

# The Raleigh Minerva.

Vol 19

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1816.

No. 1036.

## RALEIGH, (N. C.)

PRINTED, WEEKLY, BY ALEX. LUCAS.  
Terms of subscription: Three dollars per year, one dollar to be paid in advance. No paper to be continued longer than three months after a year's subscription, unless the subscriber shall have been given notice thereof. Notices, not exceeding 14 lines, are inserted free for one dollar, and for twenty-five cents each subsequent insertion; and in like proportion where there is a greater number of lines than fourteen.  
No subscription can in any case be received without payment of at least \$1 50 in advance.

## Legislature of North-Carolina.

### MR. STANLY'S SPEECH (Concluded.)

After some remarks from Mr. Daniel, (of Halifax),

MR. STANLY said he would make a few observations in reply to the gentleman from Halifax. The gentleman has taken much trouble to investigate the nature of the British orders in council and to expose their injustice: Mr. S. saw not how the labor was necessary. No man in America, and certainly no one in that house, had pretended to excuse the orders in council: they were explicitly admitted to have been gross violations of our rights, but it had been contended, they were not a real cause of the war, or the war would not have been continued after the orders in council were repealed and the fact communicated by admiral Warren with an offer of an armistice. The gentleman from Halifax, Mr. S. presumed, was prompted to this display on the orders in council, by that oracle the "Olive Branch," which had been before introduced into this debate by the gentleman's friend, (Mr. Inge.) This work of which one Carey (an Irish book-seller was editor, would more properly be called the "Fire-Brand." It was a thing made by Carey in the way of trade, by clipping with a pair of shears from old newspapers, and the garbled "shreds and patches" bound together with a red leather back, had become the democratic manual! Were the impudent consider to present himself in this assembly to read his garbled documents and impudent assertions, he would be spurned from its presence.

On the subject of impressments, the gentleman wonders I should refer to the practice of British admiral and a French captain instead of citing Grotius. In my opinion, sir, the practice of a nation is only to be proved by the conduct of its officers: when I undertake to establish a principle of national law, I will consult Grotius—the gentleman from Halifax, would I presume consult the "Olive Branch."

The silence of the treaty of Ghent upon the subject of impressment, the gentleman says is an abandonment of our opposition to the British claim, to take their seamen because, he says, the British claim to take their seamen, only exists in time of war, and the British being at peace when the treaty of Ghent was made, it was unnecessary to have made any stipulation on the subject. Sir, the gentleman is mistaken; the British claim is not of a belligerent nature, but is due by natural allegiance:—let me read him the authority of our own democratic cabinet on this point. The very message of Mr. Madison recommending war, declares, that the "practice of impressment is not the exercise of a belligerent right founded on the law of nations against an enemy, but of a municipal prerogative over British subjects;"—and Mr. Monroe's letter to the commissioners at Ghent, 15th April, 1813, states, "the practice of impressment is not founded on any belligerent right,—the British government founds it on that of allegiance, which is a permanent right, equally applicable to peace and war." These quotations remove even the slender apology for the abandonment of the claim of the U. States, that the king shall protect the crew—and will give the gentleman from Halifax some reason to believe there are some political truths not stated in the "Olive Branch."

But says the gentleman, a proposition was made in congress for war with France as well as England, and the federalists voted against, and for this he doubtless believes no good reason can be given. The federalists knew we were not prepared for war and opposed it, by voting against war with France as well as England, they were consistent. Were the democrats consistent? With equal injuries from both nations and with the same power to declare war against both as against one, they voted to war against England and in fact for peace. This war with both France and England and they at war with each other, which seems the gentleman would have approved, indeed, have been a political phenomenon and has been abundantly ridiculed as a triangular war."

The islands in Passamaquoddy, the gentleman says, are not a part of the United States. Mr. Daniel explained—he said the British claimed them to be a part of the United States. I am, sir, said Mr. Stanly, our right seems good to these islands as to any other part of territory; we gained the possession during the revolutionary war, and we have kept ever since—a claim and a possession of years form a strong presumption of right. Should be sorry, should the doubts of our title

be expressed by the gentleman from Halifax, be known to the enemy,—the opinion of so distinguished a jurist and statesman might, with the foolish monarch who is to arbitrate our claim, go far to decide against us.

Custine and the district of Maine were indeed shamefully abandoned to the enemy—but while the gentleman bestowed this censure, he remembered that Massachusetts was federal: let me remind him that the District of Maine is democratic; nearly unanimously. Had there been more federalists there, let me hope a better defence would have been made.

The gentleman justifies the rejection of Monroe's treaty, because of the note attached to it. That note respected the right of Great Britain to retaliate the Berlin decree if acquiesced in by neutrals. Might not the treaty, if this was the only objection, have been ratified upon condition that the note was withdrawn? But we know, sir, the treaty was rejected by Jefferson on other grounds; he desired no treaty with Great Britain—he refused to renew Jay's treaty, the most advantageous convention ever formed by the United States; he declared he would accept no treaty which did not abandon the right of impressment, and he rejected Monroe's treaty without consulting the senate, because it did not contain the acknowledgment that the flag should protect the crew. And what have the United States gained by the rejection of this treaty? Not a better as was promised, but eight years of commercial embarrassment, continued difficulties and finally an unsuccessful war. You promised us to obtain a better treaty, and like every other promise, like your promise regarding armies, taxes and navies, you have disappointed and deceived us.

To acquit Mr. Madison of the reproach of the capture of Washington, and of the disgrace of his flight from Bladensburg, general Winder and Mr. Simmons are brought forward. Gen. Winder is a federalist and therefore a fit subject for a scape-goat for your president; but unfortunately for Mr. Madison, his court of enquiry have given Gen. Winder the highest praise for his bravery and arrangement, and acquitted him of the slightest censure for the disasters of that day. Gen. Winder had but just been appointed to command the district, and the men who were to defend the city were at their ploughs, scattered over an hundred miles of country, while the enemy were in march to the attack. It was the duty of the president to have provided earlier for the defence of the city,—to his neglect is justly ascribed the misfortunes of the day.

Mr. Simmons, it is alleged, has said that Mr. Madison did not run from Bladensburg till the enemy were in sight. Mr. Simmons is an honorable man and entitled to credit. He was appointed by Gen. Washington to the office of accountant of the war department, which he held under every successive administration until after the late war, when refusing to pass John Armstrong's account, in which was a charge of one thousand dollars for mahogany furniture for a tent, he was dismissed from office as too honest for an administration, one of whose means of rewarding its friends is to permit them to defraud the public. Mr. Simmons says the president was in sight of the enemy and that he pointed them out to him:—but so far from this evincing Mr. Madison's firmness, it shews he was, upon the ground from mistake in the situation of the enemy, for as soon as he was assured they were in sight he turned about and executed that bold manoeuvre, a flight, which will forever distinguish him among the Great Men of this country as the "Hero of Bladensburg."

### FROM THE REGISTER.

Mr. J. J. DANIEL said, the gentleman from Newbern had commenced his opposition to this Resolution by asserting that the War was unnecessarily declared.—He states the alleged causes of the War to be the Orders in Council and the Impressment of our Seamen. And will the gentleman say that these wrongs could have been borne without War, when every attempt at Negotiation had failed? He hoped for the honor of North-Carolina that no gentleman will say this.

So far back as the year 1803, the British Government violated the laws of nations by declaring the whole Continent of Europe in a state of blockade. The French Nation, in return, threatened to put the whole of the British Dominions under blockade.—The Berlin Decree was retaliatory of the blockade by Great Britain until the date of the Order of Council of the 7th of Nov. 1807. What right had the British Government to pass another Order counteracting that Decree? No property had been captured under it. It can readily be seen that their object was to cripple our trade. Under this decree, American property was captured and condemned to the amount of 20 millions of dollars. We remonstrated in vain against these violent proceedings. Perhaps it would have been best to have declared War at once. But we wished to remain at peace, and negotiated till Negotiation became contemptible. And after the Emperor of France had repealed his decrees, the British still pursued the same vexatious and injurious course, alleging that they had no official account of the repeal.

In the first place, the British had nothing to do with our differences with France. If one

belligerent thinks proper to injure a neutral Power, they must settle that matter between themselves. Yet after this plea was done away, and the repeal was officially announced, what do the British then say? But a few days before the Declaration of War, Mr. Foster, the British Minister told our Secretary of State, that this repeal was not sufficient; but we must force the Government of France to suffer British vessels to enter French ports. This was impossible; it was a matter in which we had no right to interfere. The French had determined to exclude British manufactures altogether from their country. The War, therefore became inevitable. We had a choice only of War or Disgrace.

But as the gentleman from Anson had erroneously stated, Mr. Madison did not declare War, but our Representatives in Congress. Mr. D. expected the gentleman would have produced some authority from public law to have warranted the British practice of Impressment, instead of the authority of a British Captain. He challenged gentlemen to produce any authority to shew that a Nation has a right to take from a vessel at sea any thing but goods contraband of war, or English officers and Soldiers. The flag must cover the crew. But if the British had only taken their own seamen (though they had no right to do it) no complaint would have been made by us. We complain of their taking our seamen. And this had been complained of ever since Gen. Washington's time, before Party was known in the Country. Indeed, the British do not only take American citizens from on board our ships, but Portuguese, Spaniards, Germans, or any other foreigners, when they find them in our crews, for the purpose of manning their Navy to fight against the world.

These were the causes of the War; that it had been honorably prosecuted had been shewn by the gentleman from Granville, (Mr. Inge.) He should not therefore say any thing on that subject.

The Gentleman from Newbern had said that the Treaty negotiated by Mr. Monroe and rejected by Mr. Jefferson was an honorable one, and declared to be so by Mr. Monroe himself. There was a note attached to this treaty respecting Seamen which Mr. Monroe wished to have embodied in the Treaty. The letter which he writes is an apology for having signed the Treaty, which he had been induced to do from the note of Lords Auckland and Holland, to which he refers.—But a short time afterwards this Ministry was removed, and the Note therefore passed for nothing.

The gentleman had also said, there had been no attempt at Negotiation on the subject afterwards. This is not correct. Mr. Pinkney was alone in London twelve months after that time; and when he applied to the British Government on the subject of impressment, he was told that they considered nothing as binding which was not in the body of the Treaty. Then Mr. Monroe saw he had been deceived by the British Government.

The house had been called upon to notice Mr. Cheves's Speech in Congress in respect to impressment. The sentiments then expressed were correct; but when the Treaty was made, England was at peace with all the world, and we could therefore sustain no inconvenience from the want of a provision respecting impressment. Suppose our Government had closed with Admiral Warren's proposition, without any provision on this subject, at that time, the British would have taken every American seaman they had met with.

But it has been asked why not declare War against France as well as England? Mr. Bibb, in the Senate, proposed a declaration of this kind; but only seven members voted for it, but three or four of them Federalists. The gentleman's friends did not therefore think proper to go to war with France.

Have we, then, got nothing by the War, asked Mr. D.? Does not this Country stand upon more elevated ground—is she not better thought of even by the British Nation itself? No doubt of it.

But the gentleman from Newbern says, we have surrendered to G. Britain, a part of the old United States. This, said Mr. D. is not the fact. The Island of Passamaquoddy has always been claimed by the British, though we had possession of it.—She obtained it from the imbecility of its inhabitants and the disloyal conduct of that part of the country generally. (This being the case, our commissioners honestly agreed to have the matter settled by arbitration.

As to the Fisheries, he did not believe the United States had sustained any injury in respect to them. The English claim but three miles from the shore. Our fishermen care nothing about landing; they fish from their vessels, and have not been in the habit of using the liberty which they heretofore had of landing. So that nothing is lost on this head.

The gentleman says our public debt is increased to 200 millions. This, said Mr. D. is not correct. It is but 120 millions.—And can this be considered an extravagant debt when it is recollected that we have preserved our liberty unimpaired, and that we have valiantly driven the Enemy from our shores?

Mr. Clay's speech had been cited to shew that the taking of Canada was one of the objects of the War. These were no doubt Mr. C's sentiments. We were then at War and it was right to do our enemy all the harm in our power. This is policy and agreeably to the rules of war.

With these remarks, he should sit down and hoped the Resolution would pass.

## Political.

FROM THE FEDERAL REPUBLICAN.  
SPAIN.

The House of Representatives was on Friday afternoon put in possession of the information respecting the letter of the Spanish minister to our cabinet, demanded on the motion of Mr. Robertson. The communication of the Spanish minister was made on the fourth of January. The answer of our ingenious gentleman, the secretary of state, was written on the nineteenth—Just 15 days after. Whether it was that the Spaniard's demand appeared to our cabinet of too dubious a nature to be understood, or that they were puzzled about the reply they should give to it—or that great bodies must necessarily move slow, particularly if the weight of them be more than proportionate to the bulk, as is suspected to be the case with that great engine of response, the cranium of *Monsieur le Secrétaire*—I leave to James the 2d (we hope falsely)—So it is that the Spanish minister had reason to think that silence gave consent, and that his demands were likely to be acceded to in being so long unhonoured with the notice of their two-fold majesty the Jameses—when he was suddenly roused from his comfortable expectations by a reply, or rather a *contre-projet* from the royal republican king cabinet. These are the demands of the king of Spain.—He demands the territory west of the river Perdido—the punishment of our factious insurgents in Louisiana and New Orleans, who raise armies for and help the revolutionists in South America—and to forbid the revolutionary flags of South America to enter our ports.

Whatever their majesties aforesaid may have thought of this Spanish manifesto—for almost a manifesto it is—we must say that we have never read any thing less dubious or more unequivocal in our lives; there is not a special pleader or conveyancer in the pulchre of the temple that could have put a ten pound bargain into terms more explicit:—we therefore wonder at Mr. Monroe's so long delaying to answer it;—more particularly as his master and himself must have, for some time, had lodged in a corner of that part where the conscience ought to be deposited, a secret intimation that they had a right to expect something of the kind from Spain. In the day of prosperity, when the sun of their political hemisphere—the sun of modern heathenish idolatry too—Bonaparte—was in its meridian height—and when timid with depraved ambition, the priests of the rights of man, crawled, like serpents, in the dust, humiliated in worship before their deity—in that dread day, when the people of Spain were even to the last man—aye, to the last woman—up in arms to expel that monster, which though to our cabinet a sun, blackened the horizon of that fair country—we endeavoured by embargoes to starve them into that usurpers chains—Do they (we mean the Jameses) imagine that such injustice can be forgotten—that our receiving what Bonaparte wrested from the throne of Spain by thievish force and fraud, can be forgotten or the injury forgiven?—Can they hope it will be overlooked that this very CHEVALIER DE ONIS was refused a reception by our government, while a ray of hope that Bonaparte could recover his ground remained in existence, at the same time that we felt no sort of reluctance to admit into our ports the rebel subjects of Spain?—Did nothing within whisper this to our great men so honest—and so-wise?—If not, then, do we affirm that the mallet of the next carpenter is as fit to grace the council board, as their heads.—Do they forget that they have to deal with Spaniards, who never forgave an insult—and that their useless, ostentatious bravadoes, as well as their zeal in the cause of the human enemy of mankind—the vicegerent of Belzebub upon earth—must have deposited in the bosom of every European government, a fixt and settled loathing to them:—so much indeed that those who love Americans most, do most abhor our administration. Or can they be so insensible to the fair play of the world, to the reciprocal duties of government to government, as well as of man to man, as not to recollect what their own feelings would have been, if any nation in Europe had joined Burr, upbraided him in his treason and recollecting it, not to apply it to the case of Spain upon those territories we have been hovering (aye, some time even our Congress too,) like a Vulture over a carcass, ready to pounce upon it when occasion offered.

Of the attempts or threats of Spain, we have no apprehension—we can truss her up as easily as a poulterer, does a rabbit—but we hope the people will in justice remember, how much of any quarrel that may ensue, ought to be ascribed partly to the rapacity—partly to the political fanaticism, and partly to the subserviency to Bonaparte, of their own rulers.

### EUROPEAN TREATIES.

Treaties have been entered into between the Emperor of Russia, the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia and the King of Great Britain, the stipulations of which are very important.

1. The first article stipulates for preserving the integrity of the treaty entered into, between the high contracting parties, and the present government of France.

2. They stipulate to preserve inviolable, the treaty entered into at Paris last year, and likewise to confirm the one entered into with Louis, by which Napoleon Bonaparte and his family are forever excluded from the throne of France, to accomplish which they engage to employ their whole united force, if necessary.