

The Raleigh Minerva.

FRIDAY, JULY 2, 1819.

No. 24.

Vol. 1.

RALEIGH, (N. C.)

PRINTED, WEEKLY, BY HARVEY AND CASSO,
EDITED BY A. LUCAS.

Terms of Subscription: Three dollars per year, one half to be paid in advance. No paper to be continued longer than three months after a year's subscription becomes due, and notice thereof shall have been given. Advertisements, not exceeding 14 lines, are inserted gratis for one dollar; for twenty-five cents each subsequent insertion; and in like proportion where there is a greater number of lines than fourteen. The cash must accompany those from persons unknown to the editor.

No subscription can in any case be received without payment of at least \$1 50 in advance; and no discount is made without payment of arrears, unless at the option of the editor.

Foreign.

NORFOLK, JUNE 23.

We are indebted to Mr. LYFON, Keeper of the Steam Boat Hotel Reading Room, for the loan of the New-York Commercial Advertiser of Saturday, received from his Correspondent in that city, per the schooner Ranger, Capt. Irons, from which we copy the following

LATE AND INTERESTING
INTELLIGENCE FROM ENGLAND.

NEW-YORK, JUNE 19.

LATE FROM ENGLAND.
The ship Canton, Captain Rodgers, arrived last evening in 32 days from Liverpool. By this arrival we have received from our Correspondents, London papers to the 13th of May, Lloyd's and General Shipping and Commercial Lists to the 11. New Price Current to the 11th, and Liverpool papers to the 15th inclusive.

American Stocks, on the 8th of May, three per cents, 62 1/2-2; new six per cents, 97 a 99-1-2; United States bank shares, 124 a 25.

British Stocks on the 13th three per cent Red. 71 a 72 3-4; three per cent. consols 71-3-1; four do. 99 1-2; consols for account 71-5-8.

French Funds on the 9th of May, five per cents, 66f. 25c. Bank Stock 1500f.

The Hector, Capt. Gillender, from this port, arrived at Liverpool in 18 days. She was off Cork in 14 days from the time she left the Highlands.—We have seen a letter from Liverpool, which says, "this town is in an uproar, by the arrival of the Hector; she has brought answers to letters that were sent out by the Triton to Boston, which vessel has been absent only 28 days."

In the House of Lords, on the 11th of May, there was an interesting debate, on the motion offered by the Marquis of Lansdowne, for information respecting the cession of the Floridas and the execution of Arbuthnot and Ambrister. A sketch of this debate our readers will find in a subsequent column.—The Editor of the "British Statesman" in noticing that part of the debate which relates to Arbuthnot and Ambrister, says, "With respect to the execution of our unfortunate countrymen, no satisfaction will now, it is plain, be ever received. Our own Ministers have become the defenders of Gen. Jackson.—They abuse the cruelty, but contend, that as far as we are concerned he had the right of acting as he has done. If he sinned, it is only against his own government. With such principles we shall not long retain that proud eminence which has been so fondly extolled, and which we have purchased with so many sacrifices. The dignity of our character is gone, and insults will not fail to be lavished on those who bear them with impunity."

At Stockholm, three large commercial houses have suspended payment.

On the 27th of April the extensive house of Pauli, at Lubeck, failed, and on the 28th that of M. G. H. Printz, jun. of Hamburg. The latter for the sum of 337,100 marks banco.

Accounts from Brussels of May 5, say, "the duty proposed to be laid on Coffee, excites great interest among the merchants. The project laid before the Chamber, consisted of only seven articles. The various objections of the central sections on the mode of levying the duty, and on its amount, have caused the project to be entirely altered, both with respect to Coffee and Sugar."

"To this new project, in 45 articles were added some explanatory remarks. This new project, after a preliminary examination, gave occasion to fresh conferences with the Director General; upon which a third project has been presented, with the change of some articles and the addition of others. This new project was discussed in the sitting of the Second Chamber of the States General on the 6th May. The debate was very animated, and many distinguished members spoke at great length, but several others being still desirous of delivering their opinions, the Chamber adjourned to the evening of the 6th."

The Catholic question was postponed from the 6th of May, in consequence of the indisposition of Lord Donoughmore.

The Bank Committee have made their report to the House of Lords.—Our limits for this day will not admit of its insertion. We shall embrace an early opportunity to give a sketch of it. In introducing the report, the Editor of the Star observes, "It forms with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix, a folio volume of 424 pages; and is substantially the same in the measures which it recommends for the Gradual Redemption of Cash Payments. Like that of the Commons it establishes the fact that the Bank are competent to the Resumption of Cash Payments, and able to cancel every claim that can come against them, if the Government will once repay the debt they owe to the Bank."

HOUSE OF LORDS, MAY 11.

ARBUTHNOT AND AMBRISTER, AND CESSION OF THE FLORIDAS.

The Marquis of Lansdowne said, he now rose in pursuance of the notice he had given to move for certain communications respecting the entry of the American troops into the Floridas, the execution of two British subjects by order of the commander of those troops, and the subsequent cession of the provinces in question to the United States. After the assurance which had been given on the first day of the session by the Noble Earl opposite, that every necessary explanation should be given respecting the execution of Messrs. Ambrister and Arbuthnot, it would not be necessary for him now to say much on that subject. The Noble Earl had not since then given any explanation, and it was fit that his silence should not be misconstrued to a disposition on the part of the Parliament to acquiesce in the new and dangerous interpretation that was given to the law of nations, or to the new and barbarous practice against the law of nations which had lately been resorted to, and which was detrimental to all the principles of justice. He would not attempt to impute any such disposition to the Government of the United States; and he owned it to the character of the able and distinguished Statesman who held the first office in that Government, to express a firm belief that neither he nor the other branches of the American Government would have engaged in, or sanctioned a transaction which was inconsistent with the laws of nations, and with every principle of justice and humanity. It was, therefore, in the hope that proper steps would be taken by our Government to get at all the information that could be obtained on this subject, that he now brought it under the consideration of Ministers. The facts of this case were briefly these. Several tribes of Seminole Indians, residing on the borders of Florida, had made hostile incursions into the territory of the U. States. In consequence of which the American General carried on the war against them into Florida, and thus invaded the territory of the King of Spain, on pretence and under an alleged apprehension that the Indians were about to make themselves masters of that province. As to the propriety of Gen. Jackson's entertaining this province in a hostile manner, he should not now enter into a discussion on that point, on which it was the business of the Spanish Government to determine. But it was to the circumstances which followed the military occupation that he wished to call the attention of the House. Whenever an act of violence and outrage was committed by a military commander placed in such a situation, it should never be extended beyond the necessity of the case, as at the time when Copenhagen was taken by the British troops, and the British commander commanded them, found that several persons belonging to neutral countries had been engaged in the defence of the place, and ordered them to be executed, on the pretence that they had no right to take up arms against Great Britain, would not that act have been a gross violation of the laws of nations? When the American Gen. Jackson came into the Floridas, he there found two British subjects, who had been assisting the Indians; he had them brought to a court martial, and ordered them to be executed. There was, however, some difference between the conduct of these two persons—Ambrister did certainly bear arms on the side of the Indians against the U. States.—But it was not pretended that Arbuthnot had borne arms; and the only evidence which went to show any connexion between him and the Indians, was that of a person who said he had seen a letter proving him to be an agent of the Indians, and that he had supplied the Indians with certain articles, among which was a small quantity of lead and powder. Now, an act of this kind done by an individual belonging to a neutral country, never was visited by the loss of life, and what served to render the conduct of Gen. Jackson still more atrocious in this instance was, that although the court martial which tried Ambrister had shrunk from inflicting on him the severest punishment, yet Jackson did in opposition to the sentence of the Court, order him, as well as Arbuthnot, to be punished with the loss of life. It was for their Lordships then to determine, whether such conduct as this was consistent with the laws of nations.

So far was it from being so, the very laws of the United States declared, that for such acts as those of which the two persons in question were accused, no other punishment than that of the fine and imprisonment could be inflicted. Here the Noble Marquis quoted the act of the American Legislature, which stated that the citizen or subject of any neutral country who should be found assisting a Foreign Power in carrying on war against the United States, he should be fined 1,000*l.*, and sentenced to twelve months imprisonment. Notwithstanding this law General Jackson proceeded to carry one sentence of the Court-martial into execution, and in the other instance to inflict a punishment which the court had not ordered, merely of his own authority, although before he ordered any sentence to be inflicted, he should have first communicated the business to the President of the United States, to receive his orders. Instead of this, he acted entirely from his own impulse and authority. Such conduct as this was unparalleled in the history of civilized nations, and must be regarded by every liberal man with disgust and horror. Here a military officer attacked a neutral territory without any necessity, caused two Englishmen found there to be tried, reversed the mild sentence passed on one, and ordered them

both to be executed, in direct opposition to the laws of his own country.

It was necessary to mark such a conduct as this by a public declaration of abhorrence, in order to prevent its being ever acted upon as a precedent—that it might never be held out for a dreadful example of imitation. Notwithstanding this conduct, and the circumstances of the American Government not having noticed it, he had the best wishes towards that government; he hoped they would long live in peace and harmony with this country; that they would spread innumerable blessings over the world; that they would be the depositories of every thing that was noble & estimable in life, & that instead of sanctioning acts of injustice, they go on improving and correcting the barbarous customs that prevailed in the world. But with respect to the act in question, he should leave it to their Lordships to determine what judgment was to be pronounced upon it. He hoped that our government would be found to mark it with that detestation which it merited. He should now have done with this part of the subject, and come to another, which was of the utmost importance.—He meant the act by which the Government of Spain had ceded the Floridas to the United States. He declared it as his opinion, that of all the events that could happen at this time, there was not one which so deeply affected the commercial interests of Great Britain as the cession in question. He hoped we would long continue to live in a state of peace with the United States; but as none of their lordships could tell how long that peace would last, or how soon a war might again break out between us and that nation; should it unfortunately happen, the possession of the Floridas by the United States, would place the whole of our West India trade at the mercy of the Americans. They would thus have possession of many commodious ports, and would be enabled to send out so many armed cruisers, that not one of our merchant vessels, passing into or out of the Gulf of Florida, could escape them. The Americans would thus be able to annihilate the whole of our trade in that part of the world, & give an influence to black governments in the W Indies, the might be destructive of our interests there. On all these grounds, it was greatly to be lamented, that every possible means had not been taken to prevent such a cession as this taking place. When the peace of Utrecht was made, the British negotiators felt how important it was to prevent such a cession as this; and it was accordingly provided in that treaty that Spain was not to give up to any power, any portion of her territories in America. But, although long negotiations for the security of the different countries of the world had been carried on at Vienna, no one conceived it necessary to make any provision that should have the effect of preventing the agreement of the United States. It was stated, however, in authority, that the treaty of Utrecht should be considered as the common law of Europe, and in this instance its best principles were departed from. After all the sacrifices which England had made during the late war, it was as little as she could expect, to have a security of this kind from Spain, against so great a danger as this. After having done so much for Spain, it was not so much for England to expect from her, that she should be found never to make any cession so destructive to our best interests. On this part of the subject, however, he did not mean to move for any papers; but if any statement that might serve to elucidate it could be made, he hoped such a statement would not be withheld. He should however move for copies of any communications that might have been received by government tending to show such a disavowal on the part of the American government, respecting the atrocious act in question, as should prevent a similar act in future from being considered as conformable to the law of nations. The noble Marquis concluded with moving for papers to this effect.

Earl Bathurst said he should not follow the noble Marquis in all the arguments he had used respecting the Cession of the Floridas, because he had declined making any motion on that part of the subject. He did not see any reason why our Government had not a right to cede a portion of its own territory to another Government, without any right on the part of a third Government to find fault of such an act. And he was sure the house must see how dangerous it would be to lay it down as a principle, that not one country could cede territory to another, without the British government being made responsible for such an act. Nothing would be so inconsistent with our own security, as that of going about from one country to another for the purpose of guaranteeing their respective possessions. At the time the treaty of Utrecht was made, the Floridas were not in the possession of the Spanish government. He should now proceed to the immediate question before the house. The noble Marquis must see how extremely delicate it would be to lay before the house any partial communications that might have been made to government respecting the two individuals mentioned by him; and even if they were laid before the house, he would then have but a very imperfect communication. It might be said, that the act of putting these men to death, was of such a nature as to make it incumbent on the British government to call for the punishment of the person who had ordered their execution. He (Lord B) contended, that the British government was not bound to call for any act of reparation. Two persons were taken in the Spanish territory acting with hostility against the United States, and were put to death. It was the government

possessing the territory in which this act was done, that had a right to complain of it; and the act was not done or sanctioned by the American government. It was done without their knowledge; and the question now was, whether this should be considered as an act which called upon our government to seek for reparation? This was a question of a very great delicacy. If we should once seek reparation, we must not relinquish our demand, but push it to the utmost extremity; and therefore it was proper to consider how far it was politic to run the risk of doing that which might lead to hostility, when we were not called on by any necessity to do so.—If a British subject thought proper to engage in the service of a foreign state without the consent of his own government; if he joined that state in carrying on war against another and both these states were at peace with Great Britain, such subject forfeited all protection from his own government. He must be subject to all the consequences resulting from such a state of hostility. By the law of nations, this principle must be admitted, and by sound policy it must be adopted. We were not bound to protect and seek reparation for all the British adventurers who might be put to death for joining in the wars of neutral nations. It was a thing never required, and would be most impolitic, if two men, therefore natives of Britain, engaged in a foreign service, without the consent of their government, their fate must be considered the same with that to which the persons in whose service they engaged were subject. The person named Ambrister had borne arms for the Seminole Indians against the Americans. The other had applied to the Governor of the Bahama Islands for liberty to carry on trade with them; and he did act as their agent.—Did they not, therefore, enter into the service of those tribes, in such a way as to forfeit all protection from their own government? The act of General Jackson must be decided between him and his own government; and it would then be for that government to say, whether it was right or wrong for their General to exercise such power. The Indians, at first, applied to the Spanish government for arms, and not receiving any through that channel were supplied by Arbuthnot. Some persons defended him on the ground of his being a British merchant at Bahama. If he had done no more than act as a merchant, he was entitled to British protection; he ought not now to be deprived of that protection for selling arms. But this was not the fact: Mr. Arbuthnot had entered into the service of the Indian tribes, and therefore forfeited his protection. Therefore, so far as regarded him and Ambrister, all idea of British character was at an end.—There was another point which went to show that he was an agent for the Indians; this was the copy of a letter to the Governor of the Bahama, to pay his expenses incurred as an agent. And from all these facts, it was clear he was not merely a merchant, but was assuming the character of a merchant for the purpose of forwarding his views as another.—Besides, he was not subjected to greater severity than those whom he served were subject to, for some of the Indian Chiefs were put to death by the American government when they were taken. He did not mean to question the impropriety of an act which all persons must condemn—he meant the putting the two Englishmen to death—*Hear hear!* But it was not one for which our government was bound to seek reparation; if once begun, must be persisted in.

The Marquis of Lansdowne explained.—He did not mean to say that the act of General Jackson was one for which our government was bound to seek reparation, or for which they could be justified in going to war with America. His object was to have a public disavowal of the act, and to settle the law of nations on this point. A principle of honour and of interest must induce the government of the United States to disavow the act.—This was the view he had of the subject. Their certainly was a great distinction between Ambrister and Arbuthnot, for the latter did not appear to be so engaged as to lose the protection of his own country. No more was pretended than that he had been a channel of communication for the Indians; and he acted in a military capacity. As to the cession of the Floridas, all he meant to say was, that the proud situation in which England stood at the general treaty of peace, gave her a right to require from Spain, that no such cession should take place. The thing should have been guarded against at the Congress of Vienna.—It has been the constant policy of this country to look to probable events of this kind, and to enter into stipulations to prevent their taking place. Hitherto there was a balance on which this country used to rely for her security; and it was an essential part of this balance of nations to prevent the Floridas from being ceded to the United States—an event which will hereafter be bitterly deplored as injurious and fatal to the interests of Great Britain in case of any future war with the United States. As, however, he understood that some of the communications to which he alluded took place, he would not press his motion.

The Earl of Liverpool explained what had been said by him at the commencement of the session. All he said was, that he should be ready to give every explanation respecting Ambrister and Arbuthnot when the result was known. He was ready to admit that no acts considered as moral acts, could be so atrocious as those to which the noble Marquis alluded. *[Hear!]*—On the first knowledge of this business, it was not overlooked by his Majesty's *(For conclusion, see fourth page.)*