

Miscellaneous.

Extracts from "A Brief Review, of some of the points in the L'Amistad Case."

The case of the slaves taken in the Amistad, from Havana, and the circumstances under which the district judge decided that they were not slaves either under the Spanish law or our own, is one of the deepest importance to the Southern States. When we reflect upon the important principles that England has recently pronounced to the world in the case of the brig Enterprise, and also upon the proceedings of the recent convention, held in London, from different nations, on the subject of emancipation, connected with the mad and reckless movements upon the same subject in our own country, no man who is conversant with passing events can fail to be deeply impressed with anxious solicitude for the future. Many are so absorbed in the party contests of the day, that they seem to have forgotten that they have a country, and that she has been wounded in her most vital interests. The day was when movements that have taken place at home and abroad, within the last few years, upon these great and delicate interests, would have caused the swords of a hundred thousand freemen to tremble in their scabbards. My present object is to call the cool and dispassionate attention of the reflecting portion of the community to the principles involved in the case of the Amistad, in which an appeal is now pending before the Supreme Court of the United States.

The facts of the case seem to be, that the Amistad is a Spanish vessel, and was regularly cleared from Havana, in Cuba, to Greenajah, near Puerto Principe, another Spanish port. Her papers were all regular, and signed by the proper officers; her cargo consisted of merchandise and slaves, was duly manifested as belonging to Don Jose Ruiz and Don Pedro Montes; that the negroes after being at sea two or three days, rose upon the white persons on board; that the captain, his slave, and two seamen were killed, and the vessel taken possession of by the negroes; that the two white Spaniards, after being wounded, were compelled to assist in navigating the vessel, the negroes intending to carry her to the coast of Africa; that the two Spaniards contrived, by altering the course of steering at night, to keep her on the coast of the United States; that on seeing land off New York, they came to that coast. On the 26th of August, 1839, Lieut. Gedney, commanding the brig Washington, of the United States Navy, seized and brought into the port of New London, the Amistad and cargo, and all the persons on board, for examination, and such proceedings as the law of nations and of the U. States warranted and required.

The first question that presents itself, should the negroes be considered as property? The court below has said they should not. Courtesy, and the intercourse of all civilized nations, require that the forms and papers of all authorized officers in one country, shall be respected and received in the tribunals of another. Without this, there must be perpetual confusion and just ground of complaint between nations; and instead of harmony and mutual respect, the reverse must take place. Wherever jurisdiction is delegated to a public officer, and confined only by his discretion, all acts within that discretion are to be recognized as binding; and this is true, whether the act be judicial, legislative, or executive. Without this, the code of international law, by which the peace and intercourse of nations are preserved, would gradually fall into disuse, and the strongest maritime power would sweep into its exclusive jurisdiction all cases whatever. In this case, the negroes in question were all particularly named in the permit and clearance given to Ruiz and Montes, who held them as property in Havana, and the vessel and her port of destiny all described and properly authenticated by the legal officers in Cuba. These facts are not questioned.

If there were anything wrong in this, and against the laws of Spain, and if the authorized officer did not do every thing he may have done, then that was a case for the tribunals of Spain to decide upon, and not ours. If the negroes were not slaves under the Spanish law, that was an issue to be made up there, and decided by their courts, and not ours. Suppose a Spanish judge, with his arbitrary powers, had recognized the negroes to be slaves, by a decree, and yet, under the accidental jurisdiction of the district court of Connecticut, on collateral issues, our judge had looked behind that decree, and decided they were not slaves, because the Spanish law did not authorize them to be slaves, then what would it be but exercising, in effect, appellate jurisdiction over Spanish tribunals? The arrogance of such pretension would inevitably, if carried out in our decisions, destroy all national intercourse, and finally involve us in war, for violating the law of nations. And yet, if our courts can look behind the legal papers, properly authenticated by one class of officers, why can they not, upon the same principle, look behind the papers of all others? Under such a principle and precedent, a schooner, with her regular papers from the proper officers of the port of New Haven, might be seized upon and condemned, under a prize or admiralty court of a foreign power, because, forsooth, her cargo had been purchased and she had cleared on Sunday, and they had judged that it was against the law of Connecticut to sail on Sunday, or for her cargo to be purchased on that day. On this subject, the law of nations is the law of common sense and common courtesy. However much we may disapprove of the customs of foreign officers or their acts, we cannot, in the arrogance of our self-superiority, assume a supervision and jurisdiction incompatible with the separate independence of nations, and that intercourse which has been regulated and fixed by national law.

In the case of the negro who had concealed himself on board the American ship Elias Burget, that sailed from the island of St. Croix on the 25th of June, 1822; after landing in New York, the minister of Denmark made a demand for the slave, as the property of a Danish subject. This was a case where the slave was brought off without the knowledge of the captain, by concealment in the hold of the vessel for some days. In the case of the Amistad, the slaves were forced in openly by a United States officer. Yet in the Danish case, Mr. Wirt, then Attorney General of the United States, used this strong language:

"Denmark does not tolerate slavery in St. Croix; and any attempt on the part of the United States, or the individual citizens thereof, under the sanction and protection of their Government, to interfere with the Danish regulations in this respect, would be an invasion of the sovereignty of Denmark, and, if avowed and unredressed on our part, a just cause of war. To take away the slaves from the possession of their owners, whether by seduction, invitation, connivance, or ignorance and mistake, affected or real; to bring them to the United States, and to refuse to return them to their owners, on the call of their Government, would be such a violation of private property, such a lawless infraction of the rights and sovereignty, as to expose us to the just resentment of that nation, and the merited reproach of all the civilized world. We have, in my opinion, just as much right to order our national ships to unfurl the banner of freedom among the slaves of all the West India Islands, and proclaim insurrection and liberty among them, as we have to detain this single slave."—Pub. Doc. H. R. No. 199, pages 67 and 68.

Besides, the Spanish minister, in the name of his Government, and as its accredited representative, has formally demanded these negroes as the property of Spanish citizens. The presumption ought to be, that he understood the laws of his own country, and that he had recognized the usually accredited evidences of title. He claimed that they should be delivered under the treaty of 1795. The portions of that treaty bearing upon the point, and the obligations of which were renewed by subsequent treaty bearing upon the following words, viz:

"ARTICLE 8. In case the subjects and inhabitants of either party, with their shipping, whether public and of war, or private and of merchants, be forced, through stress of weather, pursuit of pirates or enemies, or any other urgent necessity, for seeking of shelter and harbor, to retreat and enter into any of the rivers, bays, roads or ports, belonging to the other party, they shall be received and treated with all humanity, and enjoy all favor, protection and help, and they shall be permitted to refresh and provide themselves, at reasonable rates, with victuals and all things needful for the subsistence of their persons, or reparation of their ships, and prosecution of their voyage; and they shall not be hindered from returning out of the said ports or roads, but may remove and depart when and where they please, without any let or hindrance.

"ARTICLE 9. All ships and merchandise of what nature soever, which shall be rescued out of the hands of any pirates or robbers, on the high seas, shall be brought into some port of either State, and shall be delivered to the custody of the officers of that port, in order to be taken care of, and restored entire to the true proprietor, as soon as due and sufficient proof shall be made concerning the property thereof.

"ARTICLE 10. When any vessel of either party shall be wrecked, foundered, or otherwise damaged, on the coasts or within the dominion of the other, their respective subjects or citizens shall receive, as well for themselves as for their vessels and effects, the same assistance which would be due to the inhabitants of the country where the damage happens, and shall pay the same charges and dues only as the said inhabitants would be subject to pay in a like case; and if the operations of repair should require that the whole or any part of the cargo be unladed, they shall pay no duties, charges, or fees, on the part which they shall relade and carry away."

All these portions of the treaty with Spain show that the spirit and true intention was, that the citizens of either country should be undisturbed in the territory of the other, when they were forced there by the causes above enumerated; and that as to all their rights and property, they should be reinstated in the same position they were in when under the flag and in the territory of their own country. As these provisions were intended to preserve the harmony and free intercourse of the two nations, the treaty ought to be liberally construed, with a view to promote that object. There were more of great national objects in it than private, or for the adjustment of private interests and rights. It took the intercourse of the two countries out of the general law of nations, and attempted to bring us closer together by treaty stipulations.

The language of the 8th Article is, "All ships and merchandise, of what nature soever," "shall be restored entire," &c. This treaty was made in 1795, when slaves were not only "merchandise" in Spain, but in almost every State in this Union; when even the slave trade from the coast of Africa was carried on openly by both countries, and in the profits of which, the people of Connecticut themselves partook largely. Under these circumstances, it is not to be supposed that either nation intended, in 1795, to exclude slaves from being "merchandise." And the language is, "ships and merchandise of what nature soever." The construction as to the true meaning of the treaty at the time it was made, cannot for a moment be doubted. As to whether the slaves are to be considered as "merchandise" or not, we have authority which even the sickly cant of British philanthropy itself cannot disregard. In the High Court of Admiralty in Great Britain, as late as 1827, it was expressly declared, that "innumerable acts had been passed which regulate the condition of slaves, and which tend to consider them, as the colonists themselves do, as res possitae in commercio, as mere goods and chattels, as subject to mortgages, as constituting part of the value of estates, as liable to be taken in execution for debt, to be publicly sold for such purposes; and has it (the sovereign State) not established courts of the highest jurisdiction, for the carrying into execution provisions for all these purposes—and these its most eminent courts of justice—is our court of the King's Privy Council, and its courts of Chancery, where all these regulations are carried into effect with the most scrupulous attention, and under the authority of Acts of Parliament?"—Haggard's Reports, vol. 2, page

129. It is idle to quote from the courts of our own country. The point is beyond all controversy. Under the treaty of 1795, slaves are to be considered as merchandise in law. The treaty is the law of the land, and every tribunal bound to carry out its spirit and intention whenever a case arises. After an official demand has been made by the minister of Spain, and the regular ship papers, properly authenticated by the proper officers of Spanish ports, have been presented, it is carrying out the spirit of the treaty to raise and decide the abstract right of property under the local laws of Spain? Is it right to deprive a Spanish citizen, under Spanish flag, of the privilege of making his issue as to the final rights of property before the tribunals of his own country? Was it the intention of the treaty to free the citizens of Spain, who may be driven into our territory by the "act of God and the king's enemies," and seized by our own officers, to have their final title (property in possession decided upon by tribunals) it was precisely the reverse. If they had come in by their own consent, the matter might, perhaps, have been different. But the vessel was taken possession of by an officer of the United States, off Montauk Point, and admitted to be upon the "high seas." There had been insurrection, murder, and robbery committed on board by the slaves. She was taken into the jurisdiction of our district court, under charges of offences supposed to be committed against the laws of nations. Instead of having the negroes placed in a situation to receive punishment for whatever offences they may have committed against their masters, those who had been in Cuba in undisputed possession of property under the Spanish flag were instantly deprived of that possession, and their final title to the property peremptorily decided upon by an American court, in defiance of the plainest treaty stipulations. Not only that, but Ruiz and Montes, Spanish citizens, thus forced into our territory under appalling circumstances, when common humanity, independent of all law, demanded that they should be treated with hospitality, as unfortunate guests were actually thrown into prison under charges which the negroes were instigated to make, for offences committed against the negroes while they were in Cuba, under the Spanish jurisdiction. This is the justice of an American court, bowed down in disgraceful subservience before the bigoted mandates of that blind fanaticism, which prompted the judge upon the bench to declare in his decree, in reference to one of these negroes, that "although he might be stained with crime, yet he should not sigh in vain for Africa;" and all because his hands were reeking with the blood of murdered white men! It is a base outrage. (I can use no milder language) upon all the sympathies of civilized life.

It is time that the white race of the Southern States should be alive to the relations they bear towards their fellow men in other regions. When the first movements were made in Great Britain towards emancipation in her West Indies, it was thought to be the idle and visionary dreams of theoretical enthusiasts, who were not until it held a checking power over the British cabinet, and was satisfied with nothing short of its demands. Even now, wielded as it is by O'Connell, lashed into the fury and phrenzy of blind fanaticism, it holds under its sway a weak cabinet, forced to court and ally it by ministering to its base and depraved appetite. Having carried its measures at home, it now looks, in the arrogance of its power, for objects abroad, upon which to exhaust its pharisaical charity. While the public men of Great Britain exult in ravaging the fairest regions of Asia, and reducing three hundred millions of human beings to the most abject slavery on earth; whilst they have gloated for ages over plunder and murder in those vast regions through which the Ganges sweeps, they, at the same time, whine, in the drivelling hypocrisy of modern times, over the hard fate of the slave in America. Her whole and final object is to strike at the source of our power as a nation destined to be hereafter her great commercial rival in the world. The productions of slave labor furnish us our vast resources in commerce, and are the basis of our power abroad. To strike at slave labor, is to strike at our power. If she prostrates it by appealing to the hypocritical sympathies of the world, she strikes as effectual a blow at us, as her rival, as if she had sacked our cities and ravaged our coasts by war. Her aim is power, and she has ever been bent on obtaining it, either by force or by fraud. She holds the literature of the English language in her hands; and she can appeal to the religious sympathies of those who speak that language, with more certain power than by an appeal to arms. It is under these views and feelings that a minister of Great Britain has recently declared, in the sickly cant of modern duplicity, that she will no longer recognize in us "the right of property in persons." (Case of the brig Enterprise.) Let her get possession of Cuba, and she holds the exposed coast of Florida at her mercy.

In former times, the great contest was to secure the private rights of individuals in society. In modern times, the great struggle is to preserve the separate independence of different communities. The power of the "Holy Alliance," and the principles springing from its councils, together with the interested ties of commerce, have bound all Christendom together in one consolidated community; and, unless the destiny of events be arrested, the time will come when the liberty of the citizens will sink under the prostrated independence of the nation. If the municipal, or local tribunals of one nation, can modify or alter the law of nations, by declaring in what property shall not consist with us, then every other nation can modify upon some other point, and the result must be that we shall finally be driven into a state of universal war, or sink down into the eternal peace of a drivelling and dishonored nation, with neither the spirit nor the power to defend our independence. If it be true that "there can be no property in persons," because they are considered as human, then those nations that bow down and worship some of the brute creation, have the same right to declare that property shall not consist in them, because they

have divine attributes. They are independent, and have as much right to alter the law of nations, as Great Britain has.

In our intercourse with nations, the only true rule to be observed is, to preserve our foreign interests, and leave local institutions to be sustained or abolished by the local tribunals in each country.

The decision recently made in the case of the Amistad indicates base subservience to British feeling and British interests. And, if they can succeed in organizing a "World's Convention," as they are pleased to call it, and get our people to join them, they will finally succeed in using a portion of our confederacy to break down the power of the Union, and thus secure to Great Britain her darling object, permanent ascendancy upon the ocean, and the prostration of her only rival, this great and glorious republic.

Under proper application from the Spanish minister, the negroes in this case ought undoubtedly to be given up under the treaty of 1795. The questions as to the meaning of certain Spanish words, and whether they were slaves or not under the Spanish law, ought to be left to Spanish tribunals. We have confidence that the Supreme Court of the United States will do its duty, without fear, favor, or affection.

WASHINGTON, March 1.

On Saturday last, at 3 o'clock, p. m. in accordance with previous arrangement, the members of the Diplomatic Corps accredited to the Government of the United States, waited upon the President to present their united and official respects, on his approaching retirement from office.

Mr. Fox, as the senior of the diplomatic body, delivered an address in their name to the President, which, with the reply, we publish below.—Globe.

Mr. Fox's Address.

Sir—I have the honor to address you in the name of the diplomatic body accredited to the United States of America. We are anxious, sir, to express to you the high respect and esteem which we entertain for your character, as well as the gratitude that we feel personally for the kindness and courtesy we have always received at your hands. We shall all remember with satisfaction the period during which our respective public duties have placed us in communication with your Government; and in now taking leave of you officially, we beg to be allowed to assure you of the sincere interest we shall ever feel for the continued welfare and happiness of yourself and of your family.

The President's Reply.

I reciprocate, sir, cordially, the expressions of respect and esteem which you have made to me in behalf of the members of the diplomatic body accredited to this Government.

I would have regretted deeply the occurrence of a single circumstance in our official intercourse to interrupt those relations of mutual respect and personal kindness, the maintenance of which between public functionaries is always agreeable, and which seldom fails to exercise a salutary influence upon the transaction of public business. Your obliging expressions have satisfied me that my utmost wishes in this regard have been fully realized, and I derive great pleasure from the conviction.

The members of the diplomatic body will please to accept my grateful acknowledgments for the interests they take in the future happiness of myself and family; and I beg them to be assured that I will always cherish a lively solicitude for their individual welfare, and for the welfare of those whose happiness is dependent upon theirs.

From the Charleston Courier.

MINISTER TO MEXICO.—MR. HOLMES. WASHINGTON, Feb. 24.

The General Appropriation bill has just passed the House. The amendment of the Committee of the Whole, substituting a charge instead of a Minister to Mexico, was rejected by a vote of 101 to 83.

Mr. Holmes was extremely anxious that a Minister should be sent to that country, owing to the Californian, being in dispute, and a number of other important questions requiring the presence of a Minister of the United States.—Correspondence of Patriot.

We would like to know, who it was that moved the amendment, to lower the grade of our national representative at Mexico. The South, at least, is indebted to Mr. Holmes for a true appreciation of the importance of our relations with that country—and of the official dignity, which should belong to one charged with the care of our interests in that quarter. When Mr. Poinsett filled that post, he filled it as full minister. Our relations, with that country, important as they were then, are now still more so. Every day adds to their consequence. Mexico, in its connection with Texas, and the slave question, is the chosen theatre of British intrigue. The South should see to it, that we have a man there—prompt, sagacious, courageous. And the idea of sending a mere charge to Mexico, when we send Ministers to Prussia, Austria, and Russia, is ridiculous. For what are the national representatives at these Courts, but the agents simply of national courtesy and good fellowship?—What the grand requisites for filling them honorably? Good manners and a gentlemanly ease in the French language. Our relations with Mexico, on the contrary, are those of business and feeling. They reach to the honor and vital concerns of the South and the highest authority. Again we say, the South, at least, is indebted to Mr. Holmes, for his just discrimination, and a sagacity which has so properly distinguished between substance and shadow, glitter and reality the empty ceremonial of European Courts, and the home reaching consequence of our South American relations. A WHIG.

Col. Harney.—We have great pleasure in being assured by a distinguished officer just from Florida, that the report of Col. Harney's arrest is utterly untrue.

On the contrary, Col. Harney's conduct has received the marked approbation of the War Department; and has been highly commended by Gen. Armistead himself in General Orders read at the head of the troops.—Charleston Mercury.

SAVANNAH, March 4.

From Florida.—By the arrival yesterday of the steamer Isis, Capt. Picher, from Pilatka, we are in receipt of the annexed letter from one of our valued Florida correspondents.

Capt. Picher reports that on Sunday, a severe hail storm passed over St. Marys, (Ga.) which, with the severe frost, it is supposed, must have severely injured the orange trees in that vicinity.

Correspondence of the Savannah Republican.

FLORIDA, Feb. 27.

Gentlemen—Since writing you last, nothing has transpired materially to change the aspect of affairs in Florida.—The General, it is hoped, will stop the mouths of the grumblers by sending off some 400 Indians the first of next month, under Maj. Belknap. They are strongly guarded and well taken care of. Two treacherous warriors in attempting to force the duplicate guards have been emigrated to their celestial hunting grounds; which seems to have induced the balance to submit quietly to the treaty, and try those of Arkansas first. If Congress will give Gen. Armistead money, I think he will end the war, and that too in the cheapest and most expeditious manner.

More Indian Troubles.—We learn from the Little Rock Gazette, on the authority of a gentleman, recently from the Indian country, that great excitement has been created among the Cherokees, by the execution of an Indian named Achilla Smith, one of the treaty signers, who had been tried and convicted of murder. Previous to his execution he had asked and obtained leave to have a personal interview with the chief, John Ross, with the view to obtain a reprieve. While before the chief he was earnest in his protestations of innocence of the crime of which he had been convicted, but stated that he had killed three or four men. Ross refused to grant a reprieve, and Smith was executed. After this event the excitement became intense amongst a party to which Smith belonged. Threats were made against the life of Ross and his friends, and he thought it prudent to surround himself by a body guard of some forty persons. He is shortly to leave the Nation for the East.

It is further stated that Ross despatched a message to a distinguished member of the Ridge party, a relative of Boudinot's, who had (it is said,) expressed some threats against him—know what his intentions were. The reply was characteristic of the man, and of course unsatisfactory to Ross. Thus the matter stood when the informant of the Gazette left.

The people of Arkansas with good reason implore the Federal Government to send to the frontier a force sufficiently large to keep in check the numerous hostile tribes that it has concentrated on the borders of that State.

SOUTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE.

This body adjourned on Thursday the 18th ult., after a laborious session of eight days. Previous to the adjournment, the following resolution, offered by Dr. Capers, was unanimously adopted:

"Resolved, That we entertain the kindest feelings towards the people of Camden, tendered to us at the present session of our Conference; and that the minister appointed to serve them for the present year, be requested to express the same from the pulpit."

After the passage of this resolution, the Bishop read the following Stations, Circuits and Missions, with the names of the preachers annexed, by whom they are to be served during the present year.

CHARLESTON DISTRICT.

Henry Bass, Presiding Elder. Charleston—B. English, J. Sewell, and J. Stacy. Black Swamp—R. J. Boyd and M. Eady. Walterboro—J. Huggins, and one to be supplied. Barnwell—Robert J. Limehouse. Orangeburg—A. McCorquodale and A. M. Critchberg. Cypress—H. H. Durant. Cooper River—A. Walker and S. P. Taylor.

MISSIONS.

Beaufort—T. E. Ledbetter and W. L. Pegues. Pocatigo—A. J. Green. Combahee and Ashley—I. B. Coburn and W. H. Fleming. Pon Pon—C. Wilson. South Santee—Hugh E. Ogbourne. North Santee—J. R. Locke. Cooper River—A. Nettles. Charleston City—T. Hutchins.

COKEBERY DISTRICT.

Nicholas Talley, Presiding Elder. Cokesbury—J. H. Wheeler and A. M. Shipp. Edgefield—S. W. Kennerly and J. Tarrant. Pendleton—Williamson Smith. Greenville Station—W. P. Mouzon. Greenville Circuit—D. Hilliard and S. M. Green. Union—P. G. Bowman and J. R. Pickett. Laurens—Sam'l. Dunwoody. Newbury—G. W. Moore and T. S. Daniel. Aiken—W. E. Collier. Saluda—J. H. Zimmerman.

COLUMBIA DISTRICT.

Hartwell Spain, Presiding Elder. Columbia—Whiteford Smith. Columbia Circuit—W. G. Paterson. Winnsboro—D. G. McDaniel and Z. W. Barnes. Camden—W. C. Kirkland. Santee J. W. Welborn and W. S. Halton. Darlington Station—To be supplied. Darlington Circuit—L. O'Neale and E. L. King. Lancaster—W. T. Harrison.

MISSIONS.

Broad River—Joseph Holmes. Wateree—W. J. Jackson and J. Nipper. Pee Dee—W. M. Kerr.

WILMINGTON DISTRICT.

Hugh A. C. Walker, Presiding Elder. Wilmington—W. A. Ganewell. Brunswick—D. W. Seal and C. H. Pritchard. Bladen—J. M. Bradley and J. A. Porter. Fayetteville—C. S. Walker. Pee Dee—W. A. McSwain. Black River—L. Scarborough and D. Cox. Georgetown—S. Leard. Wacannaw—S. Jones and D. J. Simmons. Black River and Pee Dee Mission—M. Robbins. Wacannaw Neck—P. J. Minick and J. L. Belin. Sampit—P. A. M. Williams. Cape Fear—J. H. Chandler.

CHEW DISTRICT.

D. Derrick, Presiding Elder. Cheraw—A. M. Forster. Chesterfield—G. R. Talley. Waxhaw—John Watts. Wadesboro—J. L. Potter and S. W. Daves. Centre—S. B. Laney and A. Richardson. Montgomery—C. Smith and N. Bird. Deep River—W. C. Clarke and

L. Little. Rockingham—A. Hoyle. Rockfish—J. P. Kirtou.

LINCOLN DISTRICT.

William Crook, Presiding Elder. Charlotte—C. Murchison. Charlotte Circuit—B. Hamilton. Lincolnton—J. B. Anthony. Lenoir—C. McLeod. Morganton—M. A. McKilhen and J. McMacKin. Kings Mountain—A. Huckabee. Rutherford—A. B. McGilvray, and C. A. Crow, superannuated. Spartanburg—S. W. Capers. York—S. Townsend.

W. M. Wightman to be Editor of the Southern Christian Advocate.

Dr. W. Capers Corresponding Secretary to the Missionary Board for the South and South West.

S. Armstrong transferred to the Alabama Conference.

The next Conference will be held in Charlotte, North Carolina.

The Advertiser.

EDGEFIELD C. H.

THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1841.

We are indebted to the Hon. John C. Calhoun, and the Hon. F. W. Pickens, for various Public Documents, Papers, &c.

We have received the Inaugural Address of President Harrison, but it was too late for insertion in this week's paper. We will lay it before our readers at the earliest possible date.

Cotton.—The latest accounts of the state of the Foreign markets, as brought by the Steam Ship Britannia, at Boston, are highly favorable. Although prices have advanced but slightly, yet there was an increased demand, by manufacturers, and the markets were firm.

This news, however, has had little or no effect, to raise the price in our markets, and we can attribute it only to the want of money, among purchasers. Indeed, we scarcely recollect the time, when our business men and merchants, have been so drove as at the present. A determination is manifested by them, however, to extricate themselves from their difficulties, and ascertain the true state of affairs. As an instance, of the heretofore unparalleled pressure among creditors, we are informed, that upwards of six hundred cases for debt, have been docketed for trial, at the ensuing Spring term, of the Court of Common Pleas, in this District; besides an unusual number of judgments confessed. We also learn, that the same spirit prevails in the adjoining Districts. Whether this will operate, for the benefit of those engaged, and the community at large, remains to be decided. That there has been a disposition exhibited, by many, to delay the settlement of their dues, is a self-evident fact, which must be accounted for, either for the want of means, or a disposition to make suitable amends for the delay.

If it has been the want of requisite means, we cannot but deplore the unhappy effects, which this procedure, on the part of our business community, will have a tendency to produce, as a large amount of property must be sacrificed, to satisfy the voracity of the laws. But, if on the contrary, there has been a want of disposition to meet just demands, when due, we cannot but hope, that the law will have the desired effect, of bringing people to their senses, and to warn them in future, not to contract debts, which they have no idea of paying at maturity.

We would, that it might have been otherwise, that the expenses which must accrue from a procedure by law, might have been averted, and we yet indulge the hope that the time is not far distant, when we shall once more assume our former station, as out of debt.

Executive Clemency.—We notice by a paragraph in the Charleston Courier, that His Excellency Gov. Richardson has pardoned a young man named George W. Jones, who was sentenced to death, a short time since, for having forged a check, for twenty dollars, on T. Tupper, Esq., President of the L. C. & C. Rail Road Company. The Courier remarks, "that the case was one highly proper for Executive interposition, as the criminal was convicted, only of making, not of uttering or passing the forged instrument. Jones is to remain in jail for a considerable time, in expiation of the crime of grand larceny, of which he was also convicted, and for which he has received several public whippings.

Consecration.—The consecration of the Right Rev. Stephen Elliott, formerly the highly respected Professor of Sacred Literature, in the College of this State, at Columbia, took place, at Savannah, on Sunday the 28th ult. He is now Bishop of the Diocese of Georgia, Bishop Gadsden, of this State, Bishop Meade, of Virginia, and Bishop Ives, of North Carolina, were present, besides a number of ministers from this, and the adjoining States. The Savannah papers, speak of the ceremonial as highly interesting.

The Georgian, at the close of an article of some length, quotes the following eulogy upon Bishop Elliott.

"We know the delicate character of his mind too well, to fume before him the unseasonable incense of adulation, and we will only say, that not his Diocese only, but all Christians, of whatever names, rejoice in the coming of such a faithful and zealous