, and entered the river on the 20th of October.

The evidence of the priority of our discovery of the head branches of the Columbia river and its exploration is equally conclusive. Lewis and Clarke, in the expedition in the summer of 1805, reached the head waters of the Columbia, and descended to the mouth of the river, and wintered on Cape Disappointment. Mr. Calhoun says: "It was this important expedition which brought to the knowledge of the world the great river—the greatest by far on the western side of this continent—with its numerous branches, and the vast regions through which it flows, above the points to which Gray and Vancouver had ascended. It took place many years before it was visited and explored by any subject of Great Britain, or of any other civilized nation, so far as we are informed." It is clearly entitled us to the claim of priority of discovery, as to its head branches and the exploration of the river and region through which it passes, as to the voyages of Captain Gray and the Spanish navigator, Hequeta, entitled us to priority in reference to its mouth, and its entrance into its channel.

Our priority of settlement is equally certain. Establishments were formed by American citizens on the Columbia as early as 1809 and 1810. In the latter year, a company was formed in New York, at the head of which was John Jacob Astor, a wealthy merchant of that city, the object

THE CAROLINA WATCHMAN.

BRUNER & JAMES, Editors & Proprietors.

"KEEP A CHECK UPON ALL YOUR BUSINESS."



RULERS. DO THIS, AND LIBERTY IS SAFE. Genl. Harrison.

NEW SERIES, NUMBER 37, OF VOLUME II.

SALISBURY, N. C., JANUARY 9, 1846.

of which was to form a regular chain of establishments on the Columbia river and the contiguous coasts of the Pacific, for commercial purposes. Early in the spring of 1811, they made their first establishment on the south side of the river, a few miles above Point George, where they visited in July following by Mr. Thompson, a surveyor and astronomer of the Northwest Company, and his party. They had been sent out by that company to forestal the American company in occupying the mouth of the river, but found themselves defeated in their object. The American company formed two other establishments higher up the river—one at the confluence of the Okeneban with the north branch of the Columbia, about six hundred miles above its mouth; and the other on the Spoken, a stream falling into the north branch some fifty miles above.

These posts fell into the possession of Great Britain during the war declared the next year, but were restored by the treaty of Ghent, which placed our possession where it was before it passed into the hands of British subjects.

To these claims are added the claims of France and Spain.

The former we obtained by the treaty of Louisiana, ratified in 1803; and the latter by the treaty of Florida, ratified in 1819. By the former, we acquired all the rights which France had to Louisiana, to the extent it now has, (1803) in the hands of Spain, and that it had when France possessed it, and such as it should be after the treaty subsequently entered into by Spain and other States.—By the latter, his catholic majesty, 'ceded to the United States all his rights, claims and pretensions,' to the country lying west of the Rocky Mountains, and north of a line drawn on the 42d parallel of latitude, from a point on the south bank of the Arkansas, in that parallel, to the South Sea; that is, to the whole region claimed by Spain, west of those mountains, and north of that line.

The cession of Louisiana gave us undisputed title west of the Mississippi, extending to the summit of the Rocky Mountains, and stretching south between the river and those mountains to the possessions of Spain, the line between which and ours was afterwards determined by the treaty of Florida.

He then proceeds to make an elaborate argument on the title which continuity gives, and brings forward the contest between Great Britain and France, which was terminated by the treaty of 1763, as having arisen on the side of Great Britain on this very right of continuity from her colonies now the United States, extending westward to the Pacific. The result of this contest, he says, forecloses Great Britain against contesting the principle, particularly against us.

The treaty of 1763, between England and France after the war, 'fixed irrevocably' the Mississippi river as the permanent boundary between the possessions of England and France, and extinguished in favor of France whatever claim Great Britain may have had to the region lying west of the Mississippi.

It of course could not affect the rights of Spain—the only other nation which had any pretence of claim west of that river; but it prevented the right of continuity previously claimed by Great Britain from extending beyond it, and transferred it to France. The treaty of Louisiana restored and vested in the United States all the claims acquired by France and surrendered by Great Britain, under the provisions of that treaty, to the country west of the Mississippi, and, among others, the one in question. Certain it is that France had the same right of continuity, in virtue of her possession of Louisiana, and the extinguishment of the right of England, by the treaty of 1763, to the whole country west of the Rocky Mountains, and lying west of Louisiana, as against Spain which England had to the country westward of the Alleghany Mountains, as against France—with this difference, that Spain had nothing to oppose the claim of France, at the time, but the right of discovery; and even that, England has since denied; while France had opposed to the right of England, in her case, that of discovery, exploration, and settlement. It is, therefore, not at all surprising that France should claim the country west of the Rocky Mountains, (as may be inferred from her maps,) on the same principle that Great Britain had claimed and disposed of her regions west of the Alleghany; or that the U. States, as soon as they had acquired the rights of France, should assert the same claim, and take measures immediately after to explore it, with a view to occupation and settlement. But since then we have strengthened our title, by adding to our own proper claims and those of France the claims also of Spain, by the treaty of Florida, as has been stated.

The claims which we have acquired from her between the Rocky Mountains and the Pacific rest on her priority of discovery. Numerous voyages of discovery, commencing with that of Maldonado in 1528, and ending with that under Galiano and Valdes in 1792, were undertaken by her authority, along the north-western coast of North America. That they discovered and explored not only the entire coast of what is now called the Oregon Territory, but still further north, is a fact too well established to be controverted at this day. The voyages which they performed will accordingly be passed over at present without being particularly alluded to with the exception of the Hequeta. His discovery of the mouth of the Columbia river has been already referred to. It was made on the 15th of August, 1775—many years anterior to the voyages of Meares and Vancouver, and was prior to Cook's, who did not reach the north-western coast until 1778. The claims it gave to Spain of priority of discovery were transferred to us, with all others belonging to her, by the treaty of Florida; which added to the discoveries of Captain Gray, places our right to the discovery of the mouth and entrance into the inlet and river beyond all controversy.

It has been objected that we claim under various and conflicting titles, which mutually destroy each other. Such might indeed be the fact while they were held by different parties; but since we have rightfully acquired both those of Spain and France, and concentrated the whole in our hands, they mutually blend with each other, and form one strong and connected chain of title against the opposing claims of all others, including Great Britain.

He next refers to what has occurred since the Treaty of Ghent between the U. States and G. Britain in reference to the territory. During the negotiation of the Treaty of Ghent in 1818, the United States were admitted by Lord Castlereagh as entitled to be considered as the party in possession; and the convention which stipulated that the territory should be free and open, for the term of ten years from the date of its signature, to the vessels, citizens, and subjects of the two countries, without prejudice to any claim which either party may have to any part of the same, preserved and perpetuated all our claims to the territory, including the acknowledged right to be considered the party in possession, as perfectly during the period of its continuance as they were the day the convention was signed.

After an abortive attempt to adjust the claims of the two parties to the territory, in 1824, another negotiation was commenced in 1826—which terminated in renewing, on the 6th of August, 1827, the third article of the convention in 1818, prior to its expiration. It provided for the indefinite extension of all the provisions of the third article of that convention; and also that either party might terminate it at any time it might think fit, by giving one year's notice, after the 20th of October, 1828. It took, however, the precaution of providing expressly that "nothing contained in this convention, or in the third article of the convention of the 20th October, 1818, hereby continued in force, shall be construed to impair or in any manner affect the claims which either of the contracting parties may have to any part of the country westward of the Stony or Rocky mountains." That convention is now in force, and has continued to be so since the expiration of that of 1818.—By the joint operation of the two, our right to be considered the party in possession, and all the claims we had to the territory while in possession, are preserved in as full vigor as they were at the date of its restoration in 1818, without being affected or impaired by the settlements since made by the subjects of Great Britain.

Time, indeed, so far from impairing our claims, has greatly strengthened them, since that period; for, since then, the treaty of Florida transferred to us all the rights, claims, and pretensions of Spain to the whole territory, as has been stated. In consequence of this, our claims to the portion drained by the Columbia river—the point now the subject of consideration—have been much strengthened, by giving us the incontestable claim to the discovery of the mouth of the river by Hequeta.—But it is not in this particular only that it has operated in our favor. Our well-founded claim, grounded on continuity, has greatly strengthened, during the same period, by the rapid advance of our population towards the territory—its great increase, especially in the valley of the Mississippi—as well as the greatly increased facility of passing to the territory by more accessible routes, and the far stronger and rapidly swelling tide of population that has recently commenced flowing into it.

Next follows Mr. Pakenham's reply to the above, dated 12th September, 1844.

After briefly stating the grounds on which Mr. Calhoun declines his offer, Mr. P. observes, that he has not been able to discover any evidence that Louisiana extended westward to the Pacific, but has strong reasons to suppose the acknowledged boundary was the Rocky Mountains; and quotes President Jefferson, as having entertained that belief. If, however, Louisiana did extend westward over the Rocky Mountains, France transferred that claim to Spain in 1763, and it became subject to the provisions of the treaty of 1790 between Great Britain and Spain, which abrogated the claim of Spain to exclusive dominion over the unoccupied parts of the American continent.

He says, as to continuity, "it may more properly be considered as demonstrating

the greater degree of interest which the U. States possess by reason of contiguity in acquiring territory in that direction, than affecting in any way the question of right."

He acknowledges that Spain conveyed, by the treaty of 1819, all the rights she had the power to dispose of north of 42 degrees: "but she could not, by that transaction, invalidate the rights which she had, by a previous transaction, acknowledged to belong to another power," and the treaty of 1790, "acknowledged in Great Britain certain rights."

With respect to the claims urged for Hequeta and Gray to the discovery of the Columbia, (both vesting in the U. States, he remembered,) he says they conflict; but allowing them both to be vested in the United States, if Hequeta's claim be good, then Great Britain has a joint claim by the treaty of 1790.

He then proceeds to a consideration of the British claim, says the United States had no claims when they became a nation, and that those of France are worth nothing; urges the commercial intercourse of Great Britain with the Northwest coast, the voyages of Cook, the discoveries of Meares, and survey of the coast and islands by Vancouver, and says that by these Great Britain has as strong a claim by discovery and exploration as could be imagined.

He sets the accuracy and authenticity of Cook's and Vancouver's survey of the mouth of the Columbia by Gray.

On exploration, he says that Mackenzie, a British subject, crossed the Rocky mountains to the Pacific in 1793, and discovered the upper waters of Frazier's river, which, in process of time, was traced to the sea near latitude 49, and this he puts as a counterpoise to Lewis and Clarke's discovery of the upper waters of the Columbia.

Priority of settlement, he says, amounts to a trading post in 1811, which has not been occupied by the Americans since its surrender after the war.

In counterpoise to the declaration of Lord Castlereagh to Mr. Rush, he puts that nobleman's despatch to the British minister at Washington at the time of giving up Astoria claiming the whole territory.

He says that the state of the question is, that the parties are in joint occupancy, and Great Britain can only be divested of her right to that joint occupancy by an equivalent partition of the whole between the two powers.

He says Great Britain, in adhering to the line of the Columbia, "is not influenced by motives of ambition with respect to extent of boundary, but by considerations of utility, not to say necessity which cannot be lost sight of," &c.

He concludes by requesting a proposition from the American plenipotentiary, and, also, a statement of the claims which the United States may have to other portions of the territory, as alluded to in Mr. Calhoun's statement.

On the 20th September, 1844, Mr. Calhoun rejoins to this counter statement by Mr. Pakenham.

The statement of Mr. P. has not weakened his confidence in the American claim. He does not understand Mr. P. to deny that the Spanish navigators were the first to discover and explore the entire coasts of the Oregon Territory, or the claims of Hequeta and Gray to the discovery of the Columbia. On the other hand, he understands him as admitting these claims, but that Spain divested herself of her exclusive rights resulting from them by the treaty of 1790. But having thus put aside the claims of Spain by this assumption, the counterstatement opposes the claim of the United States by those founded on the voyage of Cook, and Meares, &c.

It will not be expected that he will undertake to repel what he regards as a mere assumption, unsupported by any reason. In his opinion, there is nothing in the Nootka Sound Convention to warrant the assumption. On this assumption the counter statement rests its objection to the well founded American claims. Without it, there would not be left a plausible objection to them.

As to McKenzie's discovery of Frazier's river, it is an inferior stream, and cannot affect the discovery of the Columbia.

It is not denied that we had the first settlement; that it was restored, or that we had a right to be considered in possession while treating of the title. He answers Mr. P. most forcibly on this point, as also on our title from France, and demolishes the superstructure he had raised on Mr. Jefferson's letter, explodes what he says about continuity and contiguity, and shows that the right of continuity westward is one claimed and enforced by Great Britain herself.

ly as occupants in common with Great Britain. Nor can he, while thus regarding their rights, present a counter proposal based on the supposition of a joint occupancy merely, until the question of title to the territory is fully discussed. It is, in his opinion, only after a discussion which shall present the titles of the parties respectively to the territory, that their claims to it can be fully and frankly adjusted. The United States desire only what they deem themselves justly entitled to; and are unwilling to take less.—With their present opinion of their title, the British Plenipotentiary must see that the proposal which he made at the second conference, and which he more fully sets forth in his counter statement, falls far short of what they believe themselves justly entitled to. In reply to the request for a statement of the claims to other parts of the territory, Mr. C. States in general terms that they are derived from Spain by the Florida treaty, and gives us a right to the extent to which they can be established, unless a better can be proposed.

Mr. Pakenham to Mr. Calhoun. Washington, 15th January, 1845.—States that he has sent all that has passed heretofore to her Majesty's government and that they have it under consideration; but, in the mean time, he is instructed to propose arbitration, leaving the choice of the arbiter to be subsequently determined upon.

Mr. Calhoun to Mr. Pakenham. Washington, January 21, 1845.—States that he has laid his proposal before the President, and is instructed to inform him he cannot accede to the offer. Waiving all other reasons for declining it, it is sufficient to state that he continues to entertain the hope that the question may be settled by the negotiation now pending between the two countries; and that he is of the opinion it would be unadvisable to entertain a proposal to resort to any other mode, so long as there is a hope of arriving at a satisfactory settlement by negotiation; and especially to one which might rather retard than expedite its final adjustment.

Mr. Buchanan to Mr. Pakenham. Washington, July 12, 1845.—The Secretary of State resumes the negotiation, and proceeds, in reply to Mr. Pakenham's note of September 11, to answer his request for a proposition from the United States Government and also for a statement of title. He commences with the title first, and rests it upon the cession from Spain, contending that at the date of this cession Spain had a good title as against Great Britain to the whole Oregon territory, and if this be established the question is then established in favor of the United States.

He proceeds first to ascertain the meaning of the Nootka Sound convention, and maintains that it conferred no rights upon Great Britain but to trade with the Indians, was transient in its nature, and did not interfere with the sovereignty of Spain over the territory, and above all, was annulled by the war between Great Britain and Spain in 1798, and has never since been renewed, and consequently, that the claim of Great Britain to any portion of the territory is destitute of foundation. Mr. Buchanan proceeds to enforce these positions with great ability and at great length.

Having established these positions, he states the positions which he considers Mr. Calhoun has proved, of our right to the whole of the territory drained by the Columbia, and maintains that the treaties of joint occupancy specially exempt this title from being impaired by them or any subsequent action of Great Britain. Our own title is older than that acquired by the Florida treaty; and admitting the application of the Nootka convention as now sought to be enforced by Great Britain, it cannot affect our title to this territory. The grounds are maintained and enforced with great ability and at length.

He then says that the President, entertaining these views of our title, would not have consented to yield any portion of the Oregon Territory had he not been embarrassed, if not committed, by the action of his predecessors in office, and with a view to manifest to the world that he is actuated by a spirit of moderation he offers the 49th parallel to the ocean, without any port on Vancouver's Island South of that parallel.

Mr. Pakenham to Mr. Buchanan. Washington, July 20, 1845.—In this communication, which is of considerable length Mr. Pakenham combats most strenuously the position of Mr. Buchanan, particularly that claiming the American title to the Valley of the Columbia to be older than the treaty of 1819, inasmuch as in another part Mr. B. had said that the title of Spain so far North as 61st degree had never seriously been questioned by any European nation; and if this were the case, the Americans could not acquire any title to that to which the Spanish title were not perfect; while if the Spanish title were not perfect, and the American title by discovery is good against that title, then he claims that there were earlier British discoveries.

He also brings forward the American offer to divide the territory previous to the treaty with Spain in 1819, and he maintains that the United States, can found no

claim on discovery, exploration, settlement, prior to the Florida treaty, without admitting the principles of the Nootka convention, and the consequent equality of the parallel claims of Great Britain on like acts. He maintains that he has shown that the Nootka convention has continued in force until the present time; and also, that if it had never existed, the claims of Great Britain are at least as good as those of the United States. He states the discoveries &c., the amount of which is to be that British navigators and explorers discovered Vancouver's Island, Fraser's River; and American, the Columbia River. He maintains, however, the British claim to the whole, and declines the offer made by Mr. Buchanan, (see above) contemptuously, by the way.

Mr. Buchanan to Mr. Pakenham. Washington, Aug. 30, 1845.—Mr. Buchanan proceeds to reply, at great length, to Mr. Pakenham's statement, and quotes the ratification of Messrs. Huskisson and Calhoun, on the 16th December, 1844. "Great Britain claims no exclusive right to any portion of that territory," Mr. B. makes a long and elaborate statement in reply to Mr. P., restating, especially the American title, and offering to the whole of Oregon, and contending that withdrawing the proposition he had given Mr. P., however, one or two paragraphs in relation to his despatch, in fact that he has rejected the offer of submitting it to his Government.

Such is a very brief abstract of the correspondence respecting the Oregon territory, during the negotiation which has been terminated. The statements and contents of the three last documents, however, compressed in a very small space, and hardly does justice to the arguments, but the length to which this abstract has been extended, had any attempt been made to give it more in detail, would have exceeded the limits of the paper.

SUSPENSION BRIDGES.

The Rochester American gives the result of an examination made by Mr. Charles A. Philadelphia Engineer, of the local Niagara Falls, where it is proposed to construct a suspension bridge over the river. Mr. C. has constructed several bridges upon this principle in Europe, and one at Fairmount, estimates are thought, therefore, to be reliable. "There is a point about a mile below the cataract, and near the center where the distance from one high bank to the other does not exceed 700 feet. A hanging bridge at that point, of sufficient strength to sustain the weight of a railroad, or any other burden which may be placed on it, and made in the best and securest manner, is estimated by Mr. Ellet at \$200,000. It offers to construct such bridge for that sum to subscribe \$20,000 to its stock."

This, if ever it be constructed, will be a magnificent work. It is thought to be of great importance in connection with the railroad from Rochester via Lockport, Falls, the distance being 80 miles and estimated expense \$1,000,000.

As the nature and efficiency of suspension bridges are not generally known in this country, the following extract of a letter from Mr. C. in the Newark Advertiser, published in those at Berner, will not be without interest.

The Suspension Bridges of Berner are among the wonders of the world, for their remarkable length and height. One, erected in 1834, which was 905 feet long, 110 feet high, and 23 feet broad, and cost \$125,000. As serious doubts existed as to its safety, strength, notwithstanding the vast supports, extraordinary means were used to test its powers. First, fifteen pieces of iron drawn by fifty horses, with 300 hundred accompanying them, were marched over them; then they were crowded as compactly as possible on various portions of it. The centre sustained the enormous pressure of an important carriage, though a depression of one inch of 394 inches in the middle. Within a very short time another bridge had been built, not so long as the first, but higher, being 705 feet in length and 110 feet above the ground. The impossibility of constructing any other species of arch bridge span the river Aar, whose lofty bluffs on both sides, has caused the erection of the which is at once an object of curiosity and ornament to the city. The eye beholds stream and rocks, the houses and people, and while the brain grows dizzy with distance, fears are excited on observing the whole stupendous mass is suspended on apparently frail cables of iron wire. — Enquirer.

The Business of a Christian Nation.

One Hundred and twenty seven.—Great Britain has spent 65 years in war, and 62 in peace. She borrowed in wars, which occupied the 65 years, 1,000,000,000. In the same time, she raised taxes £1,188,000,000, thus forming a net expenditure of \$8,982,120,000. This enormous sum, from the taut, strained sinews of the world, would have constructed fifteen railroads around the globe, allowing \$23,000,000 a mile! To raise another such sum, we require a tax of \$10 on every human being on the globe! The interest of the sum for one month, at five per cent, exceeds the whole amount contributed by the whole Christian world for promoting the gospel to the heathen for the last 1,000 sand years!

A Whig Judge elected by a Democratic Legislature.—The Tallahassee papers state that the Hon. Samuel W. Carmack, a Whig, been elected by the Legislature of Florida, Judge of the Superior Court for the Second Circuit of that State. The Judge, (see Charleston News,) is spoken of as a lawyer and a man of sterling integrity, and by such men who adorn and dignify the bench. This is one among the very rare instances occurring, in which the majesty of truth and principle triumphs over party intolerance. The Legislature of Florida have evinced their patriotism and patriotism in having kept the scales of justice unpolled by its baneful influence.