

THE MINERVA.

A. J. Murphy, Esq.

TWO & A HALF DOLLS PER ANNUM. Payable half Yearly.

PUBLISHED (WEEKLY) BY WILLIAM BOYLAN.

TWO DOLLS PER ANNUM. Payable in Advance.

Vol. 10.]

RALEIGH, (N. C.) MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1805.

[No. 493

FOREIGN.

LONDON, July 5.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

JULY 4.

Colonial Intercourse with America.

LORD HOLLAND, rose to bring forward his promised motion for some important information on this subject. He prefaced it with a very able and argumentative speech, of considerable length. He described the proceedings which had taken place in some of the W. India islands, particularly in Jamaica, which induced him to make the present appeal to the wisdom of parliament. They arose principally from the conduct of the governors of those islands, with respect to the discretionary power exercised by them relative to the commercial intercourse between the islands, and the United States of America. He alluded to the suspension of the navigation laws, in one point of view, but more especially to the restrictive power exercised by them with respect to the importation of American produce; so necessary for the sustenance of the islands, or the shipping of that country.—The line of conduct to which he referred, either in a political or commercial point of view, was of the most serious importance, and still more, as it affected the supply of the islands with articles of the first necessity, as lumber and provisions.—The inhabitants of Jamaica in particular felt it so strongly, that their legislative assemblies made repeated representations to the governor upon the subject, who, in one of his answers, stated, he could not permit the importation in neutral bottoms longer than a given period.—With respect to the question, though as affecting the interests of the islands, of great importance, was still of greater, as it may affect the commercial intercourse and good understanding between this country and the United States of America. He deprecated every thing like a narrow, selfish commercial policy with respect to America, the great importance of continuing that good understanding and extensive commercial and friendly intercourse which now happily subsists between the two countries, and to which their common origin, language, and manners, so very fortunately dispose them. One of his objects in coming forward was to give an opportunity to his Majesty's ministers to disclaim any such notions or principles as affected their conduct with respect to the restrictions on the trade and commercial intercourse between the West India islands and America. It so happened, and fortunately, he thought, that our West India islands could not be adequately supplied with articles of the first necessity, except from the United States. He thought this was eventually fortunate, because the important consideration to which he adverted would operate as an additional inducement with the government of this country to cultivate a friendly understanding with America. He adverted to some ineffectual attempts which had been made under former administrations to supply our West India islands from the British dominions in North-America. Adverting to the incalculable importance of the American commerce to this country, he observed, that any attempts to exclude America from the trade of our West India islands, would be worse than the conduct as related in the ancient fable, of the dog in the manger, whose determination was comparatively wise and liberal.—It would go to remind him of the fable of the two petitioners to Jupiter, to whom the god-head said, that whatever he gave to the one, the other should have double—then said one, in a paroxysm of folly and malignity, give me blindness in one eye, that my neighbor may be blind in both eyes. So would it be metaphorically, did this country wish to exclude America from our West-India trade, upon the principle of commercial jealousy. His lordship took a view of the policy and effects of the navigation act, in its different bearings—and argued, that the changes in the system of Europe, and the relative situation of this country, rendered the policy of acting upon it very different from what it was at its first enactment. In war, generally speaking, it was impracticable. He with-

ed the affairs to which he adverted were placed on a liberal footing and permanent basis: and it was important that ministers should declare what line or system of conduct they intended to adopt, respecting the intercourse between America and our West India colonies, in time of war.—Through the whole of his speech, more especially towards the conclusion, the noble lord expatiated upon the great national importance, either in a political or commercial view, of maintaining an amicable intercourse and close connexion with America—and repeated, that one of his principal objects in coming forward was to give ministers an opportunity of disclaiming all notions of narrow or selfish policy, with respect to their intended intercourse in question, a circumstance which would give great satisfaction to all parties; and with respect to their intended system in future, he thought they should be explicit.—His lordship concluded by moving an address to his majesty, "for the production of the communication which took place between the legislative assemblies of Jamaica and his majesty's government of that island, touching the intercourse between that colony and the United States of America, from the commencement of the war with France to the 21st of May last; also for copies of the correspondence between his majesty's secretary of state for the colonial department and the governor of Jamaica, on the subject, within the same interval; also for various documents respecting the quantities of provisions, &c. imported from America into the island of Jamaica, at certain given periods, distinguishing those imported from British America, and those from the United States of America."

The question being put on the first motion—
The Earl of CAMDEN, in allusion to what had transpired on the subject on a former evening, observed he had stated that counter orders had been sent out to the governors. The orders which were sent relative to the conduct of the governors, respecting the subject in question, were precisely the same purpose, during the last war, by the act of the 28th of the king, he observed, all goods and commodities were prohibited from being imported into the British West India Islands from the United States of America, with the exception of certain articles, as provisions and lumber, in cases of necessity; of these the respective governors were generally constituted the judges. They were to act upon their responsibility with respect to the admission of these articles, and bills of indemnity, were passed, when they had acted contrary to the law. The noble earl adverted to the extensive nature of the information called for—the propriety of accompanying these documents with others which were necessary for the full illustration of the subject, and which, in this very advanced period of the session, it would be impracticable to produce. He therefore submitted to the noble baron the propriety of withdrawing his motion for the present; or, in case he persisted, he should think it his duty to move the order of the day upon them.

Lord Holland shortly explained.

Lord Hawkebury's objections were not so much against producing the required information, as producing that alone, which should produce a false prejudice upon the subject, and would by no means put the house in full possession of the case. Under that conviction ministers would feel it their duty also to move for a number of additional documents. With respect to what was said of the restrictions upon the trade in question, he had to observe that there were many representations made from respectable and important quarters, of a direct contrary tendency to those alluded to by the noble baron, and reasons adduced that government, instead of imposing unnecessary restrictions, were in fact, too indulgent with respect to that part of the trade of the United States, to the great detriment of the British merchants; their lordships would therefore see the propriety of the proposed additional documents, in order to afford parliament and the public an opportunity to decide and judge thoroughly of the merits of the question. He admitted the subject was one which any noble lord might fairly bring before parliament, but the advanced period of the session rendered the production of the ne-

cessary documents impracticable. He was, therefore, of opinion with his noble friend, it would be preferable to postpone the discussion to another session, when all the information proper to be laid before parliament could be produced. With respect to the line of conduct intended to be pursued by his majesty's government relative to the subject in question, it would be regulated by their convictions of the true interests and character of their country, and a due respect for the principles of the navigation laws. With respect to what was said of their views in regard to the trade of America, they would be regulated by no sentiment contrary to those just and liberal principles of commercial policy, so well understood in the present day; upon principles, founded not only upon the true interest of their own country, but even with a proper regard to the interest and prosperity of America herself.

Earl Stanhope contended that ministers had not been sufficiently explicit, particularly with respect to their intended conduct during the recess. Instead of giving a plain answer to the queries of his noble friend, the secretary of state answered only by generalities. His lordship then spoke in support of some of his noble friend's arguments, with respect to the great importance of a good understanding between America and this country, whose example the latter ought to follow with respect to her line of internal and external policy.

The duke of Montrose replied with considerable spirit to many of the positions advanced by the noble earl who spoke last, whose warmth of expression, he supposed, might arise from the warmth of the present season, a period in which he generally thought proper to attend to his duty in that house. He contended that his noble friends had been sufficiently explicit; the orders given, they stated had been the same as during the last war; and the line of conduct would be persevered in. He conceived that every country had a right to regulate the trade of its own colonies, and that no other state could properly complain of it. With respect to the noble earl's panegyrics upon America, he understood that a noble earl had lately disposed of his property and gone to that country: perhaps if the noble earl opposite to him would follow the same example, he might, after a short residence in that country, return home in a better humour with his own.

The earl of Limerick was of opinion the answers given by ministers were explicit; and adverted to the consideration, how far too great an indulgence with respect to the trade of America, would operate injuriously upon the trade of Ireland and our West-India colonies.

The earl of Suffolk spoke in support of some of the positions of his noble friends, lords Holland and Stanhope.

Lord Hawkebury, the earl of Camden, and the duke of Montrose, spoke severally in explanation.

Earl Stanhope in explanation said, it was the duty of a person in his situation to watch over the interests and concerns of his country at home, and not to leave it because he might be out of humor, at the misconduct of weak, inefficient and incapable ministers.

The earls of Darnley and Carysfort spoke shortly in support of the leading arguments of noble lords on that side of the house.

Lord Harrowby briefly vindicated the conduct of the ministers on the subject in question; and he deemed them sufficiently explicit in their declarations.

Lord Holland spoke in reply, and contended that ministers had not been explicit; their declarations were mere generalities; in allusion to what was said of the emigration of a noble earl (Selkirk) to America, he referred to his late work upon the subject, which he regarded as full of useful information, and vindicated the motives which induced that noble lord to go the country in question. He warmly reprehended the idea of noble lords being told, when they openly and freely declared their opinions of the misconduct or incapacity of ministers, that they should leave their country if they did not like it. No, it was the duty, as his noble friend well observed, of persons in their situation to stay in their country, watch over its interest, endeavor to rescue it

from destruction, and to abide its fate.—Such was the duty of members of that house, and they who asserted otherwise, knew little of the duties of the legislature.

The duke of Montrose said a few words in consequence of what fell from noble lords opposite; he would not be dictated to as to the line of debate or observation he would pursue. He would adopt that which he thought most likely to conduce to his object; it was not his practice to rebuke others, neither would he be rebuked. The question being loudly called for, a division took place. For the motion 8—against it, 14—majority 6.

THE TRIPOLITAN PEACE.

We have understood that there were one hundred and fifty Americans, principally volunteers, with General Eaton, upon the expedition which went by land against Tripoli. Gen. Eaton acted under the express command of the government of the United States—he departed in July, 1804, in the American squadron, from Washington, and was landed from one of the U. S. vessels, at Alexandria in Egypt, in the month of December last; it is understood he was supplied with large sums of money, ammunition, field artillery, camp equipage, muskets, pikes, &c. for the troops, and in short with every necessary for the expedition. Gen. Eaton was accompanied with several American officers, but we have heard of no particular names. The Ex-Bathaw was found in Alexandria, and readily agreed to assist in raising the army. What the particular stipulations on both sides were, we have yet to learn. We only know at present, that 5 or 6000 men were soon collected, and that they marched to the westward, along the Barbary shore, until they encountered the Tripoline forces in the vicinity of Derne, a town on the eastern borders of, and belonging to Tripoli—here a victory was gained by the American army, and the place immediately surrendered. This was known at Malta early in the month of May, and new supplies of ammunition, &c. were immediately sent to General Eaton, in a Government brig. The reigning Bathaw of Tripoli must have been seriously alarmed. Our fleet was highly respectable—it was well known, we had then nearly twenty sail of vessels of war in the Mediterranean sea, (with the 9 gun-boats sent from this country, and some hired cutters, the number destined to attack Tripoli in July, was thirty vessels, carrying more than 3000 men, and 500 pieces of heavy cannon.) Could Tripoli hold out against a force so formidable, under officers so experienced, assisted too by an army on shore? We cannot suppose that the Bathaw could expect to oppose them with success, he therefore took the wisest course, and opened negotiations for peace. To talk of tribute, under these circumstances, was nonsense, he had not been able to command it last year. He is then said to have lowered his demand, from a million to a hundred and fifty thousand dollars. After the gallant Prestle had expended a few thousand dollars worth of powder and shot, in the different attacks on his fleet and forts, his agents at Malta probably informed him what he might expect to receive.—His only safety, therefore, was an immediate peace, and it is said, he sent a flag of truce to Malta, to treat on the terms.—Capt. Leach expressly states, that Consul Lear was thereupon dispatched to Tripoli, and that a treaty was soon negotiated, with conditions highly honorable to the United States. The American prisoners were to be all released from slavery. Ransom or tribute must have been out of the question, and future tribute, or annual subsidies must also have been abandoned forever. If the fleet had attacked Tripoli in July, as intended, it probably would have surrendered, almost upon any conditions. We rejoice, however, in the peace as it is. General Eaton and his brave companions in arms are entitled to the thanks of the Government, and nation at large, for their unequalled exertions. A march over the deserts of Africa, through an enemy's country, what an undertaking! this has been attempted by Americans, in Mr. Jefferson's Presidency; it will remain for future historians to record the fact, to our honor. Let Europeans imitate the glorious example. Let the governments of England and France, and even those of