

No. 4.—*J. T. Sherwood, Esq. to J. Bidwell, Esq.—(Received May 3.)*

*British Consulate, Maine and New Hampshire,*

(Extract.)

*Portland, March 23, 1838.*

IN my despatch, dated the 15th inst., respecting the Governor's Message to the Legislature of the State of Maine, in relation to the recent propositions received from the Federal Government at Washington, on the subject of the North Eastern Boundary, I ventured to express my opinion, that the disapproval of the Governor, as mentioned in his Message, would be adhered to by the Legislature; how far I have erred in this opinion will be gathered from the inclosed copy of the Report of the Committee\*, to whom the said Message was referred.

I have the honor to be, &c.

*John Bidwell, Esq.,*

(Signed)

JOS. T. SHERWOOD.

[\* See Inclosure 2 in No. 3.]

XII.

North-eastern  
Boundary.

Arrest of E. Greely.  
Fortifications.

No. 5.—*J. T. Sherwood, Esq. to John Bidwell, Esq.—(Received May 21.)*

*British Consulate, Maine and New Hampshire,*

(Extract.)

*Portland, March 24, 1838.*

HAVING already transmitted to you for the information of My Lord Palmerston, the several printed Reports and Proceedings thereon, in the Legislature of the State of Maine, in relation to the North Eastern Boundary,—

I have now the honor to inclose a newspaper containing a copy of the last Report and Resolves with the actions of the Senate on the same subject up to the evening of the 22d current month.

I am, &c.

*John Bidwell, Esq.*

(Signed)

JOS. T. SHERWOOD.

Inclosure in No. 5.

*Tuesday, March 20, 1838.*

The report and resolves in relation to the North-Eastern Boundary, were called up by Mr. Greene. Mr. Ham moved a recommitment, for he thought there were some objectionable points in the report. Mr. Dumont was astonished that *that* gentleman should have made such a motion, since his name was attached to the report, and he must have given his assent thereto. He trusted he would not be so fickle as to oppose his own report now. That report was signed by every member of the committee, and he saw no necessity for recommitting. Mr. Boutelle said he should have liked it better, if the gentleman from York had put his finger on the points to which he objected. The report was read to the committee, and some objections were made to it, and it was committed to a sub-committee, composed of the gentlemen from York, himself and two members of the House, and then was approved. He did not believe any good would result from the recommitment, nor did he think that any man was committed by accepting the report.

Mr. Dumont thought it was strange that the gentleman should declare that he did not understand the report; such an assertion was paying no great compliment to his intelligence. He trusted the gentleman would not *shrink from any responsibility* on this subject; that they were not about to abandon the Treaty of '83, and re-enact the farce of 1832. He had hoped that the Senate would come out like men, and speak with a united voice, and he believed the recommitment would cause needless delay, and prevent any action on the subject—any response to the general government.

Mr. Greene would never approve of a report that was drawn for *party* purposes; and agreed with the Governor that all *party* feelings should be thrown out of the scale. It was difficult to catch the meaning of any document by hearing it read, and he did not think that the gentlemen who signed the report were justly subject to the charge of vacillation, because they now ask for the recommitment. Are they, said Mr. G. because they signed that report, to be *dragooned* into sanctioning all the principles and reasoning there contained? He would never vote for imputations on the general government in the least particular.

Mr. DUMONT retorted; the gentleman has asked if those who signed the report, are to be dragooned into its support? Permit me, said he, to ask if they are to be *dragooned out of it*? Aye, that is the true question. Are they who approved yesterday, to be *dragooned out* of their opinion to-day? The gentleman says he will vote for no imputation on the General Government. I cannot blame him for that,—he would be *ungrateful*, if he did, under the *circumstances of the case*. But, it is said, this report is of a *party* character. Mr. D. could not see it. Why has not the gentleman pointed out its *party* features? It is the *truth* and nothing but the *truth*, and if he objects to *that*, he is welcome to his objections. We should look to the honor and integrity of the