

British Packet



AND ARGENTINE NEWS.

(No. 1077.)

BUENOS AYRES, SATURDAY, APRIL 10th, 1847.

(Established in 1826.)

BUENOS AYRES.

THE letters and papers received by the last packet from England leave no doubt as to the determination adopted by the British and French governments to put an immediate end to their fatal intervention in the domestic affairs of these countries. The effects of this egregious blunder were so sensibly felt in the United Kingdom that memorials were pouring in from all quarters to Lord Palmerston, praying him to use his best exertions to have the blockade of Buenos Ayres removed at once. Appeals in this sense had been sent from Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, Nottingham, Derby, and Belper, and others were in course of preparation. M. Guizot had assured the committee of the Chamber of Deputies who drew up the address in answer to the King's speech, that he entertained the most sanguine hopes that the measures already concerted between the two intervening powers would lead to the desired result, of restoring peace forthwith on the shores of La Plata. Lord Howden's mission to this river is announced in all the London and Paris papers, and appears to have been hailed with joy in every quarter. The *Morning Chronicle* of the 1st of February copies the following from a contemporary:—

Lord Howden left London for Paris on Friday evening. The object of his lordship's visit to the French metropolis is to receive the final assent of the Cabinet of the Tuilleries to the modifications which may be necessary to terminate, satisfactorily to all parties, the hostilities on the River Plate. Lord Howden's departure for South America, as British Minister at the Court of Brazil, was deemed a fitting opportunity for the two governments, acting in concert, to arm him with powers and instructions to bring the quarrels of the belligerent republics to a peaceful adjustment.—*Observer*.

John-Hobart Lord HOWDEN, the lately appointed Resident at the Court of Rio Janeiro, and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary for the settlement of the affairs of the River Plate, is Baron Howden, of Grimston and Spaldington, and of Craddockstown, county Kildare, in the Peerage of Ireland, of Howden and Grimston, county York, in that of the United Kingdom, Knight of the Hanoverian Guelphic Order, of that of St. Anne in Russia and of the Redeemer of Greece, Colonel in the Army; born 16th Oct. 1799; married Jan. 1830, Catherine, daughter of his Excellency, Paul, Count Skavronsky, and great niece of Prince Potemkin. His lordship is more familiarly known to the generality of our readers by the name of Col. CRADOCK, from the military-diplomatic appointment he held from the British Government in the Peninsula during the earlier period of the Carlist insurrection, and previously to his accession to the title on the death of his father the first Lord Howden, who was created a Baron of Ireland, 19th Oct. 1813, and a Peer of the United Kingdom, 10th Sept. 1831. His lordship's family is of ancient Welsh origin, claiming descent from Caradoc and the ancient Princes of Wales. The late Lord took the name of CRADOCK by royal license in 1831. His father was the Most Rev. JOHN CRADOCK, Archbishop of Dublin.

The report of the police in relation to the untimely end of the late Col. Rodriguez has, from the copiousness of its details and the clearness of its statements, fully justified the expectations that were

entertained. Such a connected chain of circumstantial evidence is brought forward that it is impossible that the most cautious coroner's jury could for a moment hesitate to pronounce the deceased *felo de se*. The unfortunate man appears to have been, as regards pecuniary matters, in very embarrassed circumstances, not having wherewith to supply his most ordinary wants, and being prevented from recurring to his friends for relief from his inability to meet former engagements. About a month previous to his death he applied to the British house of Nicholson, Green & Co., in this city, to sell a draft for \$4,000 hard dollars on the treasury of Cobija; and such was his anxiety to raise funds that he offered to allow 20 per cent. discount on the whole sum, and wait for the payment of one half till the bill was honoured, provided he received \$1,200 in hand. Although Mess. Nicholson & Co. declined to entertain the proposal, Col. Rodriguez seems to have flattered himself that the great allurements he held out would ultimately enable him to accomplish his end, and he actually appointed a day to settle with his creditors. That day, however, was the one on which he consummated his self-sacrifice. All his efforts to negotiate the bill on Cobija had proved unavailing. Besides these pecuniary difficulties which were so well calculated to disturb Signor Rodriguez's mind, he is understood to have undergone a good deal of mental suffering in consequence of a misunderstanding which took place between him and the Bolivian General Guilarte in Montevideo, and was seized by the unprincipled vents in that town as an excellent opportunity to vent their spite on his devoted head. From a letter which was left written by Col. Rodriguez, addressed to Lieut. Col. Del Corte, Attaché to the Bolivian Legation, it appears that his mind was so much affected that he laboured under the apprehension that he had been marked out as a victim by his political enemies. The following is a translation of this letter, a copy of which was furnished by Lieut. Col. Del Corte to the Police, and the original sent to the Bolivian Government.

Ex-Legation of Bolivia
Buenos Ayres, Nov. 26, 1846.

To Signior Commandant José del Corte.

Under date of the 18th inst. I received by the *Legalidade* a communication from Montevideo dated the 9th, in which a person of respectability deserving my full reliance, announces to me the atrocious and wild project conceived by the fanatical party spirit actuating General Guilarte, Varela and Co., in order to sacrifice me to their revenge or caprice, without any other pretext or motive than the assumption that I am very friendly and much attached to General Rosas, by whom, they say, I have been bought.

Although this atrocious and cruel supposition is equally ridiculous and self-contradictory, as neither General Rosas has had why or wherefore to buy me, nor have I been or am I saleable nor a friend to parties, but simply a Bolivian; nevertheless, as during my stay in this country from urgent necessity, the sacrifice prepared by inveterate hate and mad revenge may take place, it is incumbent on me to proscribe to you beforehand the line of conduct you are to observe in such case, as attaché to the Legation, as a Bolivian fellow-countryman, and in short, as a friend.

1st. The deed accomplished, the first thing you will do, will be to ask the sole and absolute intervention in the arrangements, inventories &c., of my house, without allowing any other person whatsoever unauthorized by you to interfere.

2dly. You will take an inventory of all my personal property, consisting solely of my bed, clothes and papers.

3dly. In order that no complications or misunderstandings may occur, I will at once state that I do not possess more than a pair of small trunks and a

few hide valises—that I have no jewelry or plate, as I have sold all to support myself—and that the remainder in the house belongs to it, or to my servants.

4thly. You will on no account allow my domestics to suffer, either by the detention of what belongs to them or by laying claim to anything as my property, in precaution of which I have made the foregoing declaration that I possess nothing but my clothes and papers.

5thly. You will collect from some papers, letters, and the copied books, which, by way of precaution I have confidentially deposited with that party.

6thly. As soon as convenient, you will report to government, stating that by Capt. Lopez and by the following mail I had written to Bolivia hinting what might occur, and I even sent a copy of the paragraph of the letter.

7thly. As I have some outstanding debts for which I have given documents, and others without this formality, you will take an account of them in order that they may be paid by the government either on account of my salary or of my services, as it is not just that my creditors should suffer after having rendered me a service.

8thly. You will not consent under any pretence that any other person whatsoever shall interfere in the affairs of my house, inventories, &c.

I copy for you the paragraph of the letter for your information and guidance:

"Montevideo, 9th Nov., 1846.—Notwithstanding our longing to see you here as soon as possible in order to give you proofs of our friendship and gratitude before your return home, we have been all very much delighted that you did not come, as your countryman Guilarte, Varela, Lopez and the rest who form his club, have decreed your death and even intend to carry into execution their perfidious design by causing you to be assassinated in that city, if you do not come down to this. They say it would be best to do it there, so that Rosas might bear the blame by having the imputation of the murder fastened upon him, and there might be a more immediate motive of rupture between him and the President of Bolivia. For God's sake take great care of yourself, do not go out at night, nor any distance from the city on horseback, and if you do so let it always be in the company of Carlos or some other confidential person. Look to it, you are watched, &c."

. has also given me some hints in this respect, and even writes to me stating how gratified he was I had not gone to Montevideo.

Everything else I leave to your judgment and discretion.

By way of precaution I write this, preserving it in my desk so as to strike the eye on the first inspection.

God preserve you.

MANUEL RODRIGUEZ.

True copy—José del Corte.

As an appropriate pendant to the document we gave in our last shewing the anarchy and villany which pervade the rebel ranks in Montevideo, we insert the following extract of the draft of a letter found among Rivera's papers after his late defeat. The original draft with Rivera's own signature has been sent by President Oribe to the Argentine Minister at Rio Janeiro.

Most Excellent Signior President of the Republic, D. Joaquin Suarez.

On the Coast of Las Vacas, December 2, 1846.

My Signior compadre and particular friend:

Under date of 23rd ultimo they write me from Montevideo, and amongst other things say the follow-

ing precise words, "Juan Mesa is here, and is it this moment in the house of the Signior Presidente D. Joaquin Suarez, I communicate it to you for your information."

This obliges me to make some observations to you which I have no doubt will have some weight in your judgment. Mesa, Signior Presidente, is a criminal, he is a traitor to the country, and thence a murderer of the natives of the soil; at this very moment the families of D. Ignacio Barrios, of Greguis, Lastrana, and Nieto are in mourning for defenceless relatives whose throats were cut by the barbarous Mesa and the men trained up by him in immorality, whom he afterwards abandoned as a coward, the bodies of the victims being left unburied in imitation of the proceedings of the invaders against our countrymen.

The Republic is accused before the world by its enemies of the murder of 32 Brazilians at the Estancia de Zorrilla, at Tres Arboles. Mesa and six others of those supposed to be the perpetrators of that horrid outrage I had the good fortune to capture and place in rigorous confinement in Martin Garcia with the hope of saving the government of my country from the charges which Brazil and the civilized world would urge against it for a deed which the nations which know how to respect the rights of men do not and cannot let go unpunished.

Signior Presidente: I am speaking to Y. E. who is well informed of all the events of the Oriental nation, and who has suffered the terrible evils of anarchy. I cannot believe that the respectable citizen D. Joaquin Suarez can have forgotten the deeds of Otorgues, Brasito, &c; all the clashing discordancies which were caused by the peculiar policy of father Monteroso and other scourges of the country who preyed upon it and caused it to fall into the hands of foreigners. If it is true, Signior Presidente, that Garribaldi carried off Mesa and caused him to be conveyed to Montevideo, that Mesa is there at liberty in the presence of the Government, I hope you will tell me if you find any difference between the events of the times of Artigas and the evils which the Republic then suffered, and in the midst of which you on more than one occasion was deprived of your liberty and your life exposed as well as that of numberless other citizens whom you know and who exist in Montevideo. Signior Presidente and friend, I am extremely sorry to be under the obligation of writing this letter to you and of bringing to your remembrance unpleasant circumstances which we should try to forget; but Y. E. is the Padre de la Patria and the Nation's Chief. Your Excellency and the Government which you nobly preside over, cannot nor ought to temporize with vile wretches because you are prohibited from so doing and I do not believe it—because I cannot comprehend what the policy of the Government would be, except it should be willing to continue that which was displayed by Pacheco and others like Pacheco in the former celebrated period; if it should be so, let everything be abandoned at once, let us deliver up the Republic to the enemy and not deceive the country with fine words in order to leave it to be scorned and derided by its enemies.

Your compadre and friend greets you affectionately and kisses your hand.

F. RIVERA.
True copy—
José Agustin Iturriga,
Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

The President of the Honourable Junta of Representatives.

Buenos Ayres, March 24, 1847, 33, 32, 18.

To H. E. the Governor and Captain General of the Province of Buenos Ayres, Brigadier D. Juan Manuel de Rosas.

The President of the Honourable Junta of Representatives has the honour of transmitting to Your Excellency the law sanctioned this day, by which the estimates of the expenditure for the current year have been approved of.

The Representatives while sanctioning this law in conformity with what they stated to Y. E. in their note of 4th of February last, in reference to the resignation which Y. E. tendered of the supreme command, have deemed it their duty to declare that although they have now voted the sum calculated upon in the estimates of the general expenditure for the present year, they do not on this account limit themselves now, nor will limit themselves in future, to what has been sanctioned this day: for, on the one hand, fully relying on the purity with which Y. E. administers the public treasure, and, on the other, resolved to co-operate in the most active and effi-

cient manner in the just and glorious resistance which Y. E. opposes to the intervening powers, they are firmly resolved to vote, independently of the estimates, all the resources which Y. E. may require to save the country, without even excluding their private fortunes for that sacred end.

The Representatives, convinced of the patriotism and virtue with which Y. E. sustains the rights of the Argentine Confederation and sincerely grateful for the heroic services which Y. E. renders to save the honor and independence of the same, fulfill the most gratifying duty by making that solemn declaration; for they desire that neither means nor blood be economized in order to terminate with glory this great question, in which, as in all the acts of Y. E., they honour themselves in declaring and solemnly do declare that they take upon themselves all the responsibility thereof, and of whatever events may ensue, let the future, which the injustice and force of the aggressors prepare for our country, be what it may.

All which by order of the Honourable Junta I have the honour to communicate to Y. E.

God preserve Y. E. many years.

(The President of the Honourable Junta)

Miguel Garcia.

(Deputy and Secretary)

Eustaquio J. Torres.

The following despatch from General Urquiza to the President Oribe has been published.—

Headquarters, Gualeguaychu, Feb. 22, 1847.

The undersigned has the honor to transmit to Y. E., with the previous knowledge of H. E. the Governor and Captain General of the Province of Buenos Ayres, encharged with the Foreign Relations of the Argentine Confederation, the three accompanying sealed packages which have been sent to him by the intrusive government of the town of Montevideo. In this step the undersigned conceives he gives Y. E. a fresh proof of the steadfast loyalty with which he has known how to uphold the rights of the two Republics of La Plata, combating at the head of a moral and valiant army for one common, worthy and American cause. The ruthless Unitarians who, by attempting to interest the humane and philanthropic feelings of the undersigned, fancied for a moment that they should entrap him in their snares, will furnish, without doubt, in the documents I place at your disposal, another proof of their impuissance and of the groveling perfidious policy with which they endeavour to sustain the semblance of authority, vilely sold to the foreigner, which exists in Montevideo.

God preserve Y. E. many years.

Justo J. de Urquiza.

H. E. President Oribe, &c.

Major Elordi, one of the Argentine officers taken prisoners at Paysandú, at the time of the combined attack of the French and Rivera, was lately sent by Admiral Lainé to Entrerios for the purpose of being set at liberty on his parole if General Urquiza was agreeable to it, the object of the admiral in adopting this course being evidently to cast a slight on the prerogative of the general government to treat of such matters. General Urquiza being informed of the circumstance by the Commandant of Arroyo de la China, wrote to that officer the following letter:—

Headquarters, Gualeguaychu,
8th March, 1847.

My esteemed friend,—By your esteemed yesterday and the enclosed of the French officer who came with a flag of truce, I have just learned the singular pretension of Admiral Lainé. As this is an affair that belongs to the Government encharged with the Foreign Affairs, you will make the same known to the French officer, adding that, whilst I await orders from that Government, to whom I report what has taken place, it would be far more advisable for Admiral Lainé to address it directly, as this Government has to act in entire accordance with the supreme administrator of the general affairs of the nation.

In my view it is the height of folly and of meanness on the part of Major Elordi to have made the promise of not taking arms again during the present contest, and it is another offence on the part of the intervenors to have arrogated to themselves by such an irritating requirement a right which by no means belongs to them, since the war they wage against the two Republics of La Plata in combination with the ruthless Unitarians has not been preceded by any declaration of their governments, and is, therefore, irregular and piratical.

Yours affectionately,

Justo J. de Urquiza.

Commander Fidel Sagastume, &c.

UNITED STATES AND MEXICO.

We yesterday received papers from the United States to the 30th of January. The house of Representatives had authorized the government to contract a loan of 23 millions of dollars, and the bill was under discussion in the Senate.

From the seat of war there is nothing new in regard to operations; but great preparations were being made by the United States in order to strike a decisive blow. Three regiments and some howitzers were ready to be embarked at New Orleans for Tusman where they will be joined by six other regiments which must have already arrived there. Their future destination was not positively known, but it was pre-umed that they would march directly on Mexico by Guachinguo, Papuda, Apan and Tezamo, a distance of 250 miles, and that General Scott who commanded in chief the forces stationed between Monterey and Saltillo, would simultaneously advance on San Luis de Potosi.

It was generally thought that Santa Ana, aware that 9,000 men were to march from Tusman, would avoid a battle at San Luis and fall back on Queretaro and Tulaezingo, in order to oppose the division from Tusman and cover the capital. The Americans reckon, notwithstanding, on dislodging Santa Ana from Tulaezingo and obliging him to fall back on Tezamo, 50 miles distant from the capital. In the meantime General Scott will march rapidly in Macon, Chica and Real del Monte, Pachuca and Otumba, and join at Tezamo the division advancing from Tusman, or by a flank movement march on Isthmaca, 15 miles distant from the capital.

Such appears to be the plan of operations adopted by the American government, and from which they expect most important results.

There is news from Mexico up to the 31st of December. Gomez Farias had taken the oath as Vice-President and assumed the reins of government in the absence of Santa Ana. General Canabal was appointed Minister of War, Signior Zubieta of Finance, and Signior Ramirez of Foreign Affairs. All these appointments had been made *ad interim*.

The financial embarrassments and the privations of the army continued. Signior Loperena had been authorized to contract a loan of \$20,000,000 in England.

(*Journal do Commercio of 21st March.*)

UNITED STATES.

Correspondence between G. J. Pendergrast and others and the Secretary of the Navy, in compliance with a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 4th of May last.

(Continued.)

Legation of the United States,

Buenos Ayres, August 30, 1845.

Sir: Could I have sent you any satisfactory information, upon which reliance might have been placed in relation to the condition of things here, and in answer to your request, I should have done so ere now; but that has been impossible.

Some days ago, I received from the consul here, Joseph Graham, Esq., a paper, of which I send you a copy enclosed, (marked E.) from Adolphus Turner, Esq. I presume it to be genuine.

The influence which this paper has already had on the trade and interests of our countrymen is very unfortunate. The particular construction, in its practical operation, which the British naval commanders may and do give to this paper, is of great importance. Whether this paper has been issued by instructions from the British government, or whether it has been issued without the authority, and under the mere color of authority, of the British government, does not appear.

Samuel B. Hale, Esq., called on me a few days since, and informed me that he has property at Maldonado, and that he desires to make purchases at that place and at the ports of the Buceo, and that he also has similar business at other ports of the republic of the Uruguay. He has asked my opinion as to what are his rights as a citizen of a neutral nation, such as the United States, in regard to going in with his vessel into these ports, and in the pursuance of the trade of an honest neutral.

My opinion in such a case is of little value; but I have advised him to send on his vessel, and pursue his lawful trade, unless interrupted.

I have thought that even should the British government have actually declared and actually made war in this case, yet that the British government and the British naval commanders would not refuse to the American ships and cargoes the same immunities which are claimed and exercised by the British government and by British naval commanders.

For example. But I must premise that I am not aware that a neutral naval commander has a right to put on a blockade; I am not aware that it is the right of a neutral nation to order their naval commanders to put on a blockade. A neutral nation, or the naval commander of a neutral nation, has no right, by authority of the law of nations, to put on a blockade; that, in so doing, they act by mere color of the authority of the law of nations, and, for such abuse, are liable to an honest neutral for any injury he may sustain in his lawful and honest pursuits. But, even if a neutral nation or the naval commander of a neutral nation has a right to put on a blockade, and this, let us suppose, by undoubted authority of the law of nations, yet it becomes important to make *some inquires* when a blockade has been put on by a British naval commander, whether by his own mere will, without any authority, or under the authority of his government. The inquiries which present themselves are as follows:

When a blockade is put on by the order of a belligerent, directed to the naval commander, and when the right to issue such order is unquestioned by the British government, yet the British doctrine and the British practice is, that if a British naval commander awaits the decision of the British plenipotentiary at the government putting on the blockade, such British naval commander has acted properly—

Query 1. Do British naval commanders concede to American naval commanders the right and power to await the decision of the American Minister at the government which has put on the blockade?

Again: When a rigorous blockade is ordered by a belligerent nation, (I do not mean by a naval commander, without the order of his government,) the British doctrine and practice is, that if a British naval commander (while his government remains neutral) will postpone the execution of the said blockade until he shall receive communications deemed necessary from the British plenipotentiary at the government putting on such a blockade, such postponement of the execution of such blockade by a British naval (neutral) commander is approved by her Majesty's government.

Query 2d. Do British naval commanders concede to an American naval (neutral) commander the right and power "to postpone the execution of the said blockade until he shall receive communications deemed necessary" from the American minister plenipotentiary at the government putting on such blockade?

Query 3d. And with regard to such postponement of the date at which such strict blockade is to take effect, both with regard to the arrival and departure, from the port blockaded, of foreign vessels, do British naval commanders concede to American naval commanders the same power as claimed for them by the British government in such case?

Again: When the rigorous blockade is ordered by the government of a belligerent nation, (I do not mean a naval commander, without the order of his government,) and this order is issued by their naval commander, and when, in such case, a British naval neutral commander receives notice of such an order, and does not recognise it at the moment, but declares that such blockade will be recognised by her Majesty's government that the conduct of such British commander, in refusing to acknowledge such blockade, is approved by her Majesty's government—

Query 4th. Do British naval commanders concede to American naval commanders the right and power to say that they will recognise such blockade at some future day?

Again: When the government of a belligerent nation orders a strict blockade, and their naval commanders issue notice of such order, the British doctrine and practice is, that it will be necessary to defer the operation of the said blockade, with respect to British vessels and British cargoes, until he, (that is, the British commander) shall have been made acquainted with the results of an application of the British minister plenipotentiary at the belligerent government putting on such blockade.

Query 5th. Do British naval commanders concede to American naval commanders that "it will be necessary for them to defer the operation of the said blockade, with respect to American vessels and American cargoes, until such American commander shall have been made acquainted with instructions from his government?"

Again: Is it the doctrine of a British commander, (sanctioned by her Majesty's government,) that when an order has been issued by the government of a belligerent nation to their naval commanders to put on a rigorous blockade, that in such case "it becomes necessary for a British naval commander to claim indemnification for any losses to which British subjects may be subjected in consequence

of the proposed rigorous blockade, with respect to British vessels, or to vessels containing British property, which may have left the port of departure before the receipt of the intelligence of the establishment of the rigorous blockade?"

Query 6th. Have American citizens a claim for indemnification for any losses to which they may be subjected in consequence of a proposed blockade with respect to American vessels, or to vessels containing American property, under similar circumstances?

In fine, as the right of a belligerent nation to issue a paper order, signed by their secretary of foreign affairs, and directed to the naval commanders of such belligerent, and the right of such naval commanders to issue a paper notification of such order to a naval (neutral) British commander, seems unquestioned by the British naval commanders, and by the British government; and, as by the documents annexed, the British government and the British naval commanders declare that the right of such belligerent becomes suspended, or nullified, or destroyed, by the rights of a British naval commander to await, to postpone the execution, to hesitate to acknowledge at a future day, to postpone the date, to defer the operation of such blockade—

Query 7th. Do British naval commanders concede to American naval commanders the same rights and powers which they claim and exercise, "to await," "hesitate," "postpone the execution," "to acknowledge at a future day," and "to defer the operation" of such blockade, as claimed by themselves, until the American commander can receive instructions from those who have the power and right to give them to him

These are grave and important questions. As to myself, I am not aware, as I have said above, that a naval commander of a neutral nation has any right to put on a blockade; I am not aware that the government of a neutral nation has a right, by the law of nations, [while considering itself neutral,] to put on a blockade, or to authorize their naval commander to do so.

I now re find until within a few years—and that only in the waters of the La Plata—that naval commanders of neutral nations have exercised the power of putting on blockades.

If, then, sir, these questions are not fully and well settled by the law of nations, and more especially, as far as we are concerned, by the government of the United States, until such adjustment and decision, inasmuch as British naval commanders claim for their subjects and their commerce the rights and indemnifications and reclamations as set out above, can they deny to American citizens and American naval commanders the same rights and indemnifications which they claim for British naval commanders and British subjects?

It will be a matter of the first importance to our citizens for the United States to enjoy the same immunities which have been claimed and enjoyed by Great Britain under similar circumstances. Mr. Hale, in the pursuit of a neutral trade, presents himself for the transaction of business most important to himself, to his family, and to those for whom he transacts business.

I shall be happy to know, and it will be most pleasing to my countrymen to know, that, until these grave questions are properly settled, and until you shall have received instructions from the government of the United States on these subjects, our citizens meanwhile have the same immunities as claimed and enjoyed by British subjects.

I annex copies of the following, viz:

1st. A letter from Mr. Mandeville, British minister at Buenos Ayres, to Mr. Turner, British chargé d'affaires at Monte Video, dated 22d January, 1845, containing a letter from Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Mandeville, dated 1st of August, 1843, [marked A.]

2d. A letter from the British captain Pasley to the general-in-chief of the squadron of the Argentine Confederation, dated 19th January, 1845, [marked B.]

3d. A letter from the British captain Pasley to the admiral commanding-in-chief of the Argentine squadron off Monte Video, [marked C,] dated 29th January, 1845

4th. A letter from the British plenipotentiary, Mr. Ouseley, to Don Felipe Arana, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Argentine government, dated 13th July, 1845, [marked D.]

In the queries which I have drawn up I have endeavoured, as nearly as may be, to conform to and employ the terms used by the British functionaries. I also subjoin letters from Admiral Laine, and one from the French chargé here, the Baron de Mareuil.

The letter of the chargé and that of Mr. Mandeville of the 22d January, 1845, show the mistake under which Admiral Laine has labored as to the pretended agreement of the Argentine government

growing out of the joint memorandum of the 28th March 1843.

This letter will be handed to you by Mr. John Naulty, supercargo of the schooner Sarah Anne.

Any practical construction which the British agents at or near Monte Video may put on this order of Admiral Ingfield for the blockade of the Buco, and his prospective order for the rigorous blockade of other ports of the Oriental republic, might serve as a guide to our citizens here. It would be desirable to know what is meant by "troops in the service of the Argentine government." Does this mean Oriental troops under General Oribe?

Your situation near the source of action may enable you to obtain a solution of various matters which may enable our citizens here to shape their course. Any such information will be highly acceptable.

Mr. Naulty is near me, and admonishes me that he has a fair wind. I must therefore conclude.

Be assured of the high and distinguished consideration of your friend and servant,

Wm. Brent.

To Commander G. J. Pendergrast, Commander of the U. S. ship Boston, off Monte Video.

United States ship Boston,
Monte Video, September 30, 1845.

Sir: I have had the honor to receive your communication of the 30th ultimo, in relation to the blockade imposed by the English and French upon the ports of the republic of Uruguay, which were, or might be, in possession of the troops of Buenos Ayres.

At the moment your letter came to hand, I was engaged in a correspondence with the British and French admirals on the subject of the blockade, and have the honor herewith to transmit copies of that correspondence.

With reference to the validity of the blockade in question, I do not feel myself authorized to decide, and shall therefore refer the subject to the commander-in-chief for his instructions or the decision of our government. In the mean time, however, I shall feel bound to respect the present blockade, provided it be enforced in strict conformity to the laws of nations, and in accordance with the principles recognised in our country.

The declaration of the whole coast of the province of Buenos Ayres under blockade I conceive to be inadmissible, and shall therefore enter a protest against it; and after taking all the steps here which I deem requisite, I think it likely I will proceed to Buenos Ayres in the Boston, and send the Bainbridge to Monte Video.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,
Sir, your obedient servant,

G. J. Pendergrast,
Commander.

To the Hon. Wm. Brent, jr., Chargé d'Affaires of the United States, Buenos Ayres.

Legation of the United States of America,
Buenos Ayres, September 23, 1845.

Sir: On the 22nd of September, 1845 at about 10 o'clock in the morning of that day, I received a letter, of which a copy (marked A) is herewith enclosed.

On its receipt I addressed a letter to Don Felipe Arana, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Argentine Confederation, to which I received the reply (marked B) herewith sent. Under the circumstances detailed in these communications, I make this communication direct to you.

In the communication marked A, it is stated that, "in consequence of a decision which the ministers plenipotentiary of England and France at Monte Video have found necessary, a blockade of the ports and coasts of the Province of Buenos Ayres has been declared, and such blockade will be enforced by the combined squadrons of England and France, forty-eight hours after the date of the present notification. Fifteen days, however, will be allowed for the departure of vessels from Buenos Ayres."

In consequence of a decision which the ministers plenipotentiary of England and France have found necessary, a blockade of certain ports and coasts has been declared. That which the plenipotentiaries of England and France have found necessary for their declaration of this blockade, I do not recognise for the United States as the rule by which they will govern themselves; and I do not acknowledge such decision of these plenipotentiaries as having any validity whatever, as far as the United States and their citizens are concerned. Nor, sir, do I consider such decision thus made by these plenipotentiaries as giving any validity whatever to such blockade of the ports and coast of the province of Buenos Ayres. Nor, sir, do I acknowledge the right of the commanders of the combined squadron

of England and France to enforce any such blockade in consequence of such decision, found necessary by the English and French plenipotentiaries.

These acts of the English and French plenipotentiaries, and of the commanders of these squadrons, are ordered to suit the necessities of these plenipotentiaries, and the notification given by them bears evident marks of being made by mere color of the authority of the governments of France and England, and not by virtue of the authority of these governments.

And moreover, sir, even if this notification of such blockade has been made by virtue of instructions actually given to these plenipotentiaries and these naval commanders under the sign manual of the sovereigns of England and France, and by virtue of what they suppose to be their due authority, this blockade is no less invalid and contrary to the rights of nations.

I therefore, sir, for the United States of America, hereby protest against this so-called and misnamed blockade: and I hereby inform you, sir, that on the part of the United States of America and of their citizens, the United States will make reclamations from those committing any acts in violation of their rights, and, moreover, will require indemnification for any injury or loss whatever which they may sustain in consequence of such illegal acts.

I am, sir, your friend and obedient servant,
Wm. Brent, jr.,

Chargé d'Affaires of the United States of America near the Argentine Confederation.

W. G. Ouseley, Esq., Her Majesty's Minister Plenipotentiary.

MARINE LIST.

PORT of BUENOS AYRES.

April 3.—Wind N.

Arrived, H. B. M. schooner Ranira, 2nd Master John S. Smith, Commander, from Montevideo 1st inst. with the February mail from England, brought from Falmouth 5th February by H. B. M. Packet Swift, arrived at Rio Janeiro, March, and from Rio Janeiro 22nd March, by H. B. M. sloop of war Satellite, arrived at Montevideo 29th.

Passengers, Messieurs George C. Deetjen, William Steward, Antonio Lopez, and Adolph Heinsen.

Sailed, during the night, Sardinian schooner of war Ninfa, Lieut. Riboty, for Colonia.

April 4.—Wind N.

No arrivals or sailings.
April 5.—Wind N., in the afternoon changed to S.E., fresh.

Arrived, Sardinian schooner of war Ninfa, Lieut. Riboty, from Colonia.

April 6.—Wind N.E., fresh.

No arrivals or sailings.
April 7.—Wind N.N.E., opposite coast visible, rain during the night.

April 8.—Wind S.S.W.

Sailed, Sardinian schooner of war Ninfa, Lieut. Riboty for Montevideo.

Passengers—Messieurs Louis Schipman, Henry Wegmann, Julio Vignal, Antonio Ramel, Francisco Ezequiel, Juan Descarnes, Mateo Carbó, Mariano Suvians, Juan Salday, Guillermo Quirno, Ignacio Aldasa, Francisco Arizag, Jorge Sivory, and Alberto Costa. Mesdames Florentina Ituarte de Costa, Magdalena Costa, Damasa Ituarte, Agueda Costa, Carmen Gomez, Inés Britos de Arteaga and daughter, Carolina Delaplace, Rosa Payne, Concepcion Payne and daughter, and Josefa Britos de Gomez.

April 9.—Wind W.S.W.

Sailed, H. B. M. schooner Ranira, 2nd Master John S. Smith, with the mail for Falmouth.

Passengers—Messieurs George C. Deetjen, Augustus Storp, William Trensehn, Henry T. Speer, and Charles E. Otte.

ARRIVALS AT MONTEVIDEO.

April 2.

American schooner May Flower, Le Bennet, from New York 16th October and Marañón 18th December.

SAILED FROM MONTEVIDEO.

April 1.

H. B. M. schooner Ranira, for Buenos Ayres.

April 3.

Oriental brigantine Felix, J. Chaparro, for Patagonia.

Brazilian polacre Nuevo Asilo de la Virtud, Melo, for Santos.

April 4.

Spanish polacre Trinitario, J. Mataló, for Havana.

American schooner Forest, Leland, for Rio Grande.

Vessels loading at Montevideo for foreign ports on the 27th March.

For London,	British barque Ipswich, Sbiro.
"	Do. do. Clio, Le Grand.
"	Oriental do. Panchita, Horton.
"	Do. brig General Belgrano, Garrido.
"	Do. do. Golondrina, Smith.
"	Do. barque Enrique, Dayley.
"	Liverpool, British steamer Flecha, Green.
"	Do. barque Carolina, Parker.
"	Do. schooner Racet, Priouet.
"	Oriental do. Ernestina, Goodrich.
"	Plymouth, British barque Minstrel, Simpson.
"	Antwerp, Prussian do. Herzog Bogislaw, Jaeger.
"	Bremen brig Active, Lamke.
"	Hamburg barque Emma Louisa, Haesloop.
"	Do. do. Meiners, Linau.
"	Danish schooner Freja, Giesing.
"	Swedish brigantine Experiment, Almgreen.
"	Dutch galliot Anna Auguste, Pekers.
"	Hamburg, Hamburg brig Robert & Louise, Voss.
"	Do. brig Wilhelmina, Beersén.
"	Havre, French barque Achille, Bernard.
"	Do. brig Georgette, Morgan.
"	Do. do. Omega, Doynel.
"	Oriental barque Manuelita, Bereyl.
"	Marseilles, Do. do. Margarita, Brown.
"	Do. brig Pereira, Pereira.
"	Sardinian do. Graciosa Fanny, Triscornia.
"	Do. do. Triunfo del Brazil, Manaro.
"	Cette, American barque Isabella Hyne, Dewing.
"	Oriental brig Caprichoso, Capelo.
"	Genoa, Sardinian do. Precursore.
"	Do. polacre Margarita.
"	Do. brig Maria Teresa.
"	Bilbao, Spanish do. Unico, Roig.
"	Cadiz, Do. barque Restauracion, Puig.
"	Malaga, Do. do. Diosa del Mar, Vich.
"	Boston, American brig Olinda, Paston.
"	Salem, Do. do. Colonel Taylor, Steckney.
"	Do. barque William Schroder, Upton.
"	Danish brig Fides, Closter.
"	New York, American barque Mason Barney, Scott.
"	Havana, Spanish polacre Trinitaria, Mataló.
"	Do. do. Mensagera, Millet.
"	Do. brig Alfonso, Maristany.
"	Do. polacre Anita, Aisina.
"	Do. do. San Antonio, Durall.
"	Do. do. Teresina, Maristany.

H. B. M. packet Express from Rio Janeiro 16th December, with the mail per Griffon hence 19th and Montevideo 28th November, arrived at Falmouth on the 28th of January.

THERMOMETER in the Mirador of the Commercial Rooms since our last:—

Saturday	69
Sunday	71
Monday	70
Tuesday	70
Wednesday	73
Thursday	64
Friday	64

Blockade of the Port of Buenos Ayres by the combined Anglo-French squadron.

No movement worthy of notice has occurred this week.

This day (10th inst.) completes the 560th day of the blockade.

FOREIGN VESSELS OF WAR IN PORT.

BRITISH—Brig Grecian, 16 guns, Commander Louis S. Tindal.
FRENCH—Corvette Expeditive, 16 guns, Captain de Miniac.
SARDINIAN—Brig Deino, 14 guns, Captain Chevalier Scalfiero.

The Paris papers mention the appointment of M. Le Prédour, *capitaine de vaisseau*, as successor to Admiral Lainé on the River Plate station.

It is reported that Don Santiago Vasquez, late Foreign Secretary of the intrusive government of Montevideo, died in that city on the 6th inst.

Advertisements.

Wants a Situation.

A S Cook and Housekeeper, an English female. Apply at No 156, Calle del 25 de Mayo.

Notice

IS hereby given, that the Union Library has been returned from the house of Mr. J. Tucker to that of Mr. P. C. Diek, Calle del 25 de Mayo, No. 23, where it will continue to be carried on the same terms as formerly.
Buenos Ayres, 19th March, 1847.

MARRIED.

In Montevideo on the 25th ultimo, by the Rev. John Armstrong, Edward Zimmermann, Esq., Hanseatic Consul, to Margaret Eliza Courtney, eldest daughter of Robert M. Hamilton, Esq., Consul of the United States at that city.

On the 26th ult. by the Rev. Dr. Brown, Mr James Burnet to Elizabeth daughter of Mr. Henry Bell.

BIRTH.

On the 18th ultimo Mrs. N. P. Hansen of a son.
On the 3d instant Mrs. Patrick Bookey of a son.
On the 6th instant Mrs. Robert Leys of a son.

DIED.

On the 1st inst. Major Andreas Ulrick Damström, native of Stockholm, aged 64 years.

PRICES CURRENT.

Doubloons, Spanish	310	312	each.
Do. Patriot	308	310	do.
Plata, macuquina	17	18	do. for one
Dollars, Spanish	19	19	each.
Do. Patriot & Patacon	19	19	do.
Six per cent. Stock	96	98	do.
Exchange on England	2 1/2	2 3/4	do.
Do. France	93	95	franks per ounce
Do. Rio Janeiro	1	1	per patacon.
Do. Montevideo	1	1	per cent. prem.
Do. United States	18	19	do.
Do. for England & Germany	26	27	do.
Do. France	46	50	per pesada
Do. North America	28	29	do.
Do. Spain	43	46	do.
Do. salted	40	42	do.
Do. Horse	22	24	do. each
Calf skins	43	45	per pesada
Sheep skins, common	25	26	per dozen
Do. fine	35	36	do.
Deer skins	without price		do.
Goatskins	do.		do.
Natria skins	4	5	nominal
Chinchilliskins	without price		do.
Horse hair, short	45	48	dol. per arroba
Do. mixed	56	64	do.
Do. long	110	120	do.
Wool, common, washed	17	20	do.
Do. picked	without price		do.
Do. shorn from skins	15	20	do.
Do. mottled, dirty	24	28	do.
Tallow, pure	24	25	do.
Do. raw	20	21	do.
Do. with grease	22	23	do.
Jerked beef	28	30	per quintal.
Horns, mixed	200	250	per thousand
Do. Ox	400	450	do.
Shin bones	without price		do.
Hide cuttings	7	8	per 100 lbs.
Ostrich feathers, white	without price		do.
Do. black	10 1/2	11	do.
Salted tongues	8	10	per dozen
Salt, on board	none		per fanega
Discount	1	1 1/2	per cent. month

The highest price of Doubloons during the week 313 dollars.

The lowest price 308 dollars.

The highest rate of Exchange upon England during the week 2 3/4.

The lowest 2 1/2.

Doubloons 71 to 73 shillings.

Do. From 93 to 95 francs.

GEORGE THOMAS, Responsible Editor.