



FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1813.

No. 10.

Vol. XIV.

INDIAN BARBARITIES.

The following is an interesting correspondence between a Committee of Gentlemen of Albany and the Hon. A. B. Woodward, Judge of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Michigan, relative to the recent events in that Territory.

Albany, March 26, 1813.

Sir.—It has been intimated, that you have recently made a communication to the Secretary of State of the general government, relative to the situation of the Michigan Territory, since it was surrendered to the British government—Sensibly participating in the sympathy, which the unfortunate fate of that Territory excites in the citizens of the U. States generally, and on the frontier of this state particularly—We the undersigned, acting in behalf of the citizens of this city, would be gratified in being possessed of the information you have so transmitted—and of your opinion whether it would be improper for us to cause the same to be published.

We have the honor to be, &c. F. BLOODGOOD, I. TOWNSEND, G. Y. LANSING. Committee.

The Hon. J. B. Woodward, Judge of the Supreme Court, Michigan Territory.

To Messrs. Francis Bloodgood, Isaiah Townsend and Garret Y. Lansing, a committee of gentlemen of the City of Albany.

Albany, March 27, 1813.

GEN. LEMEX.—The sympathy which the unhappy fate of the Territory of Michigan, has excited in the citizens of the United States generally, and in those of the frontier of this state particularly is at once as natural, as it is honorable, to the humane heart.

The information which I have had occasion to communicate to the Honorable the Secretary of State of the general government, relative to the Territory of Michigan, since it has been surrendered to the arms of G. Britain, is such as might have been put into possession of the Government and the public by any other channel, and I conceive there is no impropriety in my complying with your polite request. I do not perceive any reason why the same information might not, without impropriety, be laid by you before the public.

I therefore do myself the honor to transmit to you herewith, copies of the several communications, which I have had occasion to make to the General Government, relative to the situation of the Territory under the British flag.

I have the honor to be, &c. A. B. WOODWARD.

To the Editor of the Albany Argus.

Albany, March 29, 1813.

Sir.—Of the documents communicated to us on the 27th inst. by the Hon. Judge Woodward, we transmit you an extract of the following for publication in the Argus, as containing matter of public interest.

We are, sir, &c. FRANCIS BLOODGOOD, ISAIAH TOWNSEND, GARRETT Y. LANSING.

Extract from a letter from Judge Woodward to Gen. Proctor, dated Detroit, February 2, 1813.

It is well known to you, sir, that the capitulation of the sixteenth of August, 1812, has suffered many infractions in every quarter of the territory, by the Savages in the employ of the British government. The inhabitants have borne them with an unexampled patience. They have entertained a constant apprehension, that when the American forces approach the territory, and when an engagement has taken place, the fury of the savage mind at the sight of blood, and in reflecting on the dead they lose, and perhaps on the retaliatory treatment of prisoners or of the dead, which their cruel mode of warfare produces, is always likely to drive them to an ignoble revenge on the prisoners they find in the country, & the inhabitants of it who are American citizens. They therefore pressed

the subject on your attention previous to the battle of the 22d January, 1813—and felt satisfied with your assurance, that you considered your own honor pledged for their effectual protection. Since the result of that battle, facts are before their faces which they cannot shut their eyes upon.—Some of them are perhaps unknown to yourself. I will enumerate some which I believe there will be no difficulty in establishing beyond the reach of contradiction.

First, Some of the prisoners, after the capitulation of the 22d January, 1813, have been tomahawked by the savages.

Second, Some of the prisoners, after the capitulation have been shot by the savages.

Third, Some of the prisoners, after that capitulation, have been burnt by the savages.

Fourth, Some of the inhabitants of the Territory of Michigan, citizens of the United States of America, after that capitulation, have been shot by the savages.

Fifth, The houses of some of the inhabitants of the Territory, American citizens, after that capitulation, have been burnt by the savages.

Sixth, Some of the inhabitants, American citizens, after that capitulation, have been pillaged by the savages.

These facts evince that in some quarter, and in some department or other, either the moral or physical means of preventing a violation of your capitulations do not exist. The alarms of the inhabitants, therefore are the more highly excited by the expectation of another battle; and they feel, and perhaps very justly that their persons and property are not respected.

It is on this account that I have been requested to submit to your consideration a convention between the citizens and yourself which may remove the first difficulty suggested in this letter, and obviate the second.

Sandwich, 9th Feb. 1813.

Sir,—You will have the goodness to appoint a day for the purpose of adducing before Col. Proctor, such proofs as you may have, to substantiate the assertions stated in your letter to him, relative to the slaughter of the enemy's sick and wounded, on the 22d January last.

I have the honor to be, &c. A. W. M'LEAN, A. D. C. Aug. B. Woodward, Esq. Detroit.

Sandwich, Feb. 10, 1813.

Sir,—I had the honor to receive on the third day of this month, a verbal message from you, communicated to me by Major Muir, requesting me to endeavor to procure some evidence of the massacre of the American prisoners, on the 23d day of January last.

I met with only a few persons at Detroit, who are inhabitants of the River Raisin, nor was it altogether a pleasant task to those, to relate in these times, the scenes they have beheld; some of them however, appeared before a French magistrate, and I send you copies of what they have stated.

It will occur to you, sir, immediately, that what any of them state on the information of others, though not direct evidence in itself, leads to the source where it may be obtained.

The truth will undoubtedly, eventually appear; and that unfortunate day, must meet the steady and impartial eye of history.

In communicating your message, Maj. Muir added something having relation to American citizens, who might be willing to take the oath to the King. It will be obvious to you, sir, that in a state of open and declared war, a subject or citizen of one party cannot transfer his allegiance to the other party, without incurring the penalties of treason; and, while nothing can excuse his guilt, so neither are those innocent, who lay temptation before him.

The principles adopted by the U.

States on the subject of expatriation, are liberal, but are perfectly inapplicable to a public enemy in time of war.

The law of nations does not justify coercion upon any man to bear arms against his country. Vattel says that a man of spirit ought rather die ten thousand deaths.

Some of the French inhabitants of the Territory of Michigan, citizens of the United States of America, have been much urged on this subject, and are apprehensive of being further troubled.

I had the further honor of receiving on the 8th inst. your verbal message by your aid-de-camp Mr. M'Lean, acquainting me that there was no capitulation on the 22d January, and that the prisoners surrendered at discretion, I therefore beg pardon for that mistake. The principles of the law of nations, however, impose an obligation almost equally strong.

I beg leave to repeat a request for the favor of a passport.

I have the honor to be, &c. A. B. WOODWARD. Col. Henry Proctor, Sandwich.

[Then follow Affidavits which fully prove all the facts above alleged, which are omitted for want of room.]

From the ENQUIRER.

DEBATE IN PARLIAMENT.

We have seen an interesting Debate in the House of Lords on the "American Negotiation," on the 18th of February. It is too copious for insertion in this paper, and we must content ourselves for the present with making extracts from such parts of it as relate to the great bone of contention between the two countries, the practice of impressment. It is difficult from this discussion to catch the tone of parties in England on American affairs. Lord Harrowby is the only speaker, who declares in explicit terms that England could not "give up the right of impressment." Ministers asked for some project from America; what laws she would enact as a substitute for impressment. Lord Eldon, the Chancellor (formerly Sir John Scott) descends from the woolsack to urge this objection to the conduct of America. "He should have been most happy to hear of any measures or law having been proposed that might have promised the hope of peace being continued between the two countries." It is extraordinary but it is true, that the whole debate does not contain a syllable of the proposition of Mr. Russell to Lord Castlereagh to cease the employment and even the naturalization of British seamen—a strange proof either of the mutilated state in which the American Negotiation has been submitted to Parliament, or of the disingenuous manner in which it has been treated. Lord Eldon presents us with one glimpse of peace. "Till America (says he) altered her conduct with respect to the naturalization of our subjects, he honestly confessed that he did not see a fair ground for hoping that England might expect an early termination to the war with that power." But America has passed a law giving to her regulations on this subject a new scope and character; she has altered her conduct with respect to naturalization." Lord Eldon then presents some glimpse of peace. Lord Harrowby would extinguish that spark in a night of "interminable war."

Much stress is laid, in the Debate, on the Opposition in this country.—Shall we have Peace from the mediation of Russia? Perhaps, if Lord Eldon speaks the sentiments of Ministers, no circumstance would defeat it, but this very Opposition. If the federalists would but act as the Marquis Wellesley tells the House of Peers they ought to act, that "being in the war, they ought to fight it out manfully," we should have an immediate peace on the most honorable terms.

Some censure was thrown out in the Debate on the "mode on which

the war had been carried on;" that the war was to have been expected; yet that the force on the American station was insufficient "to bear down and crush, at the first symptom of decided hostility, the naval means of America." Lord Melville says in reply, that "that force was such, as according to all rational and political calculation, (that is, for fir built frigates, &c.) was adequate to its object—neither could it have been increased or augmented, without withdrawing from other services what could not be spared. The Baltic force, for instance, could not have been reduced, without a sacrifice beyond any proposed object; and if he could have anticipated the events that occurred he would not have advised the withdrawing, for any trans-atlantic purpose, one ship from the Baltic."—Lord Liverpool re-echoes the statement of his colleague; "The fact was, that every preparation had been made consistent with the regard which we ought to have to other quarters in which our interests were certainly not less pressing and peculiar."

But we detain the reader too long from the interesting extracts we have promised—

LORD BATHURST.

"He would here call upon their Lordships to decide, whether a right always exercised by this country, and not only by this country, but by others, was to be abandoned on the occasion alluded to? America affected to entertain notions of maritime rights that were applicable to general commerce and the privileges of independent States; but she had never brought forward, or stated specifically, or any way that we had heard, her code of regulations. The mode, for instance, now sailors belonging to England were to be prevented from entering into the American service, had never been described."

"The practice of the American Government, as tending to encourage desertion, was notorious. Their limit of five, or of four years citizenship, in any part of America, afforded a scope for that purpose, which was obvious and incalculable. Upon what ground, then, could the American Government, or Mr. Monroe, object to a regulation which had for its object a clear and definite prevention of abuses felt and acknowledged to exist? The right of search had long since existed, and though it had, at some times been disputed, yet it stood upon a basis of such solidity and general acknowledgment in the Government of this country, that until he should hear of some adequate substitute, he should not be persuaded to give it up. He hoped, however, that whatever differences of opinion in other matters might prevail, there was one sentiment of accord in the object & principle of the ADDRESS, which he should submit to their Lordships."

THE MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE.

"Upon the subject of impressed seamen, that was a practice which rested not upon abuses. The principle was acknowledged and could not be disputed by America in reference to the Government of England. Abuses indeed were always open to correction; and American subjects, when ascertained to be such, were unquestionably exempt from the arm of English impressment. He wished not to diverge from the main question, or to offer any arguments or suggestions which could impair the unanimity which he trusted would prevail in favor of the address proposed by the Noble Secretary. Yet he could not feel expressing an earnest wish, notwithstanding all which had previously taken place, whether in the errors or prejudices of the different governments, a spirit of conciliation might take place and repair or reconcile as far as possible, all former differences."

LORD LIVERPOOL.

"The motives set forth by America were not her motives. Who could now believe that the right of

impressment was the actual cause?—That right was no doubt, an old and solemn right of England; but it was not of a nature to admit of modifications. Amicable discussions might have reduced the whole controversy to nothing; but was it to be believed that America wanted this?"

LORD HOLLAND. "In a short speech expressed his belief that from the extreme nicety of the point, on which the negotiation broke off it might not be altogether hopeless of renewal. On the question of naturalization, there could be no doubt that the King had a right to the services of the natives of this country, and that the flag of the merchant could not protect them. But strong as were the demands of America, we had made stronger in our day. He accidentally had taken up the Statute Book on the table, & found a Statute of Anne, enacting, that any man, not merely who resided in England, but to any other country, and to the oaths of allegiance to the Queen, should be considered as under English protection. With some objections, he approved of the tenor of the Address."

LORD HARROWBY "expressed his surprise at the language held by the Noble Baron who spoke last, when he considered what were the pretensions of America, and what would be the consequence of acceding to those pretensions? And what was to be the price of your concession? Not a peace, but merely an armistice. He must say, that if the Americans insisted on our giving up the right of impressment, there was no probable end of the dispute between the two countries; an interminable war must ensue; and he thought that all who heard him would be ready to expend their last shilling in such a cause."

LORD ERSKINE.

"He differed from the Noble Secretary in what he said respecting the demands on England by America, for the regulation of our future conduct in the impressment of seamen. She had not called on England to abandon the right. America had only called on us for a cessation of the practice, till the claim might be adjusted. He could not but lament that a war had been entered into; yet, having entered into it, he hoped that Ministry would so act as to sustain the high honor and high maritime character of England. He agreed with the sentiments of a Noble marquis, (Wellesley) that we ought to beware of entering into a quarrel—but, being in it, fight it out manfully."

LORD ELDON.

"Anxious however, as they were for peace, they would not abandon those rights which, in their estimation tended to support the honor, the dignity, and the power of this country. And here he must be allowed to enter his solemn protest against the doctrine broached by his Noble & Learned Friend (Erskine) this day, in the course of his speech to their Lordships. He would oppose even a suspension of those rights questioned by America, believing, as he did and ever must, that our country could not exist unless her natural-born subjects were to be prevented from entering into the service of other states at war with this country, into the service of States to which they could owe no allegiance. The natural born subjects of this country could not put off that allegiance which they owed to it—and when this country might be called into conflict, for its safety, it had a right to demand the support of all its natural-born subjects. As to the extent to which the impressment of seamen might be carried either by this country or by America, their Lordships must very well know, that it had been a matter of frequent discussion with all Administrations. Hitherto all of them had failed in their endeavors to ascertain the extent to which it might be carried, for all of them had found it impossible to give way to those demands which were made by America. But it was said that the American government had